

Analysis of Representations on Draft Springvale Local Area Design Statement and Recommended Responses. July 2006.

Topic/Paragraph	Comment	Recommended Response
<i>General Comments</i>	General support for the aims and objectives of the document (2, 3, 5, 8)	Support is welcomed
<i>Setting (internal character)</i>		
2.9	The gradient of the slope should be followed sympathetically. (2)	The LADS requires development to respect the existing character of the area, and this would include the topography. The Guidelines limit development primarily to 2 storeys which will also help to retain the appearance of the slope. <i>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</i>
2.17	Agreed. The allotments are valued by those without long gardens. This area is probably unacceptable for housing due to noise and air pollution. (4)	The LADS acknowledges the importance of the allotments to local residents. Allotments that are being utilised are protected under Policy FS5 of the Review Local Plan. <i>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</i>
2.21	St Nicholas Rise should not be described as an “estate development” (2, 4, 5). This description could lead to incorrect assumptions about the future use of the road. St Nicholas Rise also has views of the open country as Mortimer Close does. (5) St Nicholas Rise should have the same degree of protection that Mount Pleasant has. (5) Future developments should not be accessed from St Nicholas Rise. (2)	The LADS was attempting to differentiate between the characters of the various Close’s in the area, however, it is agreed that the term estate is not entirely appropriate in this instance. The LADS does not identify views of the open country from St Nicholas Rise as a particular feature of the road, however this is not to say that there are none. Mount Pleasant is considered to have a particular character that should be protected.

		<p>The LADS cannot treat all the roads in the same manner.</p> <p>The LADS seeks the retention of features that make up the character of the area and recognises the importance of vegetation in the area.</p> <p>The report states that access into the inner part of the study area would be best achieved from Springvale Road. Any proposed access via St Nicholas Close, or any of the other roads would be assessed by the Highways Engineer for its suitability.</p> <p>Recommended Change: delete the word “estate” from paragraph 2.21.</p>
Guidelines		
<i>Introduction Section</i>		
3.2	Highways issues may be more than significantly limiting in the context of increasing numbers of development (4)	<p>The Highways Agency will take account of the cumulative effect of developments in the area on traffic levels and assess new developments accordingly.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
3.6	Increased traffic effects need to be taken into account for Bedfield and Church Lanes which have difficult accesses to Worthy Road because of bends. (4)	See response to 3.2
<i>Issues Discussion</i>		
3.11	Feel <u>strongly</u> that screening should be internal as well as around the edges. (2)	See response to L2
3.11	Cul de sac developments would be preferable and in keeping with the area. (2)	Numerous cul de sacs may not be the most efficient use of land and do not always assist with the permeability of areas. The LADS does

		<p>not propose a particular type of road for new developments as in practice, this is likely to depend on the amount of development that comes forward and how comprehensive the proposals are.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
3.12	<p><u>All</u> buildings should be of limited height and of similar materials and designs to existing properties (2)</p>	<p>See response to D1</p>
3.13	<p>Hedges & screening should be more important than development numbers on the site. (2)</p>	<p>Although it would not be reasonable to retain all existing vegetation, the LADS makes a similar point to the respondent in 3.19, where it states that that such features may need to be retained at the expense of redevelopment density., and again in Guideline D3</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
3.15	<p>More emphasis needs to be put on the role of the City Council as enforcer of environmental guidelines, and to ensure that adequate consultation takes place amongst residents on proposed developments, not just reacting to “design-led” development. (4)</p>	<p>The LADS provides strong design guidelines for development, acting as a framework for developers to follow, although as paragraph 3.22 points out, there must also be room for design responsiveness and flair within the scope of the LADS. Government guidelines and the City Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) encourage developers to carry out consultations with the local community before submitting applications</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
3.18 & 3.19	<p>Internal views and visual impact are more important for local residents than views from outside. (5)</p>	<p>See response to D3.</p>

3.19	Strongly support the statement that the character of the area must be the prime consideration. (2,3) Feel strongly that individual developments should not overcrowd individual sites (2)	Support for this prime tenant of the LADS is welcome. Compliance with the requirements of PPG3, makes it inevitable that densities will be higher over the whole of the study area than is currently the case. However, the LADS also makes it clear in paragraph 3.19 and Guideline D3 that the character of the area is paramount, including the feeling of openness. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.
3.20	Strongly agree that this is the <u>essential policy</u> for future development. (2,3) <u>Seriously</u> concerned that developers will use the argue that this is an inefficient use of land to attempt to achieve denser development. (2)	Support for this aspect of the LADS is welcome. It is the case that retention of hedges and vegetation will result in a lower densities than would otherwise be the case, however the LADS explains why this is considered important to respect the character of the area. By taking this approach, it is also necessary to accept that densities may need to be higher in some parts of the area to mitigate for lower densities in other parts, as acknowledged in Guideline D3. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.
3.22	The paragraph as written gives developers loopholes not to comply with the guidelines. (2,3) Word change suggested as follows: “Whilst it should be noted that the guidelines listed below are not defined as absolute constraints that must be followed in every case, nonetheless they should be considered by all stakeholders as an essential and vital part of the overall development proposals for this study area. These guidelines	It is not considered reasonable to insist on strict adherence to the Guidelines in every instance. However, this paragraph clearly states that the guidelines require “clear reasons and justification if they are not to be followed”. This is considered to create a sufficient balance between strong guidelines and a reasonable degree of flexibility. No change is considered necessary as a

	clearly define key characteristics and defining features which should be maintained.” (2)	result of this comment.
Development Guidelines		
D1	<p>Support that any future buildings be no more than 2 storeys high. (2, 3, 4), nor outside the mass of existing buildings. (4) There should be no large and overpowering blocks of any one type (2)</p> <p>Recent developments Elan in Springvale Road and Egypt Mills in Nations Hill are out of scale and character with this semi-rural area and do not followed these guidelines. (3, 4)</p> <p>Maintenance of external views is essential if the distinct character of the area and the privacy of existing residents are to be protected. Any new houses should be restricted to single storey to reduce overlooking and loss of privacy, and should not be sited close to existing boundaries. (6)</p>	<p>The LADS recognises the predominantly low-rise nature of development in the area, which compliments its semi-rural appearance. It is therefore proposed that buildings should of no more than 2 storeys in height. It is sometimes possible to achieve a third floor within the roof of a 2 storey building with careful design. An insistence on single storey development would be an inefficient use of land. Restriction to mainly 2 storey development and the retention of much of the existing vegetation will still result in a relatively open and low density area.</p> <p>The LADS states that developments should be substantially of the same mass as existing buildings, therefore it is unlikely that any large blocks would be permitted.</p> <p>The guidelines in the LADS aim to maintain the essential characteristics of the area and they have taken account of the opinions of local residents on the character and appearance of recent developments in the vicinity.</p> <p>The issue of external views are considered under D3</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a</p>

		result of these comments.
D2	Developments should be rejected if they would lead to landlocking of a block of land. (2) A comprehensive planning approach is essential for any new development in the area, to avoid piece meal development. (3)	It is agreed that developments should not prejudice possible future adjacent developments, in the interests of the efficient use of land. This is reflected in Guideline D2. No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.
D3	It is as important for the internal areas of development to have an "appearance of openness" as it is for the external boundaries of the area. (2) Balancing the need for new development with the essential character features of the area is paramount. Do not agree that higher densities could be acceptable within internal areas of the study area, to offset lower densities elsewhere. Higher densities which are not in character with the area should not be acceptable. Consider re-writing the clause so that the words "careful and sensitively" are meaningful. (3)	The planning system cannot protect the views of individual properties, Guideline D3 stresses views into the area as these will have the greatest impact in maintaining the current sense of openness. D3 refers to being aware of the position of development in relation to boundaries and L2 seeks to protect vegetation within the area, which will help to maintain a degree of openness within the area. It has to be recognised that government guidelines and the Local Plan Review, require overall densities to be between 30-50 dph. In order to achieve that, the density of development within this area will have to increase. The LADS attempts to protect the most valuable features from development, but there will have to be an increase in development in some other parts of the study area. Without the LADS guidelines the Council would have no grounds for rejecting development proposals in excess of 30 dph anywhere within the study area. D3 and its supporting commentary outlines the

		<p>above issues in great detail and highlights the potential conflicts that may occur. It is considered that the guidelines are correct in stating that careful and sensitive handling of development schemes can make a great difference to above character.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</p>
D4	<p>Must be maintained as written. (3) The guidance on building lines in Springvale Road should be flexible, to avoid an inefficient use of land, but any changes closer to the road should be well screened with vegetation. (D8)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed. The set-back of buildings from the frontage is one of the defining characteristics of the area. The important factor in proposals is to maintain a sense of spaciousness and scale in the set-back from the road.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
D5	<p>Strongly agree. (2) Strongly support. Must not be diluted in any way. Large mass blocks of flats with bulky proportions and large parking areas must be rejected, as they would destroy the key features and characteristics of the area. (3)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed. The development of flats cannot be ruled out per se. It is the appearance of bulky blocks with large areas of parking that may be harmful to the area. It is considered that D5 and its commentary requires some re-wording to reflect these concerns, whilst not excluded flatted development per se.</p> <p>Recommended change: <i>officers to agree re-wording of.D5 with the Portfolio-holder.</i></p>
D6	<p>Any development should comply with 'Secure by Design' standards. Concern over potential noise and light pollution. (2) New pedestrian links may attract crime. (2, 4, 5) Lighting for the current roads/closes is a higher priority. (4)</p>	<p>Increasing permeability of areas by increasing the number of pedestrian links has been shown to reduce crime, so long as surveillance and other 'Secure by design' criteria are respected. It would be useful to contain reference to this within the Guideline. Consideration of the</p>

		existing lighting situation in the area is outside the scope of the LADS Recommended change: add “and comply with “Secure by Design” guidelines” at the end of D6.
D7	Mt Pleasant to be protected under any future developments in the area. (2) Must be maintained as written. (3)	Guidelines D7 and T1 seek to maintain the particular character of Mount Pleasant. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.
D8	Delete ‘generally’ (2) A key clause, which must not be diluted. New development must have individuality and be of a high standard, responding to and respecting of existing building forms and materials. (3) Emphasise that Mount Pleasant is extremely sensitive to change and should be afforded special protection from insensitive development. (6) Mount Pleasant needs to be preserved, but also needs careful planning to prevent it becoming an isolated rural patch within a largely built-up area in the future. (7)	The LADS recognises the opinions of local residents regarding the design and appearance of new developments and Guideline D8 reflects this. It is however agreed that the last sentence of the first paragraph of the comment could be reworded to reflect the aims of D8 in dealing with architectural treatment and individuality. The LADS recognises the particular characteristics of Mount Pleasant and Guidelines D7 and T1 seek to protect these. These characteristics may lead to the road being of a different character to the rest of the study area. Recommended change: reword last sentence of the first paragraph of the comment to read – “The excessive repetition of standard house types and design features should be avoided.”
D9	Complete agreement (2)	Support is welcomed
L1 – L4	Strongly agree that trees and hedges need to be retained wherever possible to maintain the semi rural character of the area. (2)	Support is welcomed
L1	These comments are essential and must not be diluted. The wider wooded/green vegetation areas	The LADS acknowledges the importance of vegetation including trees and hedges as an

	are as important as TPO trees. (3) Needs to clarify that significantly-sized trees within the study area visible from within properties also need to be protected for visual character and noise protection. Particularly if densities are to be increased. Should be sanctions against developers who ignore TPOs. (4)	important defining characteristic of the area. Guidelines L1 – L4 are aimed at protecting important trees and other vegetation in the area. However, it would not be realistic nor reasonable to retain all trees and vegetation blocks within the area. No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.
L2	Other vegetation visible by residents from within their own properties needs to be protected to maintain the unique character of the area. (4)	See response to L1 above.
L3	Information on tree reports should be available to the wider area of residents. (4)	Developers will submit tree surveys with their applications and these will therefore be publicly accessible as part of the consultation on any proposal. The Council's arboriculturalist assessments on potential TPO trees and comments on developers' tree surveys are also publicly available. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.
L4	The whole of this clause is crucial and should not be diluted. Large bland areas of hardstanding detract from the overall appearance and led to run off problems. New entrances should also reflect the existing discrete entrances. (3)	Support is welcomed
T1	Highways proposals must be appropriate to the setting. Urbanising the semi rural appearance of roads must be avoided at all costs. Mount Pleasant is a particular example. (3) Current cul-de-sacs such as St Nicholas Rise, should remain as cul-de-sacs where traffic speeds will be lower. St Nicholas Rise cannot support increased traffic	The LADS acknowledges the semi rural character of much of the area and singles out Mount Pleasant for particular care. The LADS stresses the importance of context as much as technical solutions to highways standards. The LADS does not rule out accessibility to development from existing cul de sacs in

	<p>volumes, manoeuvring is already difficult when there are lots of parked cars on the road. (4)</p> <p>Mount Pleasant is inadequate to serve more than a v small number of additional houses and cannot be improved without destroying many trees and other vegetation. As the road is private, landowners consent would be required for any changes. Any loss of informal character or road widening is unlikely to be acceptable. (6)</p>	<p>principle, but makes it clear in paragraphs 3.4 – 3.6 that there are likely to be character and landscape issues that may rule out such proposals in practice. It suggests that access would be better achieved from Springvale Road. It is not appropriate for the LADS to go into detail regarding existing traffic situations on specific roads. Issues of accessibility, manoeuvring, car parking, traffic speed and increased traffic levels will be addressed by the Highways Agency when applications are received.</p> <p>T1 makes specific reference to the sensitive nature of Mount Pleasant, and it is not considered necessary to add to this.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</p>
T2	<p>Strongly endorse. (3) Nations Hill/Church Lane only has pavement on one side. (4)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p>
T3	<p>Strongly endorse. (3) It is not realistic to expect car usage to be minimised in a semi-rural village. There is already occasional overspill car parking in St Nicholas Rise from Nations Hill houses. (4)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Car parking provision should accord with the standards set down by Hampshire County Council. Current government guidance advises against the over-specification of car parking provision.</p> <p>No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
T4	<p>Strongly endorse. (3)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed</p>
T5	<p>Strongly endorse. (3)</p>	<p>Support is welcomed</p>
T6	<p>Replace the word “may” with “must”. (2) Add reductions in noise pollution from A34. (4)</p>	

<i>Appendix</i>	The Appendix succinctly sets out the concerns of residents as aired at the public consultation meeting. (3) Does not include the point raised at the meeting that St Nicholas Rise should be kept as a short cul-de-sac. An extension of the road would lead to appalling and dangerous effects on the traffic on Nations Hill. (5)	The issue of retaining St Nicholas Rise as a short cul-de-sac is covered in the response to T1 above
<i>Other Issues</i>		
Noise	Developers should contribute to addressing noise pollution from A34, where resurfacing work is required. The guidelines should require that the trees planted on the bank of the A34 as a noise barrier should be retained (4) There is a problem of traffic noise in the area, this would be increased should any trees or vegetation be lost. Therefore there should be only limited development in this area. (6) Could any money be provided from developers for noise barriers on A34 embankment? (2)	Although it would be reasonable to expect developers to mitigate any unacceptable increase in noise caused by their development (such as by the removal of vegetation), it would not be reasonable to expect developers to address existing problems that are not caused by their proposal. <i>No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</i>
Flood Risk	Flooding has occurred in this area in recent years. (2) As there has been some historic flooding in parts, a flood risk assessment should be carried out for any development proposals (1) Increasing the amount of hard surfacing may increase the rainfall runoff. (1, 3). May be issues of capacity with the Nun's Walk Stream culverted watercourse, particularly when groundwater table is high. (1) All foul sewage should be directed to the main foul sewer and Southern Water should be consulted. (1)	The area covered by the LADS is within the Environment Agency's 'Area at risk of flooding every 100 years.' As such. The Environment Agency would be consulted on any development proposals as per DP11 of the Local Plan Review. Southern Water are one of several statutory consultees. <i>No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</i>
Service Capacity	Additional development would place more strain on	It is not considered that the scale of

	<p>essential services (schools, hospitals etc) (2, 4) Need to take account of the cumulative effect of developments in the vicinity and the outside area, particularly in regard to traffic and infrastructure. Increased traffic has an effect on the character. (4)</p>	<p>development likely to take place within the LADS would place an unacceptable strain on local services. It should be borne in mind that without the LADS it is likely that the level of development in the area would be even greater and would lead to greater impacts on local services. The cumulative effects of development on traffic should be taken account by the Highways Agency when assessing development proposals. No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</p>
Consultations	<p>Consultations on planning applications do not cover a wide enough area. (4) Would like to see development proposals before they are passed (7)</p>	<p>Site notices are displayed on all application sites and adjoining neighbours notified by letter. The Parish Council is also notified of all applications. Developments of more than 10 houses are given wider publicity, such as press notices and the holding of public meetings. Both government guidance and the City Council's SCI encourage developers to carry out greater pre-application consultation with both the Council and local residents. The SCI also sets out the Council's intention to have more public participation in the planning process than has historically been the case. No change is considered necessary as a result of these comments.</p>
Sustainability Appraisal	<p>The Appraisal should take account of impacts of abstraction from the Itchen SAC/SSSI and of discharges into it. (1) Should state how possible negative effects identified are to be progressed or mitigated. eg change chart on p29 to show that</p>	<p>It is considered that the study area is too far from the Itchen SAC/SSSI and the scale of development too small to have any significant impact on the SAC/SSSI.</p>

	development guidelines may have a negative effect on resources and diversity indicators. (1)	It is accepted that the Appraisal should discuss the negative effects and how they would be dealt with. Recommended change: Officers to agree with the Portfolio-Holder, an additional paragraph for the Sustainability Appraisal dealing with the issue of negative effects.
Misc comments	Church Lane is too small and narrow to accommodate more traffic (7)	See response to T1 above.
	The LADS should not be passed without some reassurance from the City Council about possible future developments at the Merrydale Childrens' Home and the woodland area adjoining the end of Mount Pleasant, which are both outside the LADS area. (7)	It is outside the scope of the LADS to consider these issues at this time. Any applications for development that are on the fringes of the LADS should of course have regard to the Guidelines insofar as they are relevant to their development. Future development proposals at the children's home are not within the control of the City Council. The woodland area at the end of Mount Pleasant is within the LADS and Guideline D7 refers to this aspect. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.
	Play areas should be provided in developments (2)	The Council will seek the provision of appropriate areas for play and recreation in accordance with Policy RT4 of the Local Plan Review. According to the scale of development and the nature of the site involved, this may either be on-site provision or a financial contribution for provision off-site. No change is considered necessary as a result of this comment.