

CABINET

29 JUNE 2005

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR THE FORMER TAYLOR'S COACHES AND
THE OLD STATION YARD, SUTTON SCOTNEY

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Contact Officer: Margaret Kirby Tel No: 01962 848170

RECENT REFERENCES:

None.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The report sets out the background to the preparation of the Draft Design and Development Brief for the Former Taylor's Coaches and the Old Station Yard, Sutton Scotney, and the arrangements made for consultation. A summary of the comments made, the officer's response and proposed changes to the Brief are attached at Appendix 1 to the Brief. Cabinet is requested to endorse the Brief, incorporating the proposed changes (which are shown more explicitly in the copies of the Brief circulated with this report), as more detailed guidance supplementing the requirements of Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Design and Development Brief for Land at the Old Station Yard and the Former Taylor's Coaches Site, Oxford/Wonston Road, Sutton Scotney, be endorsed as providing more detailed guidance to the provisions of Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review.

CABINET

29 JUNE 2005

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR THE FORMER TAYLOR'S COACHES AND THE OLD STATION YARD, SUTTON SCOTNEY

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

DETAIL:

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Proposal S.16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review provides for mixed business and housing development to take place on the former Station Yard and adjoining Coach Works at Sutton Scotney. The Local Plan Proposal recognises that this is a key site within the village, and therefore includes a number of requirements for its development.
- 1.2 The City Council needs to ensure that the various elements of the development are appropriate in scale, location, access provision and design, and therefore the Proposal requires a Design and Development Brief to be prepared before any planning application is considered for the site. This would establish principles of development to be followed, indicating how the Proposal's requirements should be met and how the various elements of the development would inter-relate.
- 1.3 A Design and Development Brief has now been prepared for the site, a copy of which has been circulated with this Report.

2 Site description

- 2.1 The site extends to about 1.7 hectares, comprising two main parts currently in different ownerships – the former Station Yard at the eastern end of the site and the land occupied until recently by Taylor's coach business in the western part of the site. The two different parts of the site may be seen on the Local Plan's Inset Map for Sutton Scotney (RD Map 36a), a copy of which is attached at Appendix 1 of the Brief.
- 2.2 Taylor's coach business closed in December 2004. This part of the site is mainly open, as it was used as the former coach parking area, with a two storey office building fronting Oxford Road. Additional buildings are located to the rear of the office building, along the northern boundary of the site, the largest of which was used in connection with the coach business, with the smaller building occupied by a separate vehicle servicing business. The site's main access is from Oxford Road, although it also has a rear access to Wonston Road, shared with the former station yard.
- 2.3 There is a prominent mature tree towards the south-eastern edge of this part of the site, adjacent to the rear access. The telephone exchange and residential development adjoin the northern boundary of the site, and two existing residential properties - Witts Cottage and Witts End - adjoin the southern boundary at a lower level. To the south-west and separated by a footpath link between Wonston Road and Oxford Road is the Victoria Hall, the village's main community hall, which has

recently been extended. The whole of the area of the former coach business lies within the Sutton Scotney Conservation Area.

- 2.4 The former Station Yard lies at a slightly higher level than the area occupied by the former coach business and is outside the Conservation Area. This part of the site contains a vacant two storey modern office building, the former railway goods shed, storage areas and hardstandings. On the western side, a tree-lined boundary adjoins the former coach business site and existing residential properties within the Conservation Area. Further residential properties, outside the Conservation Area, adjoin the narrow northern boundary. Adjacent to the site boundary to the north-east lays the doctor's surgery, with the sports pavilion and the Gratton Recreation Ground beyond. To the east of the site, and the line of the former railway line, there is residential development in Gratton Close, and this area has a well-used footpath link to the village centre in Oxford Road, around the northern boundary of the former Station Yard. The site has a line of small trees along the eastern boundary along the former railway line as far as the end of Gratton Close, but beyond that point the eastern and northern boundaries are marked by a high fence, screening the site from the adjacent public footpath.

3 Policy Background

- 3.1 Relevant national and local planning policies are set out in Section 2 of the Brief. Local planning policies have evolved through a number of Local Plans, and this is summarised in the paragraphs below.
- 3.2 The former Station Yard part of the site was first allocated for small-scale light industrial development in the Winchester Area Local Plan (adopted 1987). The Proposal required the demolition of the old railway bridge, together with lowering and reconstruction of Wonston Road.
- 3.3 The Winchester District Local Plan (adopted 1998) carried forward the proposal for small-scale light industry on the former Station Yard. Uses were limited to B1 uses, in view of the means of access through a partly residential area, and, following consultation with the then County Surveyor, the requirement to demolish the railway bridge and level the road was relaxed. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector agreed that it would be unreasonable to impose such major costs on the development and therefore the requirements of the earlier Local Plan were not continued into the adopted Local Plan. The requirement was, however, replaced with a requirement for developers to fund any off-site works required, including measures to provide safe pedestrian access to the site and the residential areas to the east.
- 3.4 The site, however, remained undeveloped when work commenced on the Local Plan Review. In 2001, as part of the background work for the Local Plan Review, the Council re-assessed all of the District's business requirements, to ensure that the Local Plan Review's policies and allocations were suited to the needs of the economy. It also took account of the requirement in PPG 3, that all employment allocations should be reviewed to consider whether they should be re-allocated for residential use.
- 3.5 All existing allocated employment sites (in the adopted Local Plan) were therefore assessed on the basis of a set of criteria, and it was concluded that there was scope for making changes to the way employment allocations were carried forward into the Local Plan Review. As a result of these conclusions, some employment allocations

were carried forward into the Local Plan Review essentially unchanged, some were carried forward with the introduction of flexibility within the employment use classes, and in others sites were re-allocated for a mix of uses.

- 3.6 Following this assessment, it was concluded that the Old Station Yard was appropriate for mixed use development, and therefore Proposal S.16 allocated it for this use in the Deposit Local Plan Review (2001). This allowed for the site to be developed for employment and housing, provided that the amount of employment floorspace exceeded the amount of residential floorspace. It provided for separate business or housing areas or live-work units, subject to the provision of satisfactory access and appropriate off-site highway improvements. This included safe pedestrian access from the residential areas to the east, through the site to the village centre.
- 3.7 Following the receipt of objections to the Deposit Local Plan, the Proposal was re-assessed, and a number of amendments were made in the Revised Deposit Plan (2003). The most significant of these was to extend the site to include the adjacent coach business site, which was still in operation at the time. This was suggested by an objector to the Deposit Plan, and the Council agreed that this would be a reasonable approach, given that the coach business did not make full and effective use of the land occupied. There would also be an opportunity to improve the environment of the Conservation Area in this key village centre site, including the site's relationship to the centre and to the Victoria Hall. The extension of the site covered by Proposal S.16 to include the adjacent coach business site was supported by the owners of the Old Station Yard, in commenting on the Revised Deposit Plan.
- 3.8 The criteria of Proposal S.16 were also amended, and a copy of the Proposal is attached at Appendix 2 of the Brief. The main amendments included:
- Additional wording in criterion (i) to allow a reduced level of employment provision if particular constraints could be demonstrated, or there was a need to accommodate other requirements of the Plan;
 - A new criterion (iii) to require improvements to the setting of the Victoria Hall, with an adjoining open area and improved access for pedestrians from the eastern part of the village;
 - A new criterion (v) to require a drainage study and flood risk assessment, with the drainage strategy requirements incorporated in the development;
 - A new criterion (vi) to require an appropriate scale, character and density of development, taking account of the site's location;
 - An amendment to criterion (viii) to require the development to accord with the principles of a Design and Development Brief to be prepared. This was to establish the relationships of the various elements of the development and principles of development to be followed.

4 Preparation of a Design and Development Brief

- 4.1 In mid 2003, the owner of the former Station Yard approached the Council and agreed to commence work on a Design and Development Brief covering the whole of the allocated site, in consultation with the City and Parish Councils. He had lodged an objection to the Local Plan Review, primarily in relation to the proportion of employment use required, and felt that the preparation of a Brief for the site would resolve the issue and assist consideration of the objection at the Local Plan Inquiry. At that time the owner of the adjoining coach business site stated that he wished to

continue operating his business for the present time, but discussions were held with him and he was kept informed of progress on the Brief.

4.2 The first stage of the preparation of the Brief required further work on a number of detailed aspects, including:

- The proportion and type of employment use to be accommodated on the site;
- Potential access constraints and limitations on the level of traffic generation from business uses;
- The nature of any drainage and flood risk constraints on the development of the site;

More detailed studies were therefore carried out to address the above issues, and to inform the content of the Brief. Following the completion of these studies, work commenced on establishing principles of development for the site.

4.3 The next stage of the work was therefore to assess whether principles of development could be satisfactorily devised to allow the two parts of the site to be developed independently. To provide the background to this assessment, a character analysis of Sutton Scotney was carried out (see Section 3 and Appendix 7 of the Brief). A contextual analysis of the site, identifying its relationship and linkages to the surrounding area of the village, features to be retained and opportunities for improvements, was also undertaken (see Section 4 and Appendix 8 of the Brief). This analysis work then formed the basis for establishing principles of development for the site, based on the Local Plan's requirements and the other more detailed work undertaken.

4.3 The first stage of the work involved the consideration of options for development that were shared with the Parish Council, the local Ward Member, and the two landowners involved. The options considered were similar in content, in that they were all based on a limited amount of employment on each part of the site. The Parish Council supported the limited amount of employment proposed in the Brief, as they believed this to be the only realistic option, and they wished to see development come forward on this key site at the earliest opportunity.

4.4 Although the Parish Council expressed concerns about the proposed density of housing and the proportion of affordable housing (at that time 50% affordable housing was being sought in accordance with Proposal H.5 of the Revised Deposit Plan), it was agreed that housing density would need to reflect PPG 3 advice and that the proportion of affordable housing sought would need to be in accordance with the proportions in the Local Plan Review. Since this discussion, however, the proportion of affordable housing in the Brief has been amended to 35%, in accordance with the revised proportion put forward to the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, following the District-wide economic assessment of the Plan's proportions and thresholds for affordable housing.

4.5 A set of principles of development was then established for the site, taking account of the comments made at this informal discussion, and these were incorporated into a Draft Brief. The key elements were:

- (i) Local Employment Opportunities: A minimum provision of new employment space with potential for increasing these amounts if there was evidence of

local need, and also subject to the results of the public consultation. The minimum comprised:

- 4 live-work units ranging in size 100m² - 150m² on the Old Station Yard, with the former goods shed converted to an appropriate business or live/work use; and
 - 460m² small business units on the Oxford Road frontage to the former Taylor's Coaches site, ranging in size 46m² - 92m² and to include the conversion of the former Taylor's Coaches office building fronting Oxford Road.
- (ii) Housing: An amount of housing dependent on the amount of employment space provided, but the Draft Brief suggested that the development of both parts of the site could result in 50-85 dwellings, 50% of which would be of 1 or 2 bedrooms. 35% of the total number of dwellings (18-30 dwellings) would be sought as affordable homes.
- (iii) Access: Access to the site would require improvements to the existing accesses to Oxford Road and Wonston Road, and there was a possibility of introducing "Home Zone" principles within the development. There would also be a need for improved pedestrian links through the site, including a link and improvements to the existing footpath from Gratton Close to Oxford Road. The developer would need to carry out a Transport Impact Assessment in association with any planning application.
- (iv) Phasing: If the development of the two parts of the site takes place at different times, the earlier phase would need to ensure integration with the later phase, particularly in terms of permeability.
- (v) New Uses for Key Buildings: The former goods shed on the Old Station Yard and the former Taylor's Coaches office building would be re-used for employment use if possible. It also might be possible to consider live-work units, if these could be achieved whilst retaining the character of the buildings.
- (vi) Open Space and Landscaping: The development is to incorporate a new area of amenity space adjacent to the Victoria Hall, and a central area of open space straddling the two parts of the development, to utilise to effect the existing change in levels. The central space is to incorporate within the area, if possible, the large specimen tree on the south eastern edge of the former Taylor's Coaches site, to act as a central focus for the development and include play equipment suitable for primary school age children. A financial contribution is to be made to fund improvements to the parish's existing sports grounds. A landscape and open space framework is to be developed for the whole site, retaining existing trees and vegetation wherever possible and providing enhancements where appropriate. The framework is to provide pedestrian links to the central open space and new amenity space adjacent to Victoria Hall.

5 Publication of the Draft Brief

- 5.1 Before the Draft Brief was finalised for publication, there was a pre-publication consultation with the Parish Council and the owner of the former coach business, to enable any inaccuracies to be highlighted and amendments incorporated. It was then published for comment in December 2004, with comments invited by 31 January 2005.
- 5.2 The Draft Brief was made available for inspection or purchase at the Victoria Hall, the Gratton Surgery and the Post Office in Sutton Scotney, in addition to the reception area of the Council's Development Services Department. A summary of the Brief's proposals was also distributed to properties adjoining the boundary of the site covered by the Brief. The content of the Draft Brief could also be accessed on the City Council's web-site.
- 5.3 Although comments were invited from any interested individuals and organisations, there were also a number of specific consultees. The Parish Council was invited to respond fully during the formal period for comment, together with various officers of the City Council representing different interests, and the County Council as Highway Authority. In addition, the Council's Economic Development Officer and local employment organisations were specifically targeted for their views on the amount of employment being proposed.
- 5.4 The proportion of employment was the main area of difference between the consultants who prepared the Brief, and Council officers, as officers believed that further information was needed to establish the amount and nature of local employment demand. It was therefore agreed that this issue would be highlighted as part of the consultation, and, in addition to targeting specific employment organisations for their views, every respondent was invited to give their views in answer to specific questions about the need for local employment.

6 Summary of comments and changes to the Brief

- 6.1 Twenty two responses were received, some of which were of a very detailed nature. The comments are summarised by topic, with officer responses, and attached at Appendix 1 to this report. The changes proposed to the Brief in response to comments are indicated at the end of each section in Appendix 1 and the main changes are highlighted below.
- 6.2 In commenting generally on the Brief, it is worth noting that the Parish Council has found it a generally sound and well-prepared document, although they have made a number of detailed points which they recognise will primarily need to be taken into account at the planning application stage.
- 6.3 Most of those who commented on the proportion of employment generally supported the amount proposed in the Brief, although views from individuals varied from one who considered that the site should be 75% employment to one requesting no employment at all. Given that the Local Plan Review allocates the site for mixed use, and the employment organisations are generally supportive of the approach in the Brief, it was concluded that no changes should be made to the amount of employment proposed. A number of detailed amendments are, however, proposed. These include encouragement for the relocation of existing local businesses within the development (paragraph 5.6), measures to ensure that the employment

floorspace provided is retained in an employment use (paragraph 5.6), and measures to ensure that the employment is provided at an early stage as part of an overall mixed use development (two new paragraphs 5.24 and 5.25).

- 6.4 Although there was some concern about the numbers of dwellings proposed in the Brief in some of the comments, the proposed density would need to accord with PPG 3 advice, and the 35% proportion of affordable homes would accord with the current proposed amendments to Proposal H.5. No change is therefore proposed in this respect, and also, in establishing a dwelling mix for the site, it was considered that the proportion of small dwellings would be adequately determined through the operation of Proposal H.7 of the Local Plan Review (which requires at least 50% units to be small 1 or 2 bedroom units), and did not need to be further addressed in the Brief.
- 6.5 Access to the site, for both vehicles and pedestrians, was the subject of a number of comments, and amendments are proposed to the Brief, to highlight the importance of PPG 13 in the national guidance (new paragraphs 2.7 – 2.9), and to clarify the Highway Authority's requirements (paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11). An amendment to paragraph 5.11 is also proposed to include a requirement to consult Hampshire County Council's Countryside Service on footpath access between the site and the adjacent countryside. There was some concern about the nature of any lighting to be provided and the need for it to reflect the rural character of the area. The Highway Authority has agreed that, depending on the details of the development, lighting may not be necessary. It is therefore proposed to amend paragraph 6.22 to include the phrase "if required" to provide for this eventuality.
- 6.6 Although a number of respondents were concerned about the possibility of flooding on the site, a specific drainage study has been carried out in consultation with the Council's drainage engineers. The Local Plan's proposal also requires a drainage strategy to be prepared and its requirements incorporated within the development. The Council's Drainage Engineer agrees with the conclusions on drainage reached in the Brief, and is satisfied that there are no drainage issues that cannot be satisfactorily overcome, given the Local Plan Proposal's requirement for a drainage strategy. No changes are therefore proposed to the Brief in relation to drainage.
- 6.7 The Council's Environmental Protection Section was concerned that that the Draft Brief did not include a requirement for the developer to submit a scheme proposing measures to deal with any land contamination identified on the site. A new paragraph (6.21) is therefore proposed to address this issue.
- 6.8 A number of respondents raised boundary issues, and an amendment is proposed to the Brief at paragraph 5.2 to refer to the need to give special attention to "sensitive boundaries", where development is likely to be in close juxtaposition to adjacent properties. These boundaries are proposed to be extended in response to a number of comments made, and therefore amendments to show them are proposed to the Development Framework in Appendix 10. Amendments are proposed to paragraph 5.30, to clarify the need for a full tree survey and the need for important trees to be retained and, where necessary, augmented. A new paragraph 5.33 is also proposed, to set out the matters developers should include in a Landscape and Open Space Framework, to be prepared in support of any planning application.

7 Local views on the changes to the Brief

- 7.1 The proposed changes to the Brief have been discussed with the local Ward Members and the Parish Council in advance of the consideration of the Brief by Cabinet. They have indicated that they are generally in agreement with the proposed revisions.

8 Status of the Design and Development Brief

- 8.1 The Brief has been prepared to amplify the requirements of Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review, and, as it is not anticipated that the Plan will be adopted until mid 2006, it is not possible to adopt the Brief formally as Supplementary Planning Guidance. With the transitional arrangements now in place for the introduction of the new planning policy system and Local Development Frameworks, the Local Plan Review would become a "saved plan" within that Framework.
- 8.2 One option would have been to have prepared the Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document under the new system's procedures, but these procedures have to accord with the new regulations, and the Brief could not be adopted until after the Local Plan Review was adopted. This would therefore have resulted in substantial delay in the site coming forward for development.
- 8.3 The landowner of the Old Station Yard is anxious to bring his site forward for development as soon as possible, and, now that the former coach business has also vacated the site, it is likely that that part of the site will also be available for development in the near future. As the site is a key site in the centre of the village, partly within the village's conservation area, and the former Station Yard part of the site has been lying unused for some time, the Parish Council is also keen to see the site developed as soon as possible. Proposal S.16 requires the preparation of a Brief before detailed development proposals may be considered for the site, and, therefore, it was agreed that the Brief should be prepared in the same way as supplementary planning guidance (SPG), with the required public consultation procedures, even though it could not be formally adopted as SPG. Cabinet would then be asked to endorse it as more detailed guidance supplementing Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review, and this would ensure that it was a material consideration in determining planning applications for the site.

9 Objections to the Local Plan Review

- 9.1 Although both landowners have lodged objections to the Local Plan Review's Proposal S.16, for consideration by the Inquiry Inspector, neither has submitted further evidence or appeared at the Inquiry to clarify the nature of their objections. The objections relate primarily to the proportion of employment use and whether the sites could be satisfactorily considered together. The Council has, however, submitted further written evidence and explained to the Inspector that a Draft Development Brief was (then) about to be published, containing principles of development for the site. It clarified to the Inspector that it had been possible to establish principles of development to allow each part of the site to be developed independently. It also clarified that the Brief proposed a much lower level of employment than allowed for in the Local Plan Proposal, but, although this had been the result of further detailed studies, the public consultation on the Brief was used to target specific employment organisations and seek their views on the level and type of employment proposed.

9.2 The Inquiry Inspector's recommendations will not be known until his Report is received later this year. Officers are however, satisfied that the site's mixed use status has been determined on a consistent basis, following a review of all employment sites in the District. The Inspector does not have any detailed evidence of the most appropriate amount of employment for the site, as it has been the subject of further study for the Brief. Objectors agreed that the preparation of the Brief was the most appropriate way forward to resolve the issue and therefore hopefully the Inspector will conclude that the Proposal is appropriately worded, and that the Brief, being based on more detailed information, would provide more detailed guidance on the specific requirements of the Proposal. He was aware that, following consideration of the comments made on the Draft Brief and any subsequent amendments, Cabinet would be asked to endorse the Brief as amplifying the requirements of Proposal S.16.

9.3 It is sensible to predict the Inspector's and Council's future views in this way – in the event that the Inspector makes a recommendation which the Council agrees to accept, requiring changes to the Brief, it would be possible to agree amendments at a later stage.

10 Conclusion

10.1 Cabinet is therefore requested to endorse the Design and Development Brief for Land at the Former Taylor's Coaches and the Old Station Yard, as providing more detailed guidance for the implementation of Proposal S.16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

11. CORPORATE STRATEGY (RELEVANCE TO):

Accords with the key priorities to provide affordable homes in safe and pleasant environments for all sectors of the community and to achieve a strong and diverse rural economy which builds on local strengths and offers opportunities for all.

12. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Within current resource levels. The Brief has been prepared by one of the landowners' consultants, in consultation with the Strategic Planning Team and other relevant departments of the Council.

13. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None.

14. APPENDICES:

1 Summary of Comments on the Draft Brief and Proposed Changes

2 Revised Brief indicating changes following consultation (due to the size of this document, it is circulated to Cabinet Members, Group Leaders and Ward Members only with a copy available in the Members' Library). A copy is available for public inspection by contacting Margaret Kirby in the Development Services Department - Tel No: 01962 848170 or email mkirby@winchester.gov.uk.

Appendix 1

Draft Design and Development Brief: Land at the former Taylor's Coaches and the Old Station Yard, Sutton Scotney

Summary of Comments and Changes

1 General comments

- A generally sound and well-prepared document. The brief should address only broad principles, but points of detail will need addressing at a later stage **5(PC)**
- Support development of the site (subject to safety improvements in Oxford Road) **2**

Officer Response

The support and recognition of the quality of the document is welcomed. The potential for safety improvements in Oxford Road is dealt with under Issue 4 below.

Proposed Changes:

None.

2 Employment

- Support retention or provision of local employment / support proposed mix of employment and housing / proportion of employment should be no less than 75% **1,3, 5 (PC), 8, 12,14, 21**
- Employment opportunities should not be lost as they will change as the community grows **14**
- Do not accept conclusions of the Vail Williams report. Sutton Scotney has locational advantages for employment, particularly high tech office users **8**
- If development is phased, each phase should contain employment **14**
- The Brief should clarify the meaning of "reserve" employment **4**
- Would only support more housing if additional local employment opportunities are provided first **12**
- Support the provision of live / work units / the development provides an opportunity to investigate the possibility of live / work units, following a detailed analysis **6, 14,18**
- Consider separate employment and housing units are preferable to live / work units **8**
- Concerned that live / work units will become residential properties **1,14**
- Live/work units may be provided as affordable accommodation, if they are truly affordable and a need can be demonstrated **20**
- Employment provision should include affordable business units **6**
- Support the retention of the former Taylor's office building and the former goods shed **1, 14**
- Would not support the retention of any buildings on the site, as they do not appear to be suitable for conversion **18**
- Concern that existing garage business will be lost / the business should be retained in the existing premises or replaced within the development **1,11,12**
- Oppose employment uses on the site **4**

Officer Response

It is significant that only one of the comments received would not support employment uses on the site, and considered that the site should be in solely residential use. Most of the other respondents would support the proposed amount of employment, with one seeking a higher proportion than that required by the Brief.

The Local Plan Review requires the proportion of business uses to constitute the majority of floorspace on the site, but a reduced level may be accepted if further detailed studies identified a need for a lower amount of business space. Further work and consultation with local employment organisations would appear to indicate that the amount and type of business units proposed in the draft Brief (small business units and live/work units) is acceptable. Although the space provided in the Brief is substantially less than the amount required by the Local Plan Review's Proposal S.16, it does provide for a variable proportion which can be increased beyond the minimum amount specified, should a need for additional local employment be identified. No change is therefore proposed in this respect.

The Development Framework Diagram in Appendix 10 of the Brief shows employment areas in both parts of the site, but respondent 14 considers that this should be set out as a requirement in the text. It does appear, however, that this has been adequately covered in paragraph 5.6 of the Brief, which refers to the proposed business use in each part of the site. Respondent 4 considers that the phrase "reserve" employment, used on the Development Framework diagram in Appendix 10, should also be explained in the text. This has therefore been clarified with a minor wording amendment to paragraph 5.7 of the Brief.

Respondent 12 would only support more housing if the employment uses were provided first. To ensure the creation of a mixed use scheme, there should be a requirement to provide the business space at the same time or in advance of the housing, and therefore it is proposed to amend the Brief to clarify that an appropriate condition to control this would be attached to any future planning consent.

Live / work units have been suggested as an option that may be appropriate in the locality and these have been supported, although two respondents were concerned that they would not be retained in employment use in the longer term. Respondent 8, on the other hand, believes separate employment and housing units would be preferable. The majority view is that they could be appropriate in this location, and therefore no amendment to the Brief is proposed to the principle of their provision. It is, however, proposed to include an amendment to clarify that the long-term retention of the employment space in any live-work units provided would need to be the subject of a planning condition.

The business units proposed are small units and therefore should be more affordable to local firms. It is accepted that every effort should be made to accommodate existing businesses in the locality or their expansion needs, and therefore an amendment to the Brief is proposed to encourage this within the employment areas of the site.

The retention of the former Taylor's office building and the former goods shed on the Old Station Yard has been supported by a number of respondents, and possible uses for these buildings are referred to in paragraph 5.25. Respondent 18 considers that no buildings should be retained on the site as a "clean" site could be developed more economically. The Council's Conservation Officer and local people consider, however, that the buildings proposed for retention are valued local buildings and, in the case of the former Taylor's office building, is important to the street scene of the village's conservation area. The Draft Brief proposed small business units in the former Taylor's office building and live-work units in the former goods shed. Whilst neither of these buildings are listed, they are both important buildings. The Council's Conservation Officer believes that a full employment use of the former goods shed

should be explored as a first option, but live-work units may be a possibility if they could be achieved without harm to the integrity of the building. It is therefore proposed that the last sentence of paragraph 5.25 should be amended to provide more flexibility for the future uses of these buildings.

Proposed Changes:

Amend first sentence of paragraph 5.7 to refer to “Areas of reserve land”.

Amend paragraph 5.6 to encourage opportunities for the relocation of existing local businesses, and to clarify the requirement for a planning condition to control the long-term retention of the employment space within the live-work units.

Add two new paragraphs 5.24 and 5.25 on phasing the development of residential and employment uses on the site, to clarify the requirement for a planning condition to control the timing of the provision of employment uses in relation to residential uses, to ensure the creation of a mixed use scheme;

Replace last sentence of paragraph 5.25, with less specific wording – “Re-using ~~the Taylor’s Coaches building~~ these buildings for small business units ~~and the former goods shed~~ or for Live/Work Units are options.....”

3 Housing numbers and mix

- Support residential only scheme **4**
- Too many houses are proposed / the density should be at the lower end of the PPG 3 range **1,5 (PC)**
- Housing should be designed to be in keeping with the village with a balance of property types **6**
- No one bed units should be included in the development **5 (PC)**
- The proposed amount of affordable housing is excessive for local needs **1**
- The proportion of affordable housing should not exceed 35% **5 (PC)**
- 35% affordable units should be provided, mainly rented, but could include some shared equity and key worker housing **20**
- The type and size of affordable homes should echo local housing need, which should include 3 bed units **20**

Officer Response

The development proposed is a mixed use scheme in accordance with the requirements of Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review. A solely residential scheme would not be appropriate as it would not accord with the requirements of the Proposal.

The former Station Yard part of the site was an employment site in the adopted Local Plan, and, for the Local Plan Review, in accordance with the requirements of PPG 3, all employment sites in the District have been reviewed in terms of their suitability to continue as full employment sites. It was concluded that the former Station Yard should be re-designated as a mixed use site, incorporating both employment and housing uses.

The number of dwellings provided would be dependent on the amount of employment floorspace, but they would also need to conform to the density advice in PPG 3. The character analysis concluded that typical densities in the central part of

the village were at the lower end of the PPG 3 density range, and the Parish Council would like the Brief to specify that the density should be at the lower end of the PPG 3 range. However, it may be possible to achieve a higher density and still reflect the character of the village, particularly as the site is in a central location. It is not, therefore, considered appropriate for the Brief to incorporate a specific density requirement. It is more important for the design of the development to reflect the local character and accommodate the types of dwellings needed. It would not be appropriate to exclude one bedroom dwellings totally, as they are the most affordable, and therefore should be provided if a need is identified.

The affordable housing aspects of the Brief have been discussed with the Council's Housing Enabling Officer. It is not considered that the 35% proportion of affordable housing is excessive, as there remains a local need for affordable housing, even though some has been provided on other adjacent sites. The Brief is being prepared to supplement the requirements of a Proposal in the Local Plan Review and therefore should accord with the Plan's requirements for affordable housing. No further change to the Brief is therefore proposed in this respect.

The Draft Brief included a sentence in paragraph 5.18 about encouraging smaller more affordable units. As this was in fact referring to their provision as both market housing and subsidised affordable homes, it was considered that the Draft Brief's guidance was not entirely clear on this issue. The affordable provision should relate to local identified needs (through Proposal H.5), and the overall mix of dwelling sizes on the site has to meet the requirements of Proposal H.7. It was agreed that the retention of the sentence could lead to confusion and therefore it is proposed that it should be deleted. Officers consider that the requirements of Proposal H.5 (for subsidised affordable provision) and Proposal H.7 of the Local Plan (on housing mix) are sufficient to provide a basis for determining an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, type and affordability on the site.

Proposed Changes:

Delete last sentence of paragraph 5.18.

4 Traffic / access

- Welcome recognition of need to improve all existing accesses **16**
- Paragraph 5.10 should be strengthened to ensure all site accesses incorporate pedestrian facilities **16**
- Paragraph 5.10 should refer to the likely need for the re-alignment of Wonston Road to provide satisfactory access, and that it may involve significant cost and construction work **16**
- Key to Appendix 8 on access should be amended as the principle of access has not yet been agreed with the Highway Authority **16**
- Paragraph 5.11 should be strengthened to clarify that developers will be expected to fund improvements to the footpath between Oxford Road and Gratton Close **16**
- Section 2 should include a section on PPG 13, referring to the need for developments to provide accessibility by all modes of transport **16**
- The removal of the railway bridge should be a requirement **1**
- A mini-roundabout at the junction of the Oxford and Wonston Roads would improve safety, and deter rat-running through the proposed development **1**
- Street lighting on the development should be low level as elsewhere in the village **1**

- The development will require safety and parking improvements in Oxford Road **2**
- A new access road should be provided from the A30 to serve the surgery, the pavilion and the development **3, 4, 10**
- The improvements needed to the footpath route between Oxford Road and the Gratton playing field, around the northern boundary of the site, should be more explicit. It should be re-routed to avoid the surgery car park **3, 9**
- Welcome the proposed footpath improvements in para. 5.11. Footpaths should link into the development to create permeability **15**
- The Development Framework Plan should show pedestrian routes through the site **21**
- The illustrative layout plan in Appendix 11 should show a tighter entrance to Wonston Road **21**

Officer Response

Discussions have been held with the Highway Authority on all the comments made on these issues, and the County Council's Countryside Service has been separately consulted with regard to footpath issues.

A number of amendments are proposed to the Brief in response to the Highway Authority's own comments, and these include a paragraph referring to the national policy context provided by PPG 13 (following paragraph 2.6 of the Draft Brief), reference to the provision of cycleways as well as footways in paragraph 5.10, strengthening of the wording relating to the need for improvements to the footpath between Oxford Road and Gratton Close in paragraph 5.11, and amendment of the notation on the Site Constraints Plan in Appendix 8 to clarify that the form of access needs to be agreed with the Highway Authority.

Whilst the Highway Authority is concerned that the works necessary to improve access to the site could be significant, and indicated that it might be prudent to draw attention to this in the Brief, they have now acknowledged that the wording in paragraph 5.10 of the Brief, together with the Local Plan's transport policies, will be sufficient to ensure that the necessary works are carried out. No further amendment is therefore proposed to the Brief in this respect.

A number of comments were also made by other organisations and individuals. Respondent 1 considers that the railway bridge should be removed as a requirement of the development, but, although this was a requirement of an earlier Local Plan, it was deleted during the early 1990s at the time of preparation of the adopted Local Plan. The Inquiry Inspector for that Plan accepted that it would be an unreasonable cost to impose on the development, and this would remain the case today. Nevertheless developers will be required to ensure satisfactory access is provided, including any necessary off-site works, through Proposals T.12 of the adopted Plan and through Proposal S.16 itself in the Local Plan Review.

Respondent 1 also considers that a mini-roundabout at the junction of the Oxford and Wonston Roads would improve safety, and deter rat-running through the proposed development. The Highway Authority is not convinced that people travelling between the Oxford and Wonston Roads will 'rat run' through the proposed development, as the internal layout will be a slow speed environment and will not be designed as a through route. The Authority is satisfied that the adopted and emerging Local Plan policies T.12 and S.16 will be sufficient to ensure that the Oxford/Wonston Road junction could be improved if necessitated by the development of the site.

Respondent 1 also raised the issue of street lighting in the development, which she considers should be low level as elsewhere in the village. Where new roads are offered for adoption, street lighting normally needs to be provided to adoptable standards, but the Highway Authority recognises the need for flexibility in rural areas, and, in some circumstances, no street lighting is required. The Highway Authority is satisfied that this detail can be agreed through the planning application, but it is proposed to add the phrase “if required” to paragraph 6.21, to clarify that flexibility exists on this issue.

Respondent 2 considers that the development will require safety and parking improvements in Oxford Road, but the Highway Authority is satisfied that the adopted Plan’s Proposal T.12 and the emerging Local Plan’s Proposal S.16 will be sufficient to ensure that any necessary safety and parking improvements are carried out in Oxford Road, and that no amendment to the Brief is required to reflect this.

Respondents 3, 4 and 10 consider that the proposed new road across the Gratton Field, to serve the pavilion and surgery, should be extended to serve the development. The Highway Authority considers that the site has existing accesses to the public highway which are required to be improved through the adopted and emerging Local Plan proposals. The proposed new road referred to is in fact a track rather than a new road, required to serve the proposed new sports ground pavilion. The construction of a significant length of new road in the countryside would not be in accordance with the County Council’s corporate aims, and it would be particularly inappropriate to construct a new length of road in the countryside if there are other existing roads which can be safely utilised for site access. No amendment to the Brief is therefore proposed in this respect.

Respondent 9 considers that the requirement to improve the existing footpath route from Oxford Road to the Gratton playing field and Gratton Surgery should be made more explicit and possibly re-routed through the development. An amendment to the text is proposed to clarify that developers will need to investigate the need for improvements to the footpath. Respondent 3 considers that the arrows on the Development Framework Plan in Appendix propose that the footpath should be routed across the surgery car park. The arrows shown on the Development Framework in Appendix 10 are only intended to be diagrammatic and only show a general direction, not precise routes. Detailed footpath routes will be determined at the planning application stage.

The County Council’s Countryside Service welcomes the proposed footpath improvements in paragraph 5.11, and considers that footpaths should link into the development to create permeability. Early consultation with the County Council’s Countryside Service on the detailed design is suggested and therefore it is proposed to amend the Brief to include this requirement.

Respondent 21 considers that pedestrian routes through the site should be shown on the Development Framework Plan in Appendix 10 and a tighter access to Wonston Road should be incorporated on the Preliminary Site Layout in Appendix 11. The comment on pedestrian routes is accepted and it is proposed to amend the Development Framework Plan to incorporate them. It is, however, not considered necessary to amend the Preliminary Site Layout to show the detail referred to by the respondent. The Plan is only intended to be illustrative, and therefore it is proposed to re-title it as ‘Illustrative Layout Plan’ to clarify this.

Proposed Changes:

In response to the Highway Authority's comments:

- Add an additional paragraph in Section 2, the Planning Policy Context, to refer to PPG 13 advice;
- Amend paragraph 5.10 to refer to the need for facilities for cyclists as well as pedestrians;
- Amend paragraph 5.11, to strengthen the wording in relation to the need for improvements to the footpath between Oxford Road and Gratton Close;
- In the Site Constraints Plan in Appendix 8, amend the access notation to clarify that the form of access needs to be agreed with the Highway Authority.

In response to other individual comments:

- Amend paragraph 6.21 to read "Street lighting, if required, will be provided...."
- Amend paragraph 5.11 on pedestrian links to require applicants to investigate the need for improvements to the footpath between Oxford Road and Gratton Close.

In response to the County Council's Countryside Service:

- Amend paragraph 5.11 to encourage developers to consult with Hampshire County Council's Countryside Service at an early stage in the design process.

In response to the Council's urban design consultants' comments:

- Amend the Development Framework Plan in Appendix 10 to show pedestrian routes through the site;
- Re-title Preliminary Site Layout Plan in Appendix 11 to read Illustrative Layout Plan.

5 Drainage / flooding

- There are serious concerns regarding flooding and surface water drainage which should be recognised more in the Brief / the proposed development would increase water run-off / exacerbate flood risk **1, 5(PC), 12**
- Do not believe that the criticality of drainage issues has been sufficiently emphasised **5 (PC)**
- The development should improve the community drainage system **5 (PC)**
- The extent of the built form should be limited to reduce flood risk to wider village areas **5(PC)**
- The drainage proposals should be co-ordinated with drainage improvements required for the Gratton Trust and Gratton Surgery **5(PC)**
- There is a preference for a new mains drainage system / for the development to link to the foul sewer to east of site **5(PC), 19**
- There would be concerns if a waste water treatment works was included on-site **1**

- If an on-site treatment works is provided, sufficient soakaway area is needed to be set aside from the development **19**
- Surface water should be dealt with at source by SUDS **19**

Officer Response

The City Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted on flooding and drainage issues.

Although respondents 1, 5 and 12 are concerned that flooding and drainage have not been adequately addressed, the Council's Drainage Engineer is satisfied that the conclusions reached in Section 6E of the Brief will ensure that satisfactory drainage is provided to the site. They reflect the results of the more detailed drainage study carried out at an early stage in the Brief's preparation.

Respondent 5 considers that the extent of the built form should be limited to reduce flood risk to wider village areas. The proposed development will, however, have to meet sustainable drainage requirements and therefore there should be no flood risk to other parts of the village. Hard landscaping within the proposed development is not likely to be greater than that already there, and therefore there is unlikely to be potential for increased runoff.

Respondent 5 also considers that drainage improvements for the proposed development should be co-ordinated with those required for extensions to the adjacent surgery and pavilion. All developments in Sutton Scotney will need to consult Southern Water and the Environment Agency on their drainage requirements. Whether or not co-ordination is possible will be dependent on the timing of each development, and therefore drainage may need to be considered separately for each site.

Respondent 5 would prefer a new mains drainage system and respondent 19 would prefer the drainage to link to the foul sewer to the east of the site. The Brief sets out foul drainage options in paragraph 6.6 and applicants are required to discuss proposals at an early stage with Southern Water Services and the Environment Agency (paragraph 6.9). The Council's Drainage Engineer considers that this is as far as the Brief can go, and that the requirement for early discussion with the drainage authorities and agreement on a drainage strategy should ensure that satisfactory drainage is provided.

The Council's Drainage Engineer will need to be satisfied that details, such as the soakage area required if an on-site treatment works is provided, is of sufficient size. This would be resolved through the early discussions with Southern Water Services and the Environment Agency, and therefore no amendment to the Brief is required to reflect this. He is also satisfied that the Brief reflects the Local Plan Review's encouragement of sustainable drainage systems wherever possible, set out in the Plan at paragraph 3.44 (as amended by RD 03.21).

Proposed Changes:

None.

6 Environmental protection

- Employment uses should be located to minimise disturbance to existing properties from additional noise 4,6
- The Brief should include a requirement for the developer to submit with any detailed scheme a report assessing the extent of any contaminated land within the site, and proposed remedial measures 17

Officer Response

Employment uses on the site are to be limited to B1 uses and therefore should be appropriate for integration with residential uses. They are therefore unlikely to be noise-generating uses. Businesses are, however, required, through paragraph 3.52 of the Local Plan Review, to consult with the Council's Environmental Health Department on acceptable noise levels and the development would need to meet the requirements of Proposal DP.13 in relation to any noise generating uses. It is therefore considered that there are adequate safeguards in Proposals DP.13 and S.16 of the Local Plan Review to control noise levels within the development, and that no amendment to the Brief is required.

The Council's Environmental Protection Officer considers that the Brief should include a section on land contamination and it is therefore proposed to amend the Brief to incorporate a paragraph on this issue.

Changes proposed:

Add new section, following paragraph 6.20 of the Draft Brief, to clarify that developers will be required to carry out a survey to identify any parts of the site that have been subject to contamination. They will need to submit a scheme, specifying remedial measures to be undertaken, with any planning application.

7 Open Space, Landscaping and Adjacent Uses

- Support provision of open space next to the Victoria Hall 1
- The space next to the Victoria Hall should be better defined on the Illustrative Site Layout in Appendix 11 21
- In view of the proximity of the play area at the Gratton Field, consider that no formal play provision is needed on the site but open areas should be provided 1
- There are inconsistencies between the Development Framework Plan and the Illustrative site layout in dealing with the issue of vegetation 21
- Consider it essential that the most important tree – the horse chestnut – is retained 1, 21
- A tree survey should be carried out to determine the location, size and health of existing trees 21
- The boundary planting on the eastern side of the former Station Yard should be retained and augmented 7
- The separation zone and the retention and enhancement of trees and boundary planting in the Development Framework should be extended along the boundary of the site adjacent to Old School House and Old School Lodge 6, 9
- Concern about proximity of the proposed development to existing adjacent properties 4,6
- The Illustrative Layout Plan in Appendix 11 should define public and private space 21

Officer Response

The support for the open space adjacent to the Victoria Hall is welcomed. The Development Framework Plan is only intended to be diagrammatic and therefore it is considered that the space is adequately defined for the purpose of the Brief. No further amendment is therefore proposed in this respect.

Officers do not agree that no play provision is needed on the development as a whole, as Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan requires provision of recreational space in accordance with Proposal RT.3. This requires developers to ensure that adequate play provision is made in accordance with the Local Plan's standard and on-site if feasible. The distance to the Gratton Playing Field would be too great for very young children to walk unsupervised. The aim is to provide a small play area within the development in a safe location, where it is overlooked by housing. A development of this size would be expected to provide a Local Equipped Area for Play, suitable for young children, together with some casual play space and space for informal use. The Brief therefore proposes that the play area should be in a central location, focusing if possible on the large specimen tree. No changes are therefore proposed in this respect.

Respondent 21 has some concerns about how trees and vegetation are dealt with in the Brief. He considers that the Brief should include a requirement for a tree survey to be carried out and this is the subject of a proposed amendment. It is accepted that some of the proposals relating to vegetation need to be clarified, and, as these generally relate to boundary planting, the issue is covered in the paragraph below. It is anticipated that the most important tree – the horse chestnut – will be retained as a feature of the scheme, but, in advance of any tree survey, it is considered that the Brief's wording is as positive as possible in this respect.

Respondents 4, 6 and 7 have raised issues relating to boundary planting, and it is accepted that not all the areas with privacy issues have been identified on the Site Constraints Plan in Appendix 6, or shown as sensitive areas on the Development Framework Plan in Appendix 10. Amendments are therefore proposed to both plans to extend the areas to include all sensitive boundaries, and to delete the reference to the 10 metre separation zone included in the Draft Brief on the Development Framework Plan as it has not been referred to in the text and the amount of separation needed will depend on the detailed design. It is also proposed to strengthen the wording to provide for enhancement in these sensitive areas where required, to achieve consistency with the requirement of Proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review. It is anticipated that these changes will satisfy the respondents' concerns.

Detailed landscape treatment would be a matter for the overall landscape framework that is required in support of the planning application. A new paragraph 5.33 is proposed to clarify the matters that the Landscape and Open Space Framework should address, and this will include boundary landscaping.

The site also adjoins the public footpath between Gratton Close and the village centre on the northern boundary of the former Station Yard. It is proposed to strengthen the wording of the Brief on this issue, requiring applicants to assess the need for improvements to the footpath in association with any planning application. The Highway Authority also supports this approach, and the proposed change to the Brief in paragraph 5.11 is referred to under section 4 above, on traffic/access.

Proposed Changes:

Amend paragraph 5.30 to include the need for a Tree Survey to be carried out.

In paragraph 5.28, first sentence, amend the wording, referring to the mature trees along the eastern boundary, to require them to be retained and augmented.

Amend wording in paragraph 5.2 to refer to the need for sensitive boundary treatment in the areas identified on the Development Framework Plan, and incorporate the need to address this issue in the Landscape and Open Space Framework (see new paragraph 5.33 referred to below). Extend areas with privacy issues on the Site Constraints Plan (Appendix 6), and those requiring sensitive boundary treatment in the Development Framework Plan in Appendix 10.

Create new paragraph 5.33 to set out the matters to be included in the Landscape and Open Space Framework, to be submitted with the planning application for the development.

8 Facilities

- The development would overload the doctors' practice **7**
- The development could bring other benefits to the village **1**
- The development should include a parade of shops **22**
- There should be a bottle bank within the development **22**

Officer Response

The doctors' surgery is aware of this proposed development, and is currently considering expansion to meet local needs.

Although other benefits would be welcomed in the village, it is only possible to seek from developers those benefits that would be required as a direct result of their development. This is clearly set out in Government guidance in Circular 1/97. It may, however, be possible to seek some off-site benefits, where they are a direct result of the development.

Respondent 22 considers that a group of additional shops should be provided within the development but it is unlikely that a development of this scale would be viable in Sutton Scotney, particularly when combined with the shops that already exist in the village centre. It cannot therefore be a specific proposal of the Brief. The general policies of the Local Plan do, however, encourage additional local shops, should an individual proposal come forward in a suitable location in the village.

The issue of suitable locations for bottle banks has to be assessed in terms of the whole village and is not a planning matter. It is therefore not possible to refer to it in the Brief.

Proposed Changes:

None.

List of Respondents:

- 1 Sue Lane, Witts Cottage, Wonston Road, Sutton Scotney.
- 2 P Hawthorne, Amara, Oxford Road, Sutton Scotney.
- 3 Dr D Firebrace, Gratton Surgery, Sutton Scotney.
- 4 Mr and Mrs Trevor, 7 Gratton Close, Sutton Scotney.
- 5 Wonston Parish Council
- 6 S Gothard, Old School Lodge, Oxford Road, Sutton Scotney.
- 7 Mr and Mrs D Curtis, 6 Gratton Close, Sutton Scotney.
- 8 North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
- 9 Old School House, Oxford Road, Sutton Scotnet
- 10 Stephens Cox Associates Ltd. (architects for the Gratton Trust and Gratton Surgery)
- 11 Motor Medic, 17 Oxford Road, Sutton Scotney
- 12 Lyla Ayres, Witt's End, Wonston Road, Sutton Scotney.
- 13 The Countryside Agency
- 14 Economic Development Manager, Winchester City Council
- 15 Hampshire Countryside Service, Network Development Officer
- 16 Development Control (Highways), Environment Department, Hampshire County Council
- 17 Environmental Protection, Winchester City Council
- 18 South Hampshire Enterprise Agency
- 19 Environment Agency
- 20 Housing Enablement Officer, Winchester City Council
- 21 Matrix Partnership (the Council's urban design consultants)
- 22 A C Hayter, 20 Wonston Close