

Appendix 1

Bishops Waltham VDS SPD - summary of representations

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
Environment Agency	No comments to make on this document	Noted
Historic England	Historic England very much welcomes and supports the preparation of this Statement and the policies therein. However, we have the following comments.	Noted
	The Statement properly acknowledges the designation of the Conservation Area for the town centre. However, there are subsequently only two references to the Conservation Area in the policies, neither of which give any greater emphasis to the importance of character and design within the Area. We expected greater detail to be given on the characteristics of, and design within, the Conservation Area reflecting its special architectural and historic interest.	<p>The Bishop's Waltham Conservation Area Technical Assessment (November 2001) contains all the detail of the characteristics and design of the Conservation Area. The document is as relevant today as it was when it was published.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : include reference to the document, its current relevance and its continuing importance for the future.</p>
	We note the reference on page 2 to a Conservation Area Planning Appraisal. Is this intended to be a Character Assessment ? Is there a timetable for its production ? If so, this could be helpfully noted in the Statement. Is there is also a management plan for the Conservation Area or an intention to prepare one ?	<p>There is an error in the terminology and the Parish Council has no intention to produce a Planning Appraisal. Neither is there, at this stage, a management plan for the Conservation Area. The Technical Assessment referred to was produced to support an extension to the Conservation Area and provides useful background as to the character and important qualities of this designated area of Bishops Waltham. None of the proposed Design Statement policies contradict the Technical Assessment guidance.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : amend the wording within the sections on the Conservation Area to correct and clarify.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>We also note the reference on page 8 to the Bishops Waltham Conservation Area Technical Assessment. I have been unable to find this on your website and am therefore not sure when this was produced or to what level of detail it characterises the Conservation Area or contains advice on developments within the Area. Nevertheless, we would have expected the Village Design Statement to have specifically related to this Technical Assessment, promoting the retention and conservation of existing important characteristics of the Conservation Area, as identified in the Technical Assessment, and their incorporation in new development, in order to maintain and reinforce the Area's character and special interest.</p>	<p>See above. The Technical Assessment contains general advice on evolving the area in a sympathetic way so that the essential character of the area is sustained for future generations. It also has content on details such as bricks, flints and hedges.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : include reference to the Technical Assessment.</p>
	<p>The Council has not identified the Conservation Area as being at risk, but are there any issues with minor alterations to buildings within the Area under permitted development rights ? Is there an Article 4(2) Direction in place ?</p>	<p>The Technical Assessment lists the detractors that could, over time, erode the visual quality and the character of the Conservation Area. It is not necessary to repeat elements of this document which provides factual information on the key features of the Conservation Area. The planning approval process has generally been adequate to ensure the guidance within the Technical Assessment is followed. If deemed necessary WCC has powers to consider imposing further restrictions by requiring planning permission for matters that are currently permitted development. These are known as Article 4 Directions and follow strict procedures and are legally binding, there are no Article 4 Directions declared in Bishop's Waltham.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>Therefore, whilst we welcome and support the policies that are in the Statement, we feel that the Statement fails to address the significance of the Conservation Area or</p>	<p>The recommended amendments above will redress these omissions</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	adequately identify where this detailed attention to the Conservation Area can be found or when it will be produced.	
Natural England	<p>General Advice from national policies on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact upon National Park Context of local area Landscape Character Assessments Green Infrastructure and Sustainable Design Biodiversity Community Engagement on VDS 	<p>The VDS covers the part of the Parish that lies outside the South Downs National Park and this is clarified in the introductory section.</p> <p>The Winchester City Council Landscape Character Assessment (March 2004) covered all the key characteristics for Bishop's Waltham and its surrounds. The document, together with a subsequent Landscape Sensitivity Analysis for Bishop's Waltham (November 2013), were used to scope and prioritise the site selection for the future developments contained within the Local Plan Part 2, which were intentionally focussed to the south of the town to avoid impact on the National Park.</p> <p>Green infrastructure and sustainable design are covered in general terms in the VDS. The biodiversity assets were recognised in the Local Plan Part 2 and, throughout the Design Statement, there are references to respecting, preserving or enhancing the rural setting as well as specifically linking open spaces to each other with green corridors to promote biodiversity in Policy 6.5. There is a specific policy on supporting innovative and sustainable design.</p> <p>There was considerable community engagement within the consultation process; the top priority for residents was about maintaining the rural feel of the town. The VDS has also been prepared with community engagement, which is set out in a separate statement</p>
South Downs National Park	p.11 - Encouraging 'cul de sacs' could be a problem in regard to permeability of new development. This policy could encourage developers to create arbitrary curves that don't make sense in terms of road layout and function.	<p>Cul de sacs are a feature of the current built environs of Bishop's Waltham, adding to the variety of layouts. They should not be ruled out from future road layouts and indeed Policy 6.2 refers to 'Developments should incorporate a variety of layouts...' and provides some examples of what features could be included such as cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Recommendation : amend Policy 6.2 to insert the words 'such as' after layouts, to indicate that the following references are examples of what could be included.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	p.13 - Materials - surfacing? we encourage permeable/porous paving for numerous reasons.	Although to be welcomed, the Design Statement reflects the look of the designs (as appreciated by residents) rather than the material compositions. This detail is provided in WCC High Quality Places SPD adopted in July 2015 and there is no need for this VDS to repeat such detail. Recommendation : no change
	p.14 - we are finding chimneys on new builds are incorrectly placed (usually false and not operational). This type of chimney should be placed where they make sense ie. not above the front door!	Policy 10.1 could be clarified to refer to the items as suggestions rather than pre-requisites. Recommendation : amend Policy 10.1 to read "Roof lines should exhibit variety by including different heights, gable ends and including chimneys where appropriate".
WCC Landscape Team	The VDS does not include a section on the village's parks and open spaces, on how valuable they were to the character and appearance of the village and how they should be protected and enhanced where possible.	Open spaces in Bishop's Waltham were re-assessed in terms of their importance for recreational and/or amenity purposes during the formulation of the Local Plan Part 2 in the Open Space Assessment 2013. The results of this review, in terms of which areas continue to be protected under Policy DM4, are set out in the updated Open Space Strategy and are shown on the Local Plan Policies Map within LPP2. The Design Statement does not set out to repeat the content of higher authority documents. Recommendation : no change
	The village has shortfalls of open space and there is pressure on remaining green spaces from car parking and housing.	Although this is true, the Design Statement is not a spatial strategy. The areas existing and required were covered in the LPP2 and its supporting documents, so there is not a requirement for that to be repeated.
	Include reference to 'open spaces'?	See above Recommendation : include a short section under "Bishop's Waltham Today", to refer to WCC Open Space Strategy and the local value of open spaces.
Tony Clements (GL Hearn acting on behalf of Crest Strategic Projects)	On a minor point of detail, given this hierarchical relationship, it is unclear why the SPD makes reference to the Winchester District Local Plan Review – 2006, given that	Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006) and Local Plan Part 1 (2013) are both adopted, whereas Local Plan Part 2 is currently not. Policies in the Local Plan Review 2006 are still an authority until superseded by Local Plan Part 2. This is explained in the Introduction to

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>the guidance within has been prepared pursuant to the Local Plan Part 1 and Emerging Local Plan Part 2 and will be interpreted as guidance designed to achieve the objectives set out within these documents</p>	<p>the Design Statement.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>With reference to NPPG and NPPF, as set out above, it is noted that Winchester City Council has recently adopted the 'High Quality Places' SPD which sets out urban design guidance to be applied to developments within the district as a whole. The provisions within this document will apply to development proposals that come forward in Bishop's Waltham and therefore it will be important to ensure that any guidance contained within the Bishop's Waltham Design Statement is specific to circumstances arising within the settlement itself, to avoid unnecessary duplication. It is understood that the Parish Council has prepared this document to support high quality development within the town and this aspiration is certainly supported; it should however be acknowledged that undue policy prescription is not supported by current national guidance.</p>	<p>The Winchester City Council 'High Quality Places' SPD was fully considered and taken into account during the formulation of the Design Statement. There is not intended to be any repetition or ambiguity.</p> <p>The Design Statement is meant to be very specific to Bishop's Waltham. It has been compiled by residents to ensure the overall character of the town is reflected in new developments without being unduly prescriptive.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>As set out above these representations are made with the intention of ensuring that the document is robust and can assume its place within the decision-making hierarchy effectively; accordingly where necessary the wording of particular 'policies' is challenged to ensure the overarching objective of achieving high quality places is realised. It should be noted from the outset that the</p>	<p>The VDS will be adopted as SPD and carry the appropriate weight in the decision making process. There is no consistency as to how the requirements are expressed in the various VDSs adopted across the Winchester District – some refer to policies others guidance or guidelines. It is the status of the VDS as SPD that clarifies its role in the planning process and therefore it is the intention to retain reference to policies.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>statement is to be read as a supplementary planning document, the purpose of which is to provide guidance on how policies within the development plan are implemented. As such it does not have 'policy' status and therefore it would be more appropriate to refer to guidance or guidelines within, rather than new 'policy'. This approach would be consistent with the 'High Quality Places' SPD.</p>	
	<p>Policy 3.1 states that "<i>Existing views to, across and from the town should be protected</i>". The wording of this policy should be refined to make clear why these are views are important and that their protection forms part of the overall development strategy for the town. This should then be read as a requirement that is compatible with the allocation strategy, rather than as a factor that could be interpreted as a constraint to delivery of these sites. As noted above, Bishop's Waltham is identified as a market town which will accommodate a level of housing growth to meet Winchester District's housing needs. To facilitate this, not all existing views to, across and from the town can remain unaltered. A level of landscape and visual change is inevitable.</p>	<p>The 'allocation strategy' for the developments sites considered a number of factors, including the Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal (November 2013). The factors were ranked for their relevance to each site and this led to the final selection for consideration in the Local Plan Part 2. Sites that were highly sensitive were not selected.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : amend the wording of the policy to replace 'should be protected' with 'should be respected'.</p>
	<p>Policy 3.2 states "<i>Views of the countryside from within edge of settlement developments should be retained where possible</i>". Again the wording here would benefit from some refinement to clarify whether this relates to existing edge of settlement development or to the residential development proposed as part</p>	<p>The policy refers to the current settlement boundary and requires, where possible, the existing views to be retained, acknowledging that with developments to the outside of the boundary, there may be some impact.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : amend the policy to clarify this point</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>of the housing allocations at Bishop's Waltham within Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Policy 4.1 relates to scale of development and states "<i>Developments should consist of groupings of houses of a size and type that are small enough to encourage neighbourliness and social inclusion, each having its own character and architectural style</i>". As currently worded, this policy is somewhat vague and is open to interpretation. It does not follow that small dwellings or small groupings of dwellings necessarily encourage social inclusion. A range of urban design principles is important in fostering a sense of place and creating well-used streets and it is suggested that by listing criteria that would in the Council's view encourage social inclusion and active streets may be a better route to achieving this objective.</p>	<p>The small size of the groupings of new dwellings is deemed important by local people to encourage neighbourliness and interaction between both new and existing residents. Listing the factors to encourage this might be too prescriptive,. To clarify the intention of this reference it is suggested social inclusion is replaced by interaction.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> delete the reference to social inclusion and replace with 'interaction'.</p>
	<p>With respect to massing of buildings, Policy 5.2 states "<i>Buildings should be no higher than 2 ½ storeys i.e. top storey in roof</i>". This is considered to be unduly restrictive insofar as it relates to all buildings within the town, not simply dwellings. Within a market town there is clearly scope for buildings of greater than two storey height, particularly commercial buildings or indeed community facilities. Similarly, with respect to residential development, it is also considered that there is scope for a variety of dwelling heights within a town creating visual interest and varied roofscapes as well as punctuation within a streetscape. While there may be</p>	<p>There are currently very few buildings, whether dwellings, commercial buildings or community buildings that are higher than 2½ storeys or equivalent in Bishops Waltham. It is considered that one or two prominent buildings would ruin the overall landscape. Part of the charm of Bishop's Waltham is that it lies in a hollow and has low buildings and residents have expressed strong feelings about restricting the height of new developments.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : amend the preamble to reinforce the intent of the policy and insert the word 'generally' after 'buildings should', to provide flexibility without being overly prescriptive.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>circumstances within the settlement where it would be perfectly reasonable to limit heights to two and a half storeys; there equally may be other instances where a taller structure would be appropriate. It is suggested that the approach should instead require development to reflect and integrate with the design and scale of existing built form within Bishop's Waltham as a whole and importantly with the immediate site context.</p>	
	<p>Policy 8.1 requires that footpaths and cycleways provided by development should link to the town centre, schools, community facilities and open spaces to the existing networks. This objective is supported and should result in delivery of developments that are able to promote links within, across and to adjacent sites. However this should be limited to what is reasonable and deliverable.</p>	<p>Comment noted : Each site policy within LPP2 specifies the need to provide a section of an inter-linking southern footpath/cycle-way and planning applications will be required to accord with these elements. It will be a condition, therefore, of granting the planning application. The Parish Council has now defined the boundary linking points to assist developers with planning their site layouts.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>Policy 10 relates to roof forms and requires that all roofs are 'made' of clay tiles or occasionally slate. The wording requires amendment to relate to external facing materials, which is the intended focus of the guideline. Furthermore to impose such a blanket restriction is considered to be overly onerous. The guidance should express a preference for the use of a sympathetic palette of materials that reflect immediate site context; the supporting text could reasonably advise that there is widespread use of plain clay tiles and slate within the town and proposals that are sympathetic to the local vernacular and immediate site context will be supported. Restricting developers to just two</p>	<p>The wording allows for sustainable alternatives of similar appearance so the policy is about the look of the roofs and not the composition.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : amend the wording of the preamble and the policy along the lines of the comments offered, to clarify it is the appearance that is of importance.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	types of roofing material is contrary to paragraph 60 of the NPPF, which advises against stifling innovation, originality and initiative.	
	The emphasis placed on the protection of trees, hedges and landscaping, parking provision and attractive frontages and boundaries is noted and supported.	Support noted
Zoe Cooke (Local Resident)	I'm really pleased to see the design statement - I've lived in BW for a year and really like the character and friendliness of the town. I do feel it is becoming characterised by modern housing developments so the design statement is welcomed.	Support noted
	If anything I would like to see more emphasis on reducing on-street parking by providing sufficient parking on properties alongside a realistic expectation of how many cars each home has. Most of our neighbours have two cars, some have three or four and most don't use their garages so often the road resembles a car park.	The Winchester District Car Parking Strategy (2014-18) details the Bishop's Waltham main car parking arrangements for the future and the Winchester City Council SPD Residential Parking Standards (December 2009) specify the requirements for parking spaces within the new developments. <u>Recommendation</u> : no change
	I'd also like to have seen a bit more detail in the sustainability section, e.g. could gardens be designed with sufficient space for home composting bins.	The designs of the gardens themselves are largely up to the householders. The Design Statement covers the appearance from the public realm. <u>Recommendation</u> : no change
Mr Hayter (Local Resident)	No strategy to reduce greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. Most of the policies give priority to character and views at the cost of not realising the potential to reduce carbon footprint.	The purpose of the VDS is to add local detail to parent policies set out in the Local Plan. The Council also adopted in July 2015 its High Quality Places SPD which provides detailed advice for new development, it is not necessary for the BW VDS to repeat this guidance, its purpose is to add the elements of local distinctiveness that are specific to BW. Therefore, it is not necessary for the VDS to include detail on reducing carbon emissions this is covered in LPP1, the focus for the VDS is on design and

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
		<p>layout detail.</p> <p>Recommendation : no change</p>
	<p>The term "developments" means any requiring planning permission as in the LPP1 DM policies. It is thus also any extension or change of use not only of housing but all other development throughout the settlement including any changes to developments on 2015's new sites through to 2031. Change to read "housing development on sites when first allocated"</p>	<p>The VDS clarifies that its purpose is to 'manage the changes brought about by future development whilst preserving the unique characteristics of BW'. Given that the VDS once adopted will apply to all relevant development proposals, including extensions and alterations the recommended change is not considered appropriate as this will limit the application of the policies in the VDS.</p> <p>Recommendation : no change</p>
	<p>"strong prerogative" should be changed to "presumption". This is derived from LPP1 & LPP2, not this Design Statement</p>	<p>Reference to 'strong prerogative' is included under the summary of the characteristics of the Outlying Hamlets, which highlights the rural nature and the requirement for this to be maintained. The Local Plan Part 1 includes the necessary policy guidance to restrict development in the rural area, but this does allow for limited development in accordance with national guidance. Whilst the term 'strong prerogative' is appropriate by replacing this with 'presumption' clarifies the emphasis of this section.</p> <p>Recommendation : change the phrase 'strong prerogative' to 'presumption'.</p>
	<p>VISION. BW is a "Market Town" that has to be just as "sufficient" for its hinterland of neighbouring parishes as for itself. Correspondingly it is not consistent with NPPF37 requirement to reduce journey lengths nor NPPF160, 161 to anticipate the need to expand the town centre.</p>	<p>The 'vision' is included to provide a context for the VDS, this vision is also reflected in LPP2 and the proposed development strategy set out in Policies BW1-BW5, which reflects the role of BW as established in Policy MTRA2 of LPP1. NPPF 37 refers to planning policies aiming to have a balance of land uses to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, etc. Policies BW1-BW5 of LPP2 respond to this requirement whereby each policy allocates land for housing/employment and associated open space and linkages with the Bishop's Waltham town centre, therefore presenting opportunities to minimise journey lengths.</p> <p>Recommendation : no change</p>
	<p>"2.1 The existing rural nature of all the</p>	<p>It is not the intention that this reference will restrict the density of</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>approaches to Bishops Waltham should be preserved where possible" The effect of this is contrary to reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well. Most of the existing "rural nature" is because of trees and verges on highway land that may have to be removed to safely cope with existing plus rising traffic volumes to 2031. In any event "where possible" is highly subjective and as a development policy has to make the developer responsible for demonstrating it is "impossible" that is impossible to do.</p>	<p>development. Indeed Policies BW1-BW5 of LPP2 refer to the retention of trees and hedgerows in recognition of the potential landscape impact of new development and for the need for this to be reduced. Reference to 'where possible' provides flexibility to this approach. NPPF 30 refers to the need to locate new development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport, and the development strategy for BW follows this approach, being a named settlement under LPP1 Policy MTRA2, based on its size and level of service provision. The VDS does not allocate sites for new development so these NPPF references are not applicable.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>3.1 Existing views to, across and from the town should be protected (See Appendix 2)".The effect of this is contrary to reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well. In any event "protected" is vague, eg by hiding built development with trees? Change to "preserved"</p>	<p>The VDS does not allocate sites for development. See above in response to NPPF references</p> <p>There is no reason why careful design of the layouts for new developments cannot take account of the existing views, though not all can be protected. The VDS acknowledges that these will change with the planned developments in LPP2. High Quality Places SPD has a section on views and vistas to provide further guidance, this also covers amenity considerations.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> change the wording from "protected" to "respected".</p>
	<p>"3.2 Views of the countryside from within edge of settlement developments should be retained where possible" Conflicts with policy 1.1 that creates strong policy boundary by indigenous planting.</p>	<p>Policy 1.1 is about the physical defining of the new settlement boundary to accord with the stated vision of the town being "within natural boundaries surrounded by farmed lands". It is aimed at influencing the definition of the new settlement boundary. Policy 3.2 is about retaining, where possible, the views from the current settlement boundary to the surrounding countryside, acknowledging that with the planned</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
		<p>developments to the outside of the boundary, there may be some impact. These policies are quite separate from each other.</p> <p>Recommendation : no change due this this issue, but the wording of Policy 3.2 will be amended slightly following another respondent's comments.</p>
	<p>"4.1 Developments should consist of groupings of houses of a size and type that are small enough to encourage neighbourliness and social inclusion, each having its own character and architectural style."</p> <p>5.1 Buildings should not dominate distant views or their immediate surroundings.</p> <p>5.2 Buildings should be no higher than 2 ½ storeys i.e. top storey in roof.</p> <p>These [three policies above] conflict with reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well; also with NPPF50 mix of dwelling sizes, types, tenures and location to meet demographic needs of the majority and special needs of others. These include affordable social and public housing, supporting extra care in the home, self build and homes for former armed forces.</p>	<p>See previous responses to policies 4.1, 5.1 and 5.2</p> <p>LPP1 policies CP 2 and 3 require a mix of dwelling types and tenure, LPP1 was found sound in 2012 and adopted in March 2013 and is NPPF compliant.</p> <p>Recommendation : no change (changed due to other representation)</p>
	6.1 to 6.3 and 6.5 Welcomed	Support noted.
	"6.4 Edges of vehicle access routes should	See above

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>include a variety of verges, trees and planted areas where possible". Conflicts with reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well; also vague & impractical. Edges can be highway or private land. Particularly "planted areas" in minor residential streets are too expensive for the highway authority to maintain. "vehicle access route" includes even to minor cul-de-sacs making this a requirement on all roads. "where possible" is vague.</p>	<p>In addition, the most distinctive features of Bishop's Waltham that the residents want preserved relate to protecting the "rural feel" of the town. Having planted areas adjacent to access routes will do more to reduce greenhouse gases than increasing the density of housing by building up to the kerb edge</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change.</p>
	<p>"7.1 Significant trees and hedgerows should be retained and not replaced with fences or walls (See Appendix 3)" Protection for trees that are "significant" in the way defined by legislation should be protected by a TPO that also cannot be applied to hedges. This policy therefore goes well beyond the development plan to which it is subservient and has to be deleted. In any event most of these appear to be on highway land or BWPC open space. Extra protection would only be needed for any on private land and if not covered by a TPO could be felled at any time.</p>	<p>This specifically applies to non-protected trees and hedgerows in recognition that these contribute to the overall appearance and character of the settlement and help to blend new and existing development. The point being made in 7.1 is the need to retain these natural features rather than being replaced with hard forms of landscaping and boundary treatment.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change.</p>
	<p>"7.2 New developments should incorporate appropriate planting with sufficient space for mature growth to reflect the local landscape character and retain the rural setting" Contradictory and impractical. The "rural setting" to be "retained" is a greenfield site</p>	<p>The intention of 7.2 is to ensure that planting is not an after-thought in the design and layout of the site, but that it is an integral part of the site planning process, respecting adjacent character whether this is existing built development or open countryside.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	that is being changed into an environment that if not on the settlement edge is urban in character.	<u>Recommendation</u> : change the wording to 'and respect the overall rural character'.
	"8.1 Footpaths and cycle-ways should link to the town centre, schools, community facilities and open spaces to the existing networks". Change to read ".....community facilities, open spaces and to the existing networks."	Comment accepted. <u>Recommendation</u> : change the policy wording to that suggested.
	8.2 Links through developments should have wheelchair usable surfaces and to include planting where possible to reflect the rural context" Delete "and to include planting where possible to reflect the rural context" It is not a rural context but in most cases an urban one and conflicts with reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well.	This policy is intended to ensure that the appropriate links are provided to allow both new and existing residents to access the town centre and community facilities without having to rely on using a car, in accordance with the NPPF. The reference to planting is to ensure that these links contribute to integrating the new development, the phrase 'where possible' is included to provide flexibility. As this policy focuses on the links it is not necessary to include reference to the rural context as this matter is covered by other policies in the VDS. <u>Recommendation</u> : delete the reference to the rural context.
	"9.1 Parking and garages should not dominate the street scene" Totally impractical as the illustration demonstrates. Garage dominance can be reduced by setting its frontage back from the building line or locating it behind the dwelling with rear access that also decreases parking dominance but these increase greenhouse gases by decreasing development density.	This is a key aspiration for the VDS, however, it is acknowledged that the photograph used to illustrate this could be explicit as to what is trying to be achieved. <u>Recommendation</u> : change the photograph to illustrate how a garage which is set back from the frontage of a house can provide additional parking beside it, thus reducing the dominance of both the garage and the parking.
	"9.2 Designated parking should be convenient and in close proximity to dwelling". Amend to read "Designated parking should be in safe and easy walking distance of the dwelling." This is requires it to	Suggested changes are not needed – 'safe and easy walking distance' is inferred by in "close proximity". <u>Recommendation</u> : no change

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>be lit and visible from adjacent dwellings.</p> <p>"10.1 Roof lines should exhibit variety by including different heights and including occasional chimneys and gable ends." Conflicts with reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14. In particular it will restrict development density by not allowing the roofline of all dwellings to be of the maximum height permitted by other policies for that area that is a major way of meeting NPPF37 journey lengths by reducing the number of trips as well. The balance between what is seen by the public from where they have right of access and as seen from behind is very different but is not reflected in the policy, Chimneys reduce space on all upper floors and are unnecessary with balanced flues. There is no policy preventing flat or lean-to roofed developments to which it would also applies.</p>	<p>See above response to NPPF – it is not the intention that by requiring a variety of rooflines will have a significant impact on the densities to be achieved. The High Quality Places SPD includes extensive detail on roofs which does need to be repeated here.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	<p>10.2 Roofs should be made of clay tiles (or other sustainable alternatives of similar appearance) with traditional decorations or occasional use of slate" Clay and slate are mined and not the most sustainable materials which are those made from recycled waste that can also have greater insulation properties; also conflicts with 10.4 solar panels. Conflicts with reducing greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14</p>	<p>The wording allows for sustainable alternatives of similar appearance.</p> <p>There is no conflict with the requirement for solar panels to be an integral part of the roofing material</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : delete the word 'other' from the Policy.</p>
	<p>"10.3 Any dormer windows should not</p>	<p>VDS is applying design principles, LPP1 policies and building regulations</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	dominate the character of the building" As the illustration shows, if this an important policy it has to apply equally to porches and dormer windows which are just as permissible square topped as triangular. Replace by "Any dormer windows should not increase the carbon footprint of the building"	cover sustainable construction matters. <u>Recommendation</u> : no change
	10.4 Solar panels, if installed on new buildings, should be an integral part of the roofing material where possible". There is an overriding need to reduce the carbon footprint of all new development. Replace by "The aspect and detailed design of every new dwelling or other building should maximise the opportunity to reduce the carbon footprint by such as use of lean-to roofs with solar panels, solar wall panels and heat pumps."	The Design Statement is primarily about the appearance of new developments and proposals requiring planning permission; it cannot be applied to those matters covered by permitted development. In this instance the Policy is intended to avoid the installation of bolt-on anomalous roof panels to ensure that these features are included at the design stage. <u>Recommendation</u> : no change
	"11.1 Buildings should incorporate materials that respond to their surroundings which include traditional red or reddish bricks and utilising various types of bonding 11.2 Flints, hung tiles, blue bricks and rendering may be used sparingly to add interest. These [above two policies] are more-of-the-same selective reproduction policies that preclude timber that is highly sustainable and innovative design including that focussed on reduction of carbon footprint. In particular it precludes sustainable recycled plastic and timber cladding that can reduce building costs and thus increase viability for larger CIL/S106 contributions and both can be "rural" in appearance.	Timber or timber cladding are not predominantly apparent in local buildings and any significant increase in their use would alter the character of the town. There is, however, no restriction on the use of sustainable materials (or design) and this is encouraged under Policy 15.1 . <u>Recommendation</u> : no change
	"12.1 New developments should respect the	Part of the character of Bishop's Waltham is the variety of its housing.

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	<p>character of the locality, with buildings addressing the public realm and including front garden/amenity space and appropriate enclosure with suitable landscaping". The illustration is of terrace housing which is a good example of high density development that reduces carbon footprint whilst also "respects the character of the locality". It should therefore be replicated for new housing development all over the settlement to increase affordability and meet the needs of those who do not have a car. Consistent with maximising density the front garden should be no wider than necessary to accommodate garden waste and recycling bins. Replace by "Terrace developments should be provided within walking distance of a bus stop for those who do not have a car. The front garden should be naturally screened and no wider than necessary to accommodate garden waste and recycling bins"</p>	<p>High density housing has its place, but it would be unduly restrictive and contrary to LPP1, to have a priority on terrace housing all over the settlement and to have front gardens designed only for garden waste and recycling bins. New development will be required to comply with the housing mix and tenure policies in LPP1 (CP2 and CP3).</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> : no change</p>
	Policy 13.1 Welcomed.	Noted
	<p>"14.1 New commercial buildings should not be intrusive and should be appropriate for a semi-rural setting" This takes no account of the need to protect existing employment by supporting by all possible means potential needs to expand, re-use sites per NPPF160, 161 or accommodate new businesses. Provision to provide for all of these can only be through increase of development density of which massing and height are the major components nor necessarily in a "semi-rural setting" .Replace by "The need to protect and</p>	<p>Existing employment provision is protected by Policies CP8 and 9 of LPP1. NPPF 160 /161 refers to the requirement for local plans to have an understanding of the business needs and economic markets operating across their area. An assessment of the economic markets and future economic needs was undertaken during the preparation of LPP1 and informed the development strategy to be applied across the Winchester District. Further assessment of the economic needs of Bishop's Waltham was undertaken during the preparation of LPP2 and resulted in the employment allocation at Tollgate Sawmill (Policy BW5 LPP2). It is not the role of the VDS to allocate further employment land; its focus is to guide the design and appearance of new development.</p>

Respondent name / organisation	Respondent's comments	Response and Recommended amendments
	grow existing employment and provide for new employment anywhere within the settlement will be actively supported by helping to find a new site and supporting this and development upgrades on existing sites through the planning system"	<u>Recommendation</u> : no change
	"15.1 Sustainable and innovative design should be encouraged provided it reflects the local context" is a contradiction of terms not consistent with NPPF58 "sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area." Replace by "Sustainable and innovative design will be supported provided that it is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the settlement,"	Agree this requirement could be clarified. <u>Recommendation</u> : change the wording of the policy to that suggested.