

APPENDIX ONE: Littleton Village Design Statement (Revised) Consultation Draft September 2009.
Summary of Comments and Responses
2nd February 2010

| No | Respondent |
|----|--|
| 1 | Environment Agency Colvedene Court Wessex Business Park Wessex Way Colden Common Winchester SO21 1WP |
| 2 | Natural England 1 Southampton Road Lyndhurst Hampshire SO43 7BU |
| 3 | Adam Welch on behalf of four others namely Mark Welch, Simon Welch, Nick Welch, Joy Welch adam@thewelches.biz |
| 4 | Lisa Long adam@thewelches.biz |
| 5 | Ben Welch adam@thewelches.biz |
| 6 | Bryan Jezeph Consultancy |
| 7 | Carter Jonas on behalf of Messrs Holmes & Sons Nursery |
| 8 | Henley Planning Associates Ltd on behalf of Mr Jeff Smith (Owner Littleton Stud) |
| 9 | Communication informally received from Mr. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor |

N.B. Some rows below spill over to the next page

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| 1. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY | <p>Supports the inclusion of paras 2.8 & 2.9 identifying the presence of flood zone 3 an area of high flood risk.</p> <p>Notes that the areas defined by Maps 1 & 2 lie above the upper chalk formation with the southern part lying within a groundwater source protection zone.</p> <p>2.9 Should make reference to the seasonally high groundwater levels, particularly in valley bottoms which have been the cause of flooding in the recent past.</p> | <p>2.6 2.8 2.9</p> <p>2.6 Map1 & Map 2</p> <p>2.9</p> | <p>2.6...add reference to groundwater protection</p> <p>2.9...add reference to seasonally high groundwater</p> | <p>2.6 The Ordnance Survey Geological Sheet 299 for Winchester indicates that Littleton is <u>located above the upper chalk formation, a principal aquifer, with the southern part lying within a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ) 2. Groundwater is vulnerable in this area and care must be taken to ensure that pollution does not occur.</u></p> <p>2.9 The area around the pond is the natural point to which surface water will collect in the valley, resulting in regular temporary flooding onto the roads adjacent to it. <u>Seasonally high groundwater levels, particularly in the valley bottom areas, have been the cause of flooding in the recent past.</u> Historically the valley, including this area, is known as "Flood Bottom" and is shown on early maps. <u>It is designated as a critical ordinary watercourse (COW</u></p> |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>2.7 & 7.13. High groundwater levels will also have constraint implications for surface water drainage in some areas covered by these paras. The sequential approach favoured by PPS25 aims to steer development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding.</p> <p>It also promotes the use of sustainable drainage techniques (SUDS) for the management of surface water run-off. This is particularly relevant to Littleton as it is not</p> | <p>7.13</p> <p>DG17</p> | <p>Amend 7.13</p> <p>DG17.4...add SUDS</p> | <p><u>3006) draining into Nuns Walk Stream.</u></p> <p>7.13 PPS25 sets out how development can take place in flood risk areas. It also states that "climate change will lead to increased and new risks of flooding." This is seen as a sustainability issue in the designated flood risk area. <u>High groundwater levels will have constraint implications for surface water drainage in some areas.</u> Landowners, developers and their designers should comply with PPS25 where appropriate and note that Littleton is not on mains drainage. PPS25 provides guidance on these issues and identifies that there are added complications when sewage treatment systems inter-relate with flooding.</p> <p>DG17.4 4. That a Sustainable Drainage System (<u>SUDS</u>) for the disposal of foul and surface water can be</p> |

| Respondent | Respondent's comments | VDS Ref | VDS team response | Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined) |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| | served by mains drainage. Site specific Flood Risk Assessments... | | add DG17.5 to reference FRA(s) | provided to serve the development site. 5. <u>The risk of flooding. Site specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) will need to be submitted in support of planning applications where appropriate.</u> |
| 2. Natural England | Add reference to LCA document and respondent advocates that the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) should be based on methodologies set out in <i>Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland</i> Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002 | Chapter 3 | The WDLP Review LCA (Appendix 2 LCA No 2) relating to Littleton is referred to in paras 7.22, 7.35, 7.36, 7.40 Amend 3.1, 7.12 | 3.1 addendum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The surrounding landscape is described in the WDLP Review 2006 Appendix 2 - Sparsholt Woodlands Landscape Character Area (LCA) (Reference Map 35)</u> 7.12 Para 13 confirms the importance of Local Planning Authorities utilising tools such as Landscape Character Assessments and Village Design Statements in considering development proposals. |
| 2. Natural England | No mention of traditional materials | 5.9 | Predominant materials are mentioned in 5.7, 5.8. | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| 2. Natural England | No mention of energy efficiency in building materials | | Add DG24 Strengthen the Sustainability Appraisal 8 Q3 positive response by replacing the existing text with reference to new policy DG24 and amending 7.7of the VDS | <u>DG24. Energy Efficiency</u> <u>Proposals for energy efficient building design, construction and renewable energy options which are compatible with other environmental issues should be submitted with all planning applications.</u> <u>Reason</u> <u>7.52 Sustainable development should utilise efficient resources to reduce energy and waste to meet both existing and future needs.</u> <u>Cross-reference to Buildings & Spaces DG list p13</u> 7.7 It also adds that design policies should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area generally. Design policies should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes and should not stifle |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>innovation, originality or initiative, although local distinctiveness should be enhanced. <u>New development should try to utilise energy-efficient building design and/or renewable energy options where possible, compatible with conservation of the natural environment</u></p> <p>SA 8 Q3 answer: Yes – DG24</p> |
| 2. Natural England | No mention of opportunity to enhance landscape | | Landscape enhancement is addressed in Chapter 7 AG1, AG2, DG12, DG14 and DG17 which augments the WDLP Review 2006 Appendix 2 Introduction and LCA No2 Sparsholt Woodlands (Reference Map 35) | None |
| 2. Natural England | Natural England promotes Green infrastructure and wants this to be cross-referenced in the VDS. | | Covered in Chapter 7 but this comment is less relevant given Littleton's relatively limited development strategy as defined in WDLP Review and Winchester District Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Option Plan (Draft May 2009) | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| 2. Natural England | Mismatches within the Sustainability Appraisal. | SA | The respondent has correctly noted that there are DG numbering errors in the Sustainability Appraisal | <p>SA 6 Natural Environment Quality</p> <p>General format change throughout SA – represent DG.n as DGn</p> <p>Prevent and reverse habitat... Change DG16 to <u>DG17</u></p> <p>Provide opportunities for provision and enhancement of green space.. Add <u>DG13</u></p> <p>Minimise adverse impacts on the landscape... Add <u>DG9</u> and rewrite as DG8, DG9, DG10</p> <p>Lead to effective... Replace DG15-DG20 with <u>DG17</u></p> <p>Prioritise the use of previously... Add <u>DG9</u> and rewrite as DG1, DG2, DG8, DG9, DG10</p> <p>Protect and enhance... Add <u>DG9</u> and write as DG8, DG9, DG10 Remove DG14</p> |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|--------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>SA 8 Built Environment and Heritage</p> <p>Protect and improve.... Remove DG14 and add <u>DG9 & DG15</u></p> <p>Help reduce... Change DG24 to <u>DG22</u></p> <p>Some of these errors were introduced when we renumbered the DG(s) but omitted to reflect the new numbering in the SA</p> |
| <p>3. Adam Welch</p> | <p>The VDS does not meet the guidance for VDS preparation & purpose</p> <p>The VDS should identify development areas</p> | | <p>The VDS adheres to Winchester City Council's advice on Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements (2005), which itself has regard to Government advice.</p> <p>The settlement boundary of Littleton, within which development will normally be permitted, is defined in the Winchester WDLP Review 2006. It is outside the scope of the VDS to amend this boundary or to suggest development sites outside of it, as</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | the VDS must supplement (not change) Local Plan policy. | |
| 3. Adam Welch | The VDS does not comply with the guidelines for VDS preparation and guidance. Namely, there is no positive statement of where development should take place. The VDS dismisses the potential for further development around the village. | 1.1, 1.5, | <p>Its objective is to provide a Supplementary Planning Document for Littleton by interpreting relevant sections of the Winchester District Local Plan Local Plan Review (2006) in the context of Littleton village.</p> <p>Winchester City Council's guidance on Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements states that Supplementary Planning Documents "<u>must not</u> allocate land" (bullet 5 page 6). Therefore it is not appropriate for the VDS to identify development sites or 'sites of opportunity'.</p> <p>The VDS has been carefully prepared in accordance with planning guidelines for adoption as a "Supplementary Planning Document". As such it must comply</p> | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|--|----------------|---|---|
| | Believe DG8 to be in error and request that it be removed. | DG8 | <p>with the statutory development plan in force at the time (WDLP Review 2006) until the Winchester District Local Development Framework (LDF) is in place. However, it has taken into account the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Option May 2009 draft and the Inspector's subsequent comments on that draft. The landscape has been extensively assessed in the Statement and refers to the current adopted WDLP Review 2006 Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) for the defined VDS geographical boundary.</p> <p>The VDS contains no references to "Strategic Gaps" but correctly employs the term "Local Gap" in DG8 to refer to the Winchester-Littleton Local Gap. This reflects the terminology in the Local Plan Review which the VDS supplements.</p> | None |
| 4. Lisa Long | Same points as respondent 3 but is additionally concerned that VDS may 'stop' development around edge of settlement. | | See response to respondent' 3 above and respondent 6 below. | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|---|------------------|---|---|
| 5. Ben Welch | Same points as respondents 3 and 4.. | | As above | None |
| 6. BJC | The VDS does not meet the criteria defined at http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning/leaflets/villagedesigns.htm and that its intention is to preclude development and thus is “entirely negative” in character. | 1.1 Chapter 7 | <p>The VDS conforms to the Winchester City Council requirements for Village Design Statements (WCC 2005) and adheres to local & government guidelines.</p> <p>The references to ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ should be changed to ‘Supplementary Planning Document’.</p> <p>The goal of the VDS is to assist developers by providing a Supplementary Planning Document that augments and interprets the WDLP Review (2006) in the particular context of the settlement of Littleton.</p> <p>Chapter 7 does <u>not</u> preclude development but clearly sets out how appropriate development, in compliance with an adopted statutory plan, should be</p> | <p>Replace 1.1 ‘What is a Village Design Statement?’ with...</p> <p><u>The VDS for Littleton, as revised and updated in 2008/2009, has been adopted by Winchester City Council as a <i>Supplementary Planning Document</i> (SPD) and describes the defining characteristics of our village. It provides guidance for future development to help maintain and enhance the particular character and setting of Littleton. As a <i>Supplementary Planning Document</i>, it should be considered as an adjunct to the Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006).</u></p> <p>Replace</p> <p>1.6 ‘Concerning advice for residents and property developers’ first bullet with</p> |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | undertaken so as to respect, maintain and enhance local identity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Before you submit a planning application or make changes to your house make sure that you or your architect have read this VDS. In terms of planning policy hierarchy it is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Chapter 7 contains design guidance that may be used by the Planning Department when considering your application.</u> |
| 6. BJC | Paragraph 7.42 is redundant | 7.42 | The Conservation Area is an important statutory designation and it is appropriate that the VDS should have a Design Guideline and explanatory text relating to it. | None |
| 6. BJC | VDS may need to be revised when LDF is approved | | The present revision of the Littleton VDS 2000 publication is part of the on-going process required to keep the VDS in step with changes to the government and local planning regulations. There is likely to be a need for future revisions but that is no reason for not making the current updates. | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|--------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| 6. BJC | <p>“Local Gaps” have been discontinued and DG8 should be removed</p> <p>Directs VDS team attention to references in Government guidance to Local Landscape designations etc</p> | DG8 | <p>Local Gaps remain part of the statutory development plan (Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006) and the relevant policies (CE2 and CE3) have recently been ‘saved’ by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. It is appropriate for the VDS to reflect this policy as it is supplementary to the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Gap policies are not local landscape designations but relate to the settlement pattern. Whilst the guidance in PPS7 is noted, it does not relate to Local Gaps and was taken into account by the Inspector, who supported the Local Plan policy.</p> | None |
| 7. Carter Jonas | <p>There is no reference to Holmes Nursery. It is an important ‘Brownfield’ site. The business is being reshaped as a wholesale distribution operation.</p> | | <p>This site is located outside the settlement policy boundary. While it is accepted that the Nursery provides important local employment, it is not a distinctive feature of the village that would warrant specific mention in the</p> | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| | <p>Suggest the VDS identifies Nursery as a "Site of Opportunity"</p> <p>Littleton Lane HGV restriction needs refining</p> | AG3 | <p>VDS.</p> <p>The VDS does not seek to restrain the aspirations of this business, subject to the business conforming to current planning and traffic regulations.</p> <p>The WCC Guidance on Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements bullet 5 page 6 states that Supplementary Planning Documents "<u>must not allocate land</u>". The VDS team are not at liberty to identify development sites or 'sites of opportunity'.</p> <p>Agreed to amend AG3</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Amend AG3 bullet 5 as follows...</p> <p><u>5. Littleton Lane, as a single lane road, is narrow with a sharp bend between Main Road and Holmes Nursery and is unsuitable for HGVs; it is designated as such at its junction with Main Road.</u></p> |
| 8. | What is legal status of VDS? | | The VDS is <i>Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</i> that | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|
| Henley Planning Associates | | | augments and interprets the WDLP Review (2006) in the particular context of the settlement of Littleton | |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | The VDS should focus on architectural, spatial and environmental characteristics ...also sustainable development | | The VDS addresses these points | None, but see proposed amendments to 7.7 new DG24 above and SA changes above |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | The VDS should be re-designated as a Design Guide | | See above | None |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | The VDS boundary should be reduced | 4.5 & DG10 | The boundary is drawn to provide a landscape context for the settlement of Littleton. The barracks has a considerable environmental impact on the settlement of Littleton and justifies its inclusion within the VDS boundary | None |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | References to Littleton Stud should be deleted – similar here to previous item | DG15 3.3 4.2 | The land presently occupied by the Littleton Stud, an important local employer, is an integral part of the rural setting of the village of Littleton. The land has a specific commercial use at present but this may not always be the case and the area itself dominates the northern | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | end of Littleton and shares a boundary with the Conservation area – it is important that this context be discussed in the VDS | |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Change reference to 'Parkland' to 'Arable land and pasture'. | 4.2 | Whilst the entrance to the Stud from Main Road has a 'parkland' setting with mown grass verges and an avenue of trees, it is accepted that the VDS para 3.3 definition of the land as arable land and pasture should be reflected in para 4.2 and the reference to "parkland" deleted. | Amend paragraph 4.2, first bullet point: <input type="checkbox"/> Parkland <u>Arable land and pasture</u> around the Littleton Stud which is intersected by a designated footpath between Church Lane and Andover Road. |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Cites reference to change of use of Civil Service Club on MOD site and suggests redevelopment potential | 4.5 | Amend 4.5 deleting reference to CSC | 4.5 The Sir John Moore Barracks occupies a large area of Littleton to the east of the village and lies partly in the Local Gap. With the rolling landscape, extensive woodland planting and an area of countryside between the barracks and the village, the proximity of the army base has no great impact on Littleton's character. There is however some concern that the barracks could further encroach upon the village through building development. This is especially the case with the recent closure of the |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | Civil Service Club in Chestnut Avenue that presents the possibility of more development and an increase in artificial lighting. from the barracks. The view was expressed by the public at the VDS workshop in 2000 that any future development at the barracks should seek to maintain and enhance the existing green landscape character. |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Need for positive plans and proposals | | <p>The WDLP Review 2006 defines current statutory planning policies for the district. Such positive plans and proposals suggested by the respondent would be subject to these policies and may be limited by the present H3 housing settlement boundary.</p> <p>The respondent defines a thriving village in terms of its shops, doctors etc. But other measures include the considerable use of the sports clubs and recreation grounds, the Millennium Memorial Hall activities, the Church, the Pub, the number of young families and so on.</p> | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>The much disputed closure of the Post Office was carried out in spite of its popularity and an energetic attempt by the community to provide financial support and a 'peppercorn' rent for the building.</p> <p>With the proximity of Littleton to the shopping centre at Harestock and the surrounding 'out of town' supermarkets just minutes away, no 'local' retail shops could profit in Littleton.</p> | |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Affordable Housing – exception sites etc – VDS does not discuss these | DG4 7.29 7.31 | <p>Chapter 7 and especially DG4 address the need for affordable housing.</p> <p>12 further units of local affordable housing have recently been permitted and will be available in early 2010.</p> | None |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Do not like the concept of Design Guidance DG(s) | Chapter 7 | The VDS has been compiled in accordance with government and local policy and as such must be clearly cross-referenced to the relevant development plan policy and documents and must not | None |

| Respondent | Respondent's comments | VDS Ref | VDS team response | Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined) |
|---|--|----------------|---|---|
| | | | undermine or conflict with it. | |
| 8. Henley Planning Associates | Suggests that the number of SA Neutral/Negatives highlight the deficiencies of the VDS | SA | The Sustainability Appraisal is a realistic assessment of the impact of the VDS on the particular questions posed. The Sustainability Appraisal responses do not <i>undermine</i> the 'design guidance' purpose of the VDS but they may assist the authorities in determining how future VDS guidelines could be changed to allow local communities to impact important issues that presently lie outside of the scope of the VDS. | None |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor | Make reference to the 'seasonal river' that runs through North & South Drives? Is flood management an issue? Recalls occasion when North Drive resembled a lagoon. | 2.9 | Refer to the response to Environment Agency submission. | See above |
| 9. Peter Highfield – | The '2009 map' does not show No.7 Holm Oak Close, built at least 5 years ago. | Maps 1-3 | This is the latest map available from the OS | None |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor | | | | |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor | 2.4 ... has a long association of (?) | 2.4 | Accepted | Change paragraph 2.4 to: 2.4 Littleton has long <u>been associated with</u> equestrian activity |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor | 3.2 I don't understand the 'vice versa' | 3.2 | Accepted | Change paragraph 3.2 to: 3.2 Littleton fits snugly into three valleys of rolling downland. The undulations of the land and the high banks along Main Road hide much of the village and its development from its surroundings, and vice versa, in dips and hollows. Exposed higher areas are generally screened by hedges and woodland. |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & | 3.4 remove 'both' | 3.4 | Accepted | Change paragraph 3.4 to: 3.4 There are few long views from within the village, other than from |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Harestock Parish Councillor | | | | houses built on the tops of the downs, e.g. from the village to the north, and from houses on Deane Down Drove in the south which both enjoy good views of open countryside. In general, the views are of trees, fields and open farmland. |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish Councillor | 5.3 ... nor should be allowed to do so in the future ... | 5.3 | Accepted | Change paragraph 5.3 to: 5.3 Most of the housing is of fairly low density providing sufficient space for fair-sized gardens which help to maintain the green and airy feel to the settlement. Existing densities are on average 8-9 houses per hectare with some variations. No house dominates the landscape nor should be allowed to do so in the future. There are a number of small businesses in and around the village, but there is no industrial development. |
| 9. Peter Highfield – Littleton & Harestock Parish | 6.10; 6.12; 7.34 suggest delete 'considered to be' (three) and 'considered' (one) | 6.10 | Accepted | Change paragraph 6.10 to: 6.10 The design, state of maintenance and variety of signs |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Councillor | | <p>6.12</p> <p>7.34</p> | | <p>varies considerably and generally reflects the period in which they were erected. The older cast iron —"finger post" type signs, such as those on the triangle between Kennel Lane and Main Road, are considered to be of more architectural interest and more in keeping than the more functional later signs. It is considered appropriate to reduce the size, impact and regularity of modern traffic signs wherever possible, as long as safety to road users is not compromised in any way.</p> <p>6.12 With the exception of Valley Road there is no street lighting. This is considered to be an important feature that should be retained and extended to new developments, in accordance with the 1994 agreement between WCC and Littleton & Harestock Parish Council (see Appendix 4).</p> <p>7.34 The medieval settlement of Littleton is separated from its 20th century development by a stretch</p> |

| <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Respondent's comments</i> | <i>VDS Ref</i> | <i>VDS team response</i> | <i>Proposed change to Consultation Draft VDS text (deleted text as shown and additional text shown as underlined)</i> |
|-------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | of prominent woodland and open steeply sloping fields. This is considered to be a fundamental landscape and physical characteristic that should not be compromised. |
| | 7.2 delete 'then' | 7.2 | Accepted | Change paragraph 7.2 to: 7.2 Earlier sections have already detailed a range of important features relating to the character of Littleton and its surroundings. These then form the basis for the Guidelines, set out below, developed by local residents in response to Government guidance that development proposals should be sensitive to public participation and should respect particular features, circumstances and characteristics relating to specific sites and situations. Government guidance also stresses the need to achieve a high standard of design. |
| | It's questionable whether a comma should ever follow or precede 'and' : a minor matter!! | 5.8, AG2 | Accepted. 2 instances of 'and,' were found and 18 instances of ',and'. | Carry out overall edit to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. |

Additional minor changes (found so far) are required as follows.

1. Remove references to Consultation Draft
2. On Page 2 replace Consultation Draft (22 October 2009) with Adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document 12th March 2010
3. On page 2 The Village Design Team change to Village Design Statement team

4. Amend 1.1 as follows:

The VDS for Littleton, as revised and updated in 2008/2009 is a Supplementary Planning Document that seeks to...

5. Amend 1,4 as follows:

Following public consultation, the VDS Revision 2008/2009 was adopted ~~by will be agreed with~~ the WCC on the 12th March 2010 as a Supplementary Planning Document.

6. Map 1 – correct colour on DG6 and DG 16 legends in box lower right
7. P8 DG4 RESIDENTIAL TYPES to be added between 3 & 5
8. Cross reference new DG24 to Buildings & Spaces in Village DG list page 13
9. Re-number para 7.52 on p27 as 7.53 following inclusion of new DG24 and new 7.52 on p26