

## **Introduction**

The Winchester District Local Plan Review was placed on Deposit in October 2001 and the Revised Deposit Plan was subsequently published in May 2003. Both publications were followed by a six week period for the receipt of representations. Pre-Inquiry Changes to address objections were then published in January 2004, also followed by a six week period for the receipt of representations. A small number of Further Proposed Changes were also published, following Council approval on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2004. In view of the small amount of time before the start of the Local Plan Inquiry in June 2004, there was no formal consultation period on them, but respondents were asked to respond to them as part of their evidence to the Local Plan Inquiry. Additional Further Proposed Changes were also put forward to the Inspector for his consideration during the Inquiry, following discussion at Inquiry sessions.

A Public Local Inquiry into objections to all the formal stages of the Plan was held between 8 June 2004 and 17 March 2005 at the Guildhall, Winchester. From a total of over 4000 representations made at all stages, 388 were withdrawn, and there were 655 representations of support. The two Inspectors therefore considered 3223 objections, which were either heard during the Inquiry or submitted as written representations.

Following the Public Local Inquiry, the Inspectors – Mr E C Grace and Mr M Andrews – presented their Report to the City Council. The Report, published in September 2005, sets out their consideration of the issues raised by each objection, the conclusions reached, and their recommendations on whether to modify or not to modify the Plan.

The Report is not a binding Report, and therefore it makes recommendations to the Council on how the Inspectors consider that the Plan should be modified. The Council has carefully considered the Report, and proposes to make a number of Modifications, having regard to the Inspectors' conclusions and recommendations. Some Proposed Modifications are consequential to the Inspectors' recommendations, or are proposed to correct and update the Plan.

## **Purpose of this Document**

This document is published in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (England) Regulations 1999. It sets out the Proposed Modifications for each Chapter of the Local Plan and gives the Council's reasons for proposing them.

This document should be read in conjunction with the Revised Deposit Local Plan Review and the Inspectors' Report. These documents are available for inspection on the Council's web-site at [www.winchester.gov.uk/planning](http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning); at the City Council's Development Services Reception and libraries in Winchester (main lending and reference library), Bishop's Waltham, Alresford, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Fareham, Waterlooville, Horndean and Havant. The Revised Deposit Local Plan and the Inspectors' Report may also be purchased from the City Council's Development Services Reception, priced £50 and £30 respectively (plus £5 postage and packing for each document).

Anyone may make representations, as objections or representations in support, but they must relate to the Proposed Modifications, and not to the contents of the original

Local Plan. Objections may also be made where modifications are recommended by the Inspector and Proposed Modifications are not put forward.

Objections / representations should state the Proposed Modification number, the relevant Proposal or paragraph number of the Revised Deposit Plan to which it relates, and the grounds on which they are made. They should be made in writing, or by e-mail through the Council's web-site, to the Head of Strategic Planning, Avalon House, Chesil Street, Winchester, SO23 0HU not later than (insert date) March 2006. A form for this purpose is included at the back of this document, and separate copies are available in the City Council's Development Services reception area.

Further copies of this document may be purchased from the City Council's Development Services Reception, price £xx (plus £5 postage and packing). For more information on the Proposed Modifications, please ring the Strategic Planning Division on 01962 848101 or 848170.

All objectors to the Local Plan will be notified of the City Council's final decision to adopt the Plan (whether or not they have made representations on the Proposed Modifications). Anyone else who wishes to be informed should write to the Head of Strategic Planning at the above address.

Two draft Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are published with this document. These relate to the replacement of Policy H.3 and the release of the Local Reserve housing sites, and should be read in conjunction with the relevant Proposed Modifications in the Housing Chapter, particularly MODs 6.11, 6.13 and 6.15. Comments on the draft Supplementary Planning Documents should be submitted separately, on the forms provided in those documents, or by e-mail on the forms provided on the council's web-site, to the Head of Strategic Planning, Avalon House, Chesil Street, Winchester, SO23 0HU, also not later than (insert date) March 2006.

### **How to use this document**

This document follows the Chapter order of the Revised Deposit Local Plan. Each Chapter includes a brief introductory section, setting out whether any Pre-Inquiry Changes or Further Proposed Changes were put forward to the Inspectors on that Chapter, and a list of the paragraphs and Proposals on which the Inspector has recommended changes. This is followed by the Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Plan for that Chapter, set out in three columns. Where map changes are proposed, these are included as an Appendix to the relevant Chapter.

Each Schedule only contains those parts of the Plan which it is proposed to modify. Proposals (Policies) and paragraphs which are not included will remain unaltered apart from changes to numbering necessitated by the proposed addition, deletion or change to parts of the Plan. Column 2 of each Schedule reproduces the text of the Revised Deposit Plan (2003) which it is proposed to modify. Where only part of the Proposal / paragraph is reproduced, the remainder will not be changed.

Within each Schedule, the first column lists the Modification number, which incorporates the Chapter number, followed by a dot, and then the Modification number in numerical sequence. For example, the Proposed Modifications to Chapter 3: Design and Development Principles are listed as MOD 3.1, MOD 3.2, MOD 3.3, etc. Each Modification number refers to a particular paragraph or Proposal (to be re-named as Policy), which may, in some circumstances, contain more than one change to the text.

The second column sets out the details of the Proposed Modification from the text of the Plan, with the Proposals (to be re-named as Policies) shown in italic bold text, and the explanatory text in normal type. Text proposed to be deleted is shown in red and ~~struck through~~, whereas proposed new text is shown in green and underlined. Changes to be made throughout the Plan, and the need for future updating changes at the time of adoption, are shown in green normal text in brackets. Changes to maps are referred to under the relevant Modification number, also in green normal text in brackets, with the proposed map changes included as an Appendix to the relevant Chapter.

The third column sets out the reason for the change, which in most cases refers to the Inspectors' recommendation, the relevant paragraph number and the sub-section number of the Inspectors' Report. Where the recommendation accepts a Pre-Inquiry Change or a Further Proposed Change, the relevant PIC or FPC number is also included.

Following the Proposed Modifications is a section which lists the Inspectors' recommendations which the Council proposes not to accept, or to accept only in part. This section includes an explanation of the reasons for the Council's decisions on these 'rejected' recommendations.



## General Proposed Modifications

### Introduction

There were a limited number of objections applying generally throughout the Plan to the text or the maps. In response to the objections made to the Revised Deposit Plan, the City Council proposed no Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs).

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector’s recommendations. Other general updating of the text and figures is proposed to provide the most recent information at the time of publication of the adopted Plan. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector’s recommendations

#### General

- Re-naming all the ‘Proposals’ in the Plan as ‘Policies’.
- Showing the publication date on each page of the Plan.

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD GEN 1	Throughout the Plan: (General updating of text and figures to provide the most recent information, including the need to reflect changes in Government advice and changes in legislation or regulations).	To ensure that the Plan is up-to-date.
MOD GEN 2	<b>All Proposals in the Plan</b> (Rename as Policies throughout the Plan)	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 1.1.10(a).
MOD GEN 3	Every page of the Plan (Add the full date of publication of the Adopted Plan).	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 1.1.10(b).
MOD GEN 4	Proposals and Inset Maps (Use up to date map bases and information, including latest Environment Agency Flood Map)	To ensure that the Plan is up-to-date.
MOD GEN 5	Throughout the Plan (Delete site-specific allocations where these have been largely or fully implemented at the time the Plan is adopted)	To ensure that the Plan is up-to-date.



## Chapter 2: Strategy

### Introduction

There were a number of objections relating to the text of Chapter 2: Strategy, and these related to each section of the Chapter – the Strategic Context, the Local Plan Strategy, and the Objectives of the Strategy. No Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) were proposed by the City Council in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector’s recommendations.

Most of the Inspector’s recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector’s recommendations

#### Strategic Context

Re-wording of the fourth sentence of paragraph 2.7 to more accurately reflect the Structure Plan terminology.

#### The Local Plan Strategy

- Re-wording of the final sentence of paragraph 2.10 to avoid the ambiguity that has led to mis-interpretation of the text.

#### Objectives of the Strategy

- Re-wording of the second objective, paragraph 2.19 and the first part of paragraph 2.20, to provide greater clarity that the accommodation of development primarily within existing built-up areas is supplemented by the allocation of the two MDAs, as Baseline and Reserve urban extensions, as part of the Plan’s strategy.
- Additional text in paragraph 2.20 to refer to the limited number of urban extension sites to be held as Local Reserve housing allocations (recommended in the Housing Chapter), to be used if the anticipated housing supply does not materialise for any reason.
- Deletion of references to “development frontages” in paragraph 2.20 to reflect the recommended deletion of Policy H.3 and its replacement with an infilling policy.

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 2.1	Paragraph 2.7, fourth sentence The Plan also <del>reserves the possibility of</del> <u>requires identification of an additional reserve housing provision including</u> a further Major Development Area at Winchester City (North),...	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 2.1.3.

MOD 2.2	<p>Paragraph 2.10, final sentence  <del>Therefore the Local Plan, therefore, interprets</del> <u>applies</u> Government guidance and Structure Plan <u>policies, strategies, so as to ensure they are whilst also ensuring it is</u> relevant to the District's circumstances and needs.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 2.2.6.
MOD 2.3	<p>Bullet point preceding paragraph 2.19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>To provide for the development requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) primarily in</del> <u>within existing defined built-up areas, using a sequential approach, and by the allocation of two Major Development Areas (MDAs) as Baseline and Reserve urban extensions.</u></li> </ul>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 2.3.7(a).
MOD 2.4	<p>Paragraph 2.19, first sentence  In line with Government <u>advice</u> and Structure Plan policies, <del>where development is needed it should be directed within</del> <u>development potential has been identified using a sequential approach directing it, where possible, to existing defined settlements, and in addition to urban extensions on greenfield sites.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 2.3.7(b).
MOD 2.5	<p>Paragraph 2.20, first sentence  An Urban Capacity Study has been carried out <del>and shows which demonstrates</del> that the Structure Plan Review's development requirements can be met <u>by utilising a combination of sites within the in</u> existing defined built-up areas, <u>together with the two MDAs, without needing to extend the defined areas or allocate new sites (other than at the Major Development Areas), without the need to allocate significant additional new sites. Nevertheless, a limited number of Local Reserve housing allocations have been made, with the intention that they may be implemented if the anticipated housing supply does not materialise for any reason.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 2.3.7(c).
MOD 2.6	<p>Paragraph 2.20 (second sentence)  ..The Plan defines clear settlement boundaries by way of policy boundaries (Proposal H.2). <del>and development frontages (Proposal H.3).</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 2.3.7(d).
MOD 2.7	<p>Paragraph 2.26, first sentence  The settlement proposals are based on the definition of clear limits to</p>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph



	development, <del>either</del> by defining “policy boundaries” (Proposal H.2). <del>or</del> <del>“development frontages” (Proposal H.3).</del>	2.3.7 (d).
--	---	------------



## Chapter 3: Design and Development Principles

### Introduction

The Design and Development Principles Chapter was subject to a significant number of objections. A number of these expressed concern regarding the specific expression of Plan policy, others focussed on matters of more detailed policy/text wording.

In response to the objections made to the Chapter in the Revised Deposit Plan, the City Council proposed 9 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) relating to this Chapter. Five Further Proposed Changes (FPCs) were also put forward to the Inspectors, either before the Inquiry started or as the Inquiry progressed.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. With the exception of two changes relating to issues of comprehensive development (PIC 03.02 and PIC 03.03), he has accepted all of the Council's Pre Inquiry Changes and recommended other changes, in accordance with all of the Further Proposed Changes.

Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording, or specify what the recommended change is to cover, allowing the Council to devise appropriate wording. In one other instance a detailed Map change is set out. In general, therefore, the recommendations have not required significant further work, with the exception of Policy DP.8. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with most of the Inspectors' recommendations, but proposes not to fully accept the Inspectors' recommendations in relation to:**

- the amendment of the text of paragraph 3.3 – MOD 3.1
- the amendment of the text to the new paragraph following new paragraph 3.21 – MOD 3.8
- the re- wording of Policy DP.8 and accompanying text – MODs 3.14 – 3.16.

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### All policies

- The deletion of cross-references to other Plan policies, where these have been shown in the body of policies contained in the Revised Deposit Plan.

#### Maps

- Amendment to the Proposals Map and its Key, to show the officially safeguarded zone, established for those areas surrounding Southampton Airport which fall within the District and, also to illustrate the extent of the area (10km radius from the airport) within which separate consultation with the National Air Traffic Service (NATS) will be required, in the case of wind turbine proposals.

#### Specific policies and text

- The deletion of policies DP.4 (access for people with limited mobility) and DP.9 (efficient use of resources) and the replacement of DP.4 in the text.

The deletion of policy DP.11 (flood risk) and the transfer of part into Policy DP.10.

- Wording changes to the policies and text of:
  - paragraph 3.3 (development aims)
  - DP.1 (planning applications: supporting and explanatory information)
  - DP.3, paragraph 3.18, paragraph 3.19 (general design criteria)
  - DP.5 (landscape and the built environment)
  - RD03.15 - RD03.17 (aerodrome safety)
  - DP.8 (use of resources)
  - DP.10, paragraph 3.44, paragraph 3.45 (flood risk)
  - paragraph 3.49 (infrastructure for new development)
  - paragraph 3.58 (pollution-sensitive development)
  - DP.17, RD03.33 (public utilities)
  - DP.18 (renewable energy schemes)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 3.1	<p>Paragraph 3.3            ...maintaining and enhancing the character and quality of the environment. <u>The Plan also seeks to ensure that the District's strategic housing and employment requirements can be accommodated in urban extensions at MDAs West of Waterlooville and a 'reserve' MDA, Winchester City (North), in order to comply with the Structure Plan.</u></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.2.3, modified to clarify that Winchester City North is a 'reserve' MDA.</p>
MOD 3.2	<p><b>Policy DP.1</b>  <i>The Local Planning Authority will only permit development where planning applications are supported by a design statement. <u>Plans, sketches and other explanatory information should be included, as appropriate to the site and the scale of development, to set the proposal in its full context, indicating where important existing features are to be retained and enhanced where appropriate, justifying the removal of any such features and explaining how the site and its context have influenced the design of the proposal.</u> Particularly in the case of more sensitive sites, those exceeding 0.5 hectare in size, or development proposals which will have a significant impact on the local area, design statements should include a full site analysis identifying, as appropriate, the following:</i></p> <p><i>(i)...(vi)...</i></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.4.6 (a), in accordance with FPC03.A, and 3.4.6 (b).</p>

	<p><u>(vii) any areas known and/or designated for their nature conservation importance/ interest.</u></p> <p><del>Plans, sketches and other explanatory information should be included, as appropriate to the site and scale of development, to set the proposal in its full context, indicating where important existing features are to be retained and enhanced where appropriate, justifying the removal of any such features and explaining how the site analysis has influenced the design of the proposal.</del></p>	
MOD 3.3	<p>Paragraph 3.18</p> <p>All new development proposals, throughout the District, which involve the construction of new buildings or the replacement, adaptation, conversion or extension of existing buildings will be judged against <u>all</u> the following principles and criteria, <u>where relevant</u>.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13 (a).
MOD 3.4	<p><b>Policy DP.3</b></p> <p><del>... (i) makes efficient and effective use of land or buildings; taking account of the requirements of criterion (ii) below and, in the case of new residential development, achieves a net density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare and the potential for higher densities on sites close to town centres or public transport corridors. Where the site contains features that contribute to the character of the wider area (whether natural or man-made) it may be appropriate to exclude these from the developable area for the purposes of calculating net density.</del></p> <p><del>... (ii) in terms of design, scale and layout responds positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment; reflecting its distinctive development forms and patterns of building spaces, means of enclosure, townscape and landscape and incorporates in the design those features which are important to the history and form of the area;</del></p> <p><del>... (iii) keeps parking provision to a minimum taking into account the level of accessibility of the site by non-car modes, other parking available in the locality and whether</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13 (b), (c), (e), (f), (g), (i), (j) and (k).

	<p><del>or not on-street controls are available or proposed (see Proposal T.4);</del></p> <p><del>...(iv) provides for ease of movement and local 'permeability' by providing pedestrian and cycle links within the site which are safe and subject to natural surveillance and include additional links (or provision for future links) to surrounding footpaths, cycle routes, open spaces and sites (see also Proposal T.3);</del></p> <p><del>...(v) maximises access to public transport and in instances of new development likely to generate a large number of journeys, to provide a choice of travel mode, to reduce the need to travel by car (see Proposal T.3);</del></p> <p><del>...(vi) facilitates the development of adjacent sites (where the proposals of this Plan provide for this) or combined/coordinated schemes where appropriate, by providing for future access to be gained to them and promoting an appropriate layout;</del></p> <p><del>... (viii) in the case of residential development, provides adequate recreational space, in accordance with the provisions and method of operation of Proposal RT.3;</del></p> <p><del>...(ix) includes within residential development adequate private amenity space, appropriate to the size, design and residential function of the development and not unacceptably overlooked by neighbouring properties</del> <u>the development sufficient amenity and recreational space, appropriate to its size, design and function.</u></p>	
MOD 3.5	<p>Paragraph 3.19  New development should be appropriate to the site, achieve a high standard of design and efficient use of land and buildings, and should respond creatively to the character and distinctiveness of the surrounding area. <del>It should have safe vehicular and pedestrian access and appropriate levels of parking, in conformity with the Highway Authority's latest adopted standards. The design should be</del></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13 (e) and (f).</p>

	<del>compatible with the means of circulation on site, including servicing and emergency access, whilst encouraging movement on foot and by cycle. Recreational space for residential development should always meet the required minimum standard (see Proposal RT.3 and accompanying text).</del>	
MOD 3.6	New paragraph, following paragraph 3.19. <u>3.20 All new development should also reflect the area's distinctive development form and patterns of building, spaces, means of enclosure, townscape and landscape and incorporate in the design those features which are important to the history and form of the area. Account should be taken of local character, especially as identified within any adopted supplementary planning guidance (e.g. Village/Neighbourhood Design Statements) or technical studies (e.g. "Winchester City and its Setting").</u>	Inspector's recommendation 3.5.13 (c), and (d) in accordance with PIC03.01.
MOD 3.7	New paragraph, following new paragraph 3.20. <u>3.21 New development should have safe vehicular and pedestrian access and the minimum appropriate levels of parking, in conformity with the Highway Authority's latest adopted standards. Account should be taken of the level of accessibility of the site by non-car modes, other parking available in the locality and whether on-street controls are available or proposed (see Policy T.4). As part of the Plan's intention to promote maximum access to the public transport network, new development likely to generate a large number of journeys will be expected to provide a choice of travel mode, in order to reduce the need to travel by car (see Policy T.1).</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13 (e), (f), and (g), and (h) in accordance with FPC03.B.
MOD 3.8	New paragraph, following new paragraph 3.21. <u>3.22 The design of new development should be compatible with the means of circulation on site, including servicing and emergency access, whilst providing for ease of movement and local 'permeability'. Pedestrian and cycle links should be provided, within the site, which are safe and subject to natural surveillance and include additional links (or provision for future links) to surrounding footpaths, cycle</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13(f), amended to correct policy cross-references.

	<p><u>routes, open spaces and sites (see also Policies T.1 and T.3). Recreational space for residential development should always meet the required minimum standard (see Policy RT.3 and accompanying text).</u></p> <p>(Subsequent paragraphs to be re-numbered)</p>	
MOD 3.9	<p>Paragraph 3.20  <u>In instances where it would be appropriate to facilitate the development of adjacent sites (where the proposals of this Plan provide for this), or other combined/coordinated schemes, new development should, wherever possible and using a suitable design layout, provide for future access to be gained to them.</u> The amenities and operations of neighbouring properties and other lawful uses should be taken into account...</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.5.13 (i).
MOD 3.10	<p><del><b>Policy DP.4</b>  <b>In order to achieve development accessible to all members of the community, proposals will only be permitted if there is adequate access and appropriate facilities for people with disabilities and other special needs. Where there is an identified local need for mobility housing, the Local Planning Authority will seek to negotiate elements of housing, accessible to the disabled, on suitable sites.</b></del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.6.3
MOD 3.11	<p>New paragraph, following paragraph 3.24.  <u>In order to achieve development accessible to all members of the community, proposals will only be permitted if there is adequate access and appropriate facilities for people with disabilities and other special needs. Where there is an identified local need for mobility housing, the Local Planning Authority will seek to negotiate elements of housing, accessible to the disabled, on suitable sites.</u></p> <p>(Subsequent policies and paragraphs to be re-numbered).</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.6.3
MOD 3.12	<p><b>Policy DP.5</b>  <b>...(v) the landscape framework, including those key characteristics, <u>landscape and built form strategies listed at Appendix 2;</u></b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.7.7, in accordance with PIC03.04 and PIC03.05.



MOD 3.13	<p>Paragraph 3.26  ...or locally important features such as trees, walls, banks, <del>and</del> hedges <u>and views</u>. <u>Important features may be those identified as part of the Design Statement required by <del>Proposa</del> Policy DP.1, or they could be those identified in supplementary planning guidance (such as Village/Neighbourhood Design Statements) or other studies (such as “Winchester City and its Setting”).</u></p>	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 3.7.7, in accordance with PIC03.05.
MOD 3.14	<p><b>Policy DP.8</b>  .....  (ii) <del>opportunities for linking the development to renewable energy schemes (see also proposal DP.18)</del> <u>incorporating renewable energy production equipment, where appropriate, to provide a proportion of energy requirements from renewable sources;</u>  (iii) <u>measures to reduce water consumption and to safeguard the sources of water supply;</u>  (iv) <u>sustainable drainage systems (see also DP.10 and DP.11);</u>  .....  <del>(viii) measures to ensure that soil structure is not destroyed by compaction, thereby protecting natural surface water drainage, oxygen content and the potential of the ground to support plant life.</del></p>	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraphs 3.10.6 (b) and (c), but rejecting the specific wording proposed by the Inspector’s recommendation at paragraph 3.10.6(a).
MOD 3.15	<p>Paragraph 3.39  <del>Development which</del> <u>Policy DP.8 seeks to ensure that development would not be demonstrably wasteful in its use of energy or in its depletion of natural resources (e.g. groundwater supplies) will not be permitted.</u> <u>Development should not threaten groundwater supply or conflict with the Environment Agency’s “Groundwater Protection Policy”. It should also ensure that soil structure is not destroyed by compaction, thereby protecting natural surface water drainage, oxygen content and the potential of the ground to support wildlife. Conditions will be used where appropriate to ensure that topsoil is protected in-situ or stored for re-use following development.</u></p>	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraphs 3.10.6 (b) and (c).

MOD 3.16	<p>(New paragraph after 3.39)  <u>With regard to energy efficiency, Government advice provides for policies to be included in development plans that require a percentage of the energy used in residential, commercial or industrial developments to come from on-site renewable energy sources, where the installation of energy generation equipment is viable and avoids placing an undue burden on developers. Whilst it has not been possible to incorporate a detailed policy on integrated renewable energy into the Local Plan Review, the local planning authority will have regard to Government advice and best practice in implementing Policy DP.8(ii). For example, the Council notes that a number of local authorities include policies in their development plans which seek to ensure that, for large developments of more than 10 dwellings or 1000m<sup>2</sup>, 10% of energy requirements are supplied from on-site renewable energy sources. Such policies have been found to be consistent with Government advice.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraphs 3.10.6 (b) and (c).
MOD 3.17	<p><del><b>Policy DP.9  Planning permission for new development which accords with other relevant proposals of this Plan will be permitted, provided that it does not threaten the sustainability or purity of sources of water supply and, in particular, will not conflict with the Environment Agency's "Groundwater Protection Policy".</b></del></p> <p>(Subsequent policies to be re-numbered)</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.10.6 (d).
MOD 3.18	<p>New Paragraph RD03.15  Some south-western parts of the District are subject to the safeguarded areas surrounding Southampton Airport <u>and the National Air Traffic Service (NATS) has prepared additional safeguarding maps which also fall into the District. These are as shown on the Proposals and Inset Maps.</u> The whole of the District...</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.11.2, in accordance with PIC03.06.
MOD 3.19	<p>New paragraph RD03.17  ...The <del>Proposal</del> <u>Policy</u> below is included in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives</p>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.11.2, in accordance with PIC03.06, PIC03.07, PIC03.08 and FPC 03.E.

	Storage Areas) Direction 2002, but <del>is</del> <u>the safeguarded areas shown are</u> neither the responsibility nor the proposal of the Local Planning Authority.	
MOD 3.20	<p><b>Policy RD03.18</b>  <b>The Council will consult the operator of Southampton Airport on planning applications for certain types of development (summarised above) within the officially safeguarded areas established for the Airport (shown on the Proposals and Inset Maps). <u>Additionally, separate consultation will be required with NATS in the case of wind turbine proposals that fall within the safeguarded area approximately 10km around the site, as shown on Map 46a.</u> This may result in a refusal of planning permission, or in restrictions being placed on the proposed development, in the interests of securing the safe operation of the Airport.</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.11.2, in accordance with PIC03.07.
MOD 3.21	<p><b>Policy DP.10 (RD03.19)</b>  <u>Development in areas at risk of flooding should follow a sequential approach to site selection, locating development in the lowest available flood risk area, unless this would compromise other sustainability objectives, including the priority to be given to the use of land within defined built-up areas, or other policies of this Plan. Subject to this, <del>Planning permission for</del> development or change of use <del>which accord with other relevant proposals of this Plan</del> will be permitted, provided that:</u></p> <p>(i)...;  (ii)...;  (iii)...;</p> <p><del>(iv)</del> <b>In already developed floodplains at high risk of flooding (1 in 100 years or greater), <u>development will only be permitted if an adequate level of flood defence already exists and can be maintained, buildings are designed to resist flooding, there are suitable warning and evacuation procedures existing, and development does not add to flood risk up or down stream. Civil emergency infrastructure will not be permitted in these areas but, where</u></b></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 3.12.10 (a), in accordance with FPC03.C and FPC03.D.

	<p><i>it exists, provision for continued access at times of emergency should be made.</i></p> <p><i>In undeveloped or sparsely developed floodplains at high risk of flooding (1 in 100 years or greater), development will only be permitted exceptionally where there is an overriding need for the location proposed, such as for essential infrastructure.</i></p> <p><u><i>Development or change of use in functional floodplains will not be permitted other than for sport, recreation, amenity or conservation, or essential transport and utility infrastructure, in which case adequate warning and evacuation procedures should be in place. Such development should be designed to an appropriate standard of safety, to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere or inhibiting the essential maintenance of the river system (including flood defences).</i></u></p>	
MOD 3.22	<p><b><i>Policy DP.11</i></b></p> <p><del><i>Development or change of use in functional floodplains will not be permitted, other than for sport, recreation, amenity or conservation, or essential transport and utility infrastructure, in which case adequate warning and evacuation procedures should be in place. Such development should be designed to an appropriate standard of safety, to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere or inhibiting the essential maintenance of the river system (including flood defences), and should accord with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</i></del></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 3.12.10 (a), in accordance with FPC03.C and FPC03.D.
MOD 3.23	<p>Paragraph 3.44</p> <p>....The Local Planning Authority will encourage the provision of sustainable drainage and surface water disposal systems, where appropriate, <del>in all new development.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.12.10 (b).
MOD 3.24	<p>Paragraph 3.45</p> <p><u><i>In some new developments</i></u> it may be necessary to provide flood protection and mitigation measures....</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.12.10 (c).
MOD 3.25	<p>Paragraph 3.49</p> <p>...Prospective developers, <del>especially of</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation,

	<del>larger scale developments</del> , should therefore consult with the Local Planning and Highway Authorities at an early stage to ascertain the likely obligations.	paragraph 3.13.3.
MOD 3.26	Paragraph 3.58 ...it is important to consider the effects of accommodating new development adjacent to existing uses, which generate pollution, particularly noise <u>and smells</u> . Proposals for new development...	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.16.4.
MOD 3.27	Paragraph RD03.33 ...Account should be taken of public concern about the impact of such development, where it is a relevant planning consideration, and the <del>Federation of Electronics Industry's</del> <u>Mobile Operators Association's</u> 'Ten Commitments of Best Siting Practice' should be followed	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.18.7 (a), in accordance with PIC03.09.
MOD 3.28	<b>Policy DP.17</b> <del>...(iv) where possible where viable,</del> <b>all cables and pipelines are placed underground, having regard to any archaeological or ecological constraints.</b>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.18.7 (b).
MOD 3.29	<b>Policy DP.18</b> <del>... (iii) they accord with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant policies of this Plan.</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.19.3.
MOD 3.30	Paragraph 3.74. ....For this reason the Local Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that sufficient information is available to ensure that a proper analysis of a scheme can be undertaken. <u>Furthermore, the Authority will need to be satisfied that any proposals accord with Policy DP.3 and other relevant policies of this Plan...</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.19.3, and in accordance with the text of paragraph 3.19.2.



## Chapter 4: Countryside & Natural Environment

### Introduction

The Countryside and Natural Environment Chapter was subject to a number of objections, many of which related to omission site objections, where the objector was seeking the deletion of a countryside or local gap designation to allow the site to be developed. The Inspector has dealt with these site specific issues primarily in the Housing Chapter. Most of the remaining objections to Chapter 4 related to detailed policy wording or designations on the Proposals and Inset Maps.

In response to the objections made to the Chapter in the Revised Deposit Plan, the City Council proposed 8 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) relating to this Chapter. 10 Further Proposed Changes (FPCs) were also put forward to the Inspectors, either before the Inquiry started or as the Inquiry progressed.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. He has accepted all of the Council's Pre Inquiry Changes, and recommended changes in accordance with most of the Further Proposed Changes.

Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording or map changes, or specify what the recommended change is to cover, allowing the Council to devise appropriate wording. None of his recommendations have therefore required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### All policies

- Re-labelling as CE policies to reflect the Chapter title

#### Maps

- Amendments to the Proposals Map, Inset Maps and Key Sheet to provide greater clarity on the CE policies and where they apply. Inclusion of an Appendix Plan of the District depicting the SINCs.

#### Specific policies and text

- The deletion of policies C.1 (general development in the countryside) and C.17 (housing development in the countryside), and their replacement with text.
- Wording changes to the policies and text of:
  - C.5 (essential services)
  - C.6 (landscape)
  - C.8 (international nature conservation sites)
  - C.9 (national nature conservation sites)
  - C.10 (locally designated nature conservation sites)
  - C.12 (essential rural development)
  - C.16 (re-use of non-residential rural buildings)
  - RD04.36 – RD04.43 (existing established businesses)
  - C.20 (removal of occupancy conditions)

- C.22 (extension and replacement of dwellings)
  - C.23 (conversions and changes of use)
  - C.24 (conversion of larger buildings in extensive grounds)
  - C.25 (sites for gypsies and travelling showpeople).
- Updating of text to reflect the current position on the National Park designation

**NB. Details of proposed modifications to the Appendices, Glossary and the Proposals and Inset Maps, included in the Inspectors' recommendations for this Chapter, are set out in Section 15 following the Plan Chapters.**

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 4.1	<b>Policies C.1 – C.27</b> (Rename as CE policies throughout the Chapter)	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.1.11(a), in accordance with PIC04.00.
MOD 4.2	<del><b>Policy C.1</b></del> <del><b>Development will not be permitted in the countryside, unless it accords with Proposals C.5 – C.27 of this Plan.</b></del>  New paragraph following paragraph 4.3 <u>Development will not be permitted in the countryside unless it accords with Policies CE.5 – CE.27 of this Plan.</u>  (Subsequent policies to be re-numbered).	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.2.6
MOD 4.3	Paragraph 4.9 In exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to locate <u>or expand</u> some facilities or services in the countryside.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.6.5, in accordance with PIC04.02.
MOD 4.4	Paragraph 4.13 ..The District Landscape Character Assessment has identified 23 Landscape Character Areas, each of which has a recognisable local identity. <u>It is important to note that, whilst Landscape Character Area boundaries are necessarily defined on the map by a line, there is frequently a more gradual transition between these Areas. Where a Landscape Character Area flows over a settlement, there is obviously a localised change of character between the settlement and the adjacent countryside, which forms the landscape setting / context for it.</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.7.8 (c).
MOD 4.5	<b>Policy CE.6</b> <b>Development which fails to respect</b>	Inspector's recommendation,



	<p><b><i>the <b>intrinsic</b> character of the landscape or harms the key characteristics of the Landscape Character Area concerned (as set out in Appendix 2) will not be permitted.</i></b></p> <p><del><i>Development which is acceptable within the terms of this and other relevant proposals of this Plan should be consistent with the landscape and built form strategies (as set out in Appendix 2).</i></del></p>	<p>paragraph 4.7.8 (a), in accordance with PIC04.03, and 4.7.8 (b).</p> <p>(Part of the Inspector's recommendation 4.7.8(a) recommends a modification to Appendix 2. This is set out at the end of this document in the Appendices schedule).</p>
MOD 4.6	<p>Paragraph 4.16 (Update text to reflect the latest situation on the proposed South Downs National Park at the time of the adoption of the Local Plan)</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 4.1.11(e) and 4.9.2.</p>
MOD 4.7	<p>Paragraph 4.18 ...Proposals <del>CE.8</del> – <del>CE.10</del> set out how the Local Planning Authority will protect such areas. <u>Appendix 4 is a map showing all the sites of international, national and local importance, and this may be found loose in the folder of this Plan.</u> In view of the small scale of many of the areas within the District, <u>more detailed</u> information is published separately from this Plan. <del>A map showing the national and international designations and</del> <u>This includes</u> a schedule of locally designated sites, <u>which</u> can be inspected in <del>the Planning Department</del> <u>Development Services</u>. Developers should refer to these.....</p> <p>(see Appendices, Glossary and Maps schedule for details of the proposed map to be included as Appendix 4).</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.10.5.</p>
MOD 4.8	<p>Paragraph RD 04.17 Within the District, <del>20</del> <u>17</u> Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) have been designated <u>entirely or partly within the District</u>, and these are of key importance nationally.</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.11.4, in accordance with PIC04.04.</p>
MOD 4.9	<p>Paragraph 4.23 ...The locations and details of the sites <del>existing at October 2004</del> may be found in the County Council's schedule of important nature conservation areas within the District, <del>which was published with the first Deposit Plan published in (date of latest available version).</del> <u>Amendments to the date of publication of the Revised Deposit Plan are available with the document.</u> Further</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.12.5.</p>

	SINCs may be identified from time to time, and these will be incorporated in future revisions to the schedule.	
MOD 4.10	<p><b>Policy CE.10</b>  <i>...Where development is permitted that would result in harm to these <del>features</del> <u>habitats or species</u>, provision should be made to minimise <del>any such</del> harm or to replace <del>a habitat where it is to be lost</del> / <u>relocate them elsewhere in the locality.</u></i></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.13.4.
MOD 4.11	<p><b>Policy CE.12</b>  <i>Agricultural, horticultural or forestry development, for which a rural location is essential, will be permitted provided: <del>(i) no suitable alternative building or facility is available which could reasonably be used for the intended purpose;</del></i></p> <p><del>(ii) there is adequate provision for the disposal of toxic or otherwise unpleasant effluent (see also Proposals DP.13 – DP.15);</del></p> <p><del>(i) it is consistent with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan, and reflects the advice in 'Farm Buildings – A Design Guide for Hampshire', published by the Hampshire County and District Councils.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.15.5(a).
MOD 4.12	<p>Paragraph 4.30  ...and that the impact of new development is minimised. <u>Where an existing obsolete building is to be replaced, the removal of the existing building will be sought through a planning condition or legal agreement.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.15.5(b).
MOD 4.13	<p><b>Policy CE.16</b>  <i>..(iv) the scale and nature of the activity can be accommodated without detriment to the visual character of the locality, is not in a remote location, and will not harm the vitality of <del>an</del> existing <u>employment uses</u> or <u>the viability of proposed employment sites</u> in a nearby town or village;</i></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.19.8(b).
MOD 4.14	New paragraph following paragraph	

	<p>4.47</p> <p><u>Within larger complexes of rural buildings, it is unlikely that all of the complex will be suitable for re-use. If it is established that the complex is in a sustainable location for business use, proposals for re-use of any part of the complex should follow a comprehensive assessment of the whole complex, and should be able to demonstrate that the buildings proposed for re-use are the most suitable for employment use, and that the amount of business use proposed is sustainable. This should take account of such matters as levels of traffic generation, any buildings to be removed and the need for environmental improvements to the remainder of the site.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.19.8(a), in accordance with PIC04.05.
MOD 4.15	<p>New subtitle RD04.37</p> <p><del>Existing established—businesses</del> <u>lawful employment uses</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10(a), in accordance with FPC04.A.
MOD 4.16	<p>New paragraph RD04.38</p> <p>Although businesses should generally rely on buildings within the settlements or the reuse of rural buildings, the Local Planning Authority recognises that a number of <del>established—businesses</del> <u>lawful employment uses</u> exist outside the settlements.....</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10(a), in accordance with FPC04.B.
MOD 4.17	<p>New paragraph RD04.39</p> <p>The reasonable expansion of <del>firms</del> <u>established lawful employment uses</u> in the countryside will be considered where it is needed to support the efficient operation of the business, cannot be <u>satisfactorily</u> located in a nearby settlement, and can be accommodated without harm to the surrounding countryside and adjacent uses.</p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 4.20.10(a) and (b), in accordance with FPC04.C.
MOD 4.18	<p>New paragraph RD04.40</p> <p>Redevelopment of B1, B2 and B8 business uses will be considered where the current buildings have outworn their useful life, <u>and/or</u> significant environmental benefits would be achieved by replacing the existing buildings....</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10(d).
MOD 4.19	<p>New paragraph RD04.41</p> <p><del>Not all established firms are, however, appropriately located, and some may</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10(e).

	<p><del>cause harm to adjoining occupiers or the local environment if an employment use continued on the site. The replacement or expansion of such businesses will not be permitted.</del></p>	
MOD 4.20	<p>New paragraph RD04.42  <del>In addition to established firms, some businesses currently operating in converted rural buildings may not be appropriately located for continued business use. Where buildings reach the end of their useful life, the local planning authority will assess whether the site's location is suitable for continued business use. Suitable sites should be close to settlements (defined in Proposals H.2 and H.3) and the main transport network, including public transport routes. Replacement buildings will only be permitted where the site is in a suitable and sustainable location. The length of time the building had been operating as a business use since the initial conversion will also be taken into account.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10(f).
MOD 4.21	<p><b>Policy RD04.43</b>  <b><i>Within existing <u>lawful</u> employment sites in the countryside (Use classes B1, B2 and B8), the extension or replacement of existing buildings will be permitted where:.....</i></b></p> <p><b><i>..(ii) there will be no <u>material increase in employment or traffic levels as a result of any increase in</u> floorspace or built development <b>resulting in increased employment or traffic levels;</b></i></b></p> <p><b><i>(iii) the scale and design of the proposed buildings and the site achieves substantial environmental benefits that reflect local distinctiveness and the character of the countryside, <b>in accordance with Proposals DP.3, C.6 and C.7.</b></i></b></p> <p><b><i>..Proposals for redevelopment of business uses will be required to demonstrate that:</i></b></p> <p><b><i><del>(i)</del> <u>(a)</u> the buildings have outworn their useful life; <b>and</b></i></b></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 4.20.10(g) and (h), and (i) in accordance with the second part of PIC 04.06.

	<del>(ii)</del> <b>(b) the proposed buildings achieve a more efficient use of the site.</b>	
MOD 4.22	<p><del><b>Policy C.17</b></del>  <del><b>Housing development will not be permitted in the countryside except in the special circumstances detailed in Proposal H.6, and Proposals C.18 – C.26.</b></del></p> <p>New paragraph following paragraph 4.50.  Housing development will not be permitted in the countryside except in the special circumstances detailed in Policy H.6, and Policies CE.18 – CE.26.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.21.5.
MOD 4.23	<p>Paragraph 4.62  <del>A "Whole Farm Plan" in support of the application should indicate</del> <u>Where the dwelling forms part of a larger holding, the application should include details of current and planned investment in the holding, the current and proposed nature of the enterprise, a financial forecast, and the need for accommodation in relation to the criteria of Proposal CE.19. One way of demonstrating this information would be by the submission of a "Whole Farm Plan" to justify why the dwelling is no longer needed to support the holding, or other holdings in the locality.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.23.2.
MOD 4.24	<p>Paragraph 4.66  <u>There is a need for a mix of dwelling sizes and types in the countryside, to retain variety in the housing stock. There is currently an oversupply of large detached dwellings in the countryside, and the Local Authority will therefore seek to retain and restrict increases in the size of existing dwellings of less than 120m<sup>2</sup> floor area. This would apply to all proposals for replacements or extensions, which will normally be limited to no more than 25% of the existing, whatever the number of bedrooms. The Local Authority will, however, be particularly concerned to retain</u> <del>The replacement or extension of existing dwellings will be restricted to maintain the supply of dwelling sizes and types in the countryside. This will ensure that some small dwellings, particularly those the</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.24.7(a), in accordance with PIC04.07.

	<p><u>smaller more affordable dwellings</u> of 1 or 2 bedrooms, that are in short supply throughout the District, <del>are retained</del> to meet local needs. Any acceptable extension or replacement should reflect the character and design of the original dwelling, and should not result in a dwelling that is disproportionately larger than the one it is extending or replacing.</p>	
MOD 4.25	<p><b>Policy CE.22</b>  <del>..(iii) the proposal accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></p> <p><del>...In considering planning applications to extend or replace existing agricultural workers' dwellings, or to develop additional ancillary buildings within their curtilages, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to the relationship between the size and nature of the proposed extension and/or building and the ability of the holding to support the proposed development, in addition to the criteria set out above.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.24.7(b).
MOD 4.26	<p>Paragraph 4.68  <del>If an existing dwelling is unoccupied but can be re-used or rehabilitated without the need for major works requiring planning permission, it may be considered appropriate for replacement / extension, depending on the particular merits of the case.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.24.7(c).
MOD 4.27	<p>Paragraph 4.70  <del>There is a need for a mix of dwelling sizes and types in the countryside, to retain variety in the rural housing stock. The Local Authority will seek to retain this variety by limiting the proportion and nature of any extension to existing dwellings. The replacement or extension of existing dwellings with a floor area of up to 120m<sup>2</sup> floor area should not exceed 25% of that existing. Replacements/extensions of existing dwellings over 120m<sup>2</sup> should reflect the proportions and design of the existing dwelling.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.24.7(a), in accordance with PIC04.08.
MOD 4.28	<p>Paragraph RD04.46  Conversion to residential use will only be accepted where the building is of <del>a high quality and worthy of retention</del> <u>a</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.25.6(a), in accordance with FPC04.H.

	<p><u>design and construction that is suitable for conversion without</u> <del>Where residential use needs to be considered, the building should not require</del> substantial alteration, rebuilding or extension to achieve the use. <del>and if</del> a residential curtilage is created,....</p>	
MOD 4.29	<p><b>Policy CE.23</b>  <i>..(i) <del>the building is of a high quality and a design and construction that is suitable for conversion without substantial works; and...</del></i>   <i>(ii) <del>it can be demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to secure a suitable long-term business re-use for economic development purposes have been unsuccessful of the premises in accordance with Proposal C.16; or...</del></i></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.25.6(a), in accordance with FPC04.I, and 4.25.6(b).
MOD 4.30	<p><b>Policy CE.24</b>  <i>..(ii) <del>it conforms with Proposal DP.3, HE.17, and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></i>  ...  ...</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.26.4.
MOD 4.31	<p>Paragraph 4.76 / RD04.48  ..The Hampshire County Structure Plan Review requires local plans either to identify locations for sites or set out criteria-based policies for determining planning applications. <u>In accordance with the sustainability principles of this Plan, sites will be expected to use previously developed land wherever possible.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.27.4(b).
MOD 4.34	<p><b>Policy CE.26</b>  <i>..(ii) <del>the site currently (or until recently) accommodates buildings or non-agricultural commercial uses and the proposed use would maintain or enhance its appearance;</del></i>   (renumber remaining criteria)</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.27.4(a).





## Chapter 5: Historic Environment

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 5: Historic Environment related to a number of sections of the Chapter, and the City Council proposed one Pre Inquiry Change (PIC) in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector’s recommendations. Most of the Inspector’s recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector’s recommendations

Wording changes to:

- Paragraph 5.8 (Archaeology)
- Paragraph 5.11 (Historic Parks, Gardens and Battlefields)
- Paragraph 5.16 (Development in Conservation Areas)
- Proposal HE.12 and paragraph 5.37 (Blinds and Shutters)
- Paragraph 5.41 (Historic Buildings – Changes of Use)
- Proposal HE.17 and supporting paragraphs (Re-use and Conversion of Rural and Industrial Buildings)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 5.1	Paragraph 5.8, first sentence The requirement to preserve in situ the most important archaeological sites and their settings, <u>in particular those recognised nationally,</u> should be reflected in the design of development proposals.	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 5.2.7.
MOD 5.2	Paragraph 5.11, final sentence Developers will be responsible for ensuring that development proposals do not adversely affect the character of an historic park or garden or battlefield identified on these registers, either directly, <del>—or by intrusion into wider views,</del> <u>or indirectly by an impact on its setting,</u> disturbance by noise or water pollution’.	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 5.3.2.
MOD 5.3	Paragraph 5.16 The Council has produced a number of Conservation Area Technical Assessments, along with a Conservation Strategy for Winchester Conservation Area. The Winchester Conservation Area Project has resulted	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 5.4.15, in accordance with PIC05.01.

	in an environmental capital matrix to assist in the assessment of development proposals within the Winchester Conservation Area ( <del>see Chapter 11: Winchester</del> ) and contains <u>Supplementary Planning Guidance in the final Strategy Section.....</u>	
MOD 5.4	<b>Proposal HE.12, second paragraph</b> <del>...Proposals will be expected to accord with Winchester City Council's "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" (1998).</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.6.2.
MOD 5.5	Paragraph 5.37, final sentence Shopfront design can help improve security by the use of smaller glazed units, strengthened mullions and stallrisers. <u>Proposals will be expected to accord with Winchester City Council's "Design Guidance for the Control of Shopfronts and Signs" (1998).</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.6.2.
MOD 5.6	Paragraph 5.41, first sentence <u>Unless necessary as ancillary for the efficient and viable use of the ground floor,</u> the use of upper floors solely for shop storage purposes will not be permitted where the existing building is capable of use as residential or commercial accommodation without detriment to its architectural or historic character.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.7.4.
MOD 5.7	<b>Proposal HE.17</b> <b>The change of use of redundant agricultural and other rural or industrial buildings of historic or architectural interest <del>to employment or storage uses</del> will be permitted provided that:</b>  ..... <b>(iv) <del>the</del> development satisfies Proposals DP.3, C.16 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</b>  <b><del>Residential conversions will not be permitted unless this is the only means of ensuring the retention of the building and its character. A sequential approach will be required, including evidence that other acceptable uses have been fully considered and why they are not viable.</del></b>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.8.5(i) and (ii).

MOD 5.8	<p>Paragraph 5.54, third sentence          ..Where these buildings have become redundant, and cannot be used for suitable ancillary uses, <u>uses such as storage, <del>or</del> employment <del>uses</del>, or community uses</u> generally require less alteration to the fabric of these buildings than residential conversion and are, therefore, preferred.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.8.5(iii).
MOD 5.9	<p>Paragraph 5.61, transfer last sentence to a new paragraph below  <u>Residential conversions will therefore not be permitted unless this is the only means of ensuring the retention of the building and its character.</u> Conversion to residential use will always be seen as a last resort, and alternatives such as employment and community uses must be evaluated <u>in the first instance</u> and applicants will be required to show why non-residential uses are not viable.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.8.5(ii).
MOD 5.10	<p>New paragraph following paragraph 5.64  <u>Proposals for the change of use of buildings of architectural or historic interest will also be subject to the requirements of Policy C.16.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 5.8.5(ii).



## Chapter 6: Housing

### Introduction

The Housing Chapter was subject to the largest number of objections, with a large number of objections relating, in particular, to the level of housing proposed and the Plan's strategy for providing it, housing 'omission' sites, and affordable housing.

In response to the objections made to the Chapter in the Revised Deposit Plan, the City Council proposed 15 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) relating to this Chapter. An additional 9 Further Proposed Changes were put forward either immediately before or during the Inquiry, primarily relating to affordable housing.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations.

Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording, or specify what the recommended change is to cover, allowing the Council to devise appropriate wording. Two of the most significant changes relate to the Inspectors' proposed 'Local Reserve Sites' and the replacement of Proposal H.3. In both cases the Inspectors recommended the production of Supplementary Planning Guidance in addition to revised policies. The Council has commissioned consultants to advise on the new policies and accompanying Supplementary Planning Documents (which replace Supplementary Planning Guidance under the new planning system). **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with most of the Inspectors' recommendations. It proposes to reject, or not fully accept, the Inspectors' recommendations in relation to:**

- the wording of Policy H.5 – MOD 6.39;
- the inclusion of all of PIC06.13 – MOD 6.50;

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

The Inspectors have included a Chapter overview at the start of this Chapter in their Report, to outline the factors they had in mind in making recommendations on the text and policies.

#### All policies

- The deletion of cross-references to other Plan policies, where these have been shown in the body of policies contained in the Revised Deposit Plan.

#### Tables

- Include table for Local Reserve housing sites (estimated capacity)
- Update Table 1

#### Maps

- Identification of Local Reserve allocations at:
  - Pitt Manor, Winchester
  - Worthy Road/Francis Gardens, Winchester
  - Little Frenchies Field, Denmead
  - Spring Gardens, New Alresford

- Deletion of RT.1 and/or RT.2 designations at:
  - former railway cutting between New Farm Road and Bridge Road, New Alresford
  - omission site at Bereweke Way, Winchester
- Changes to the RT.4 allocations at:
  - New Alresford
- Changes to the defined policy boundaries of:
  - Colden Common
  - Corhampton
  - Droxford
  - Kings Worthy
  - New Alresford
  - Sparsholt
  - Swanmore
  - Twyford

### **Specific policies and text**

- New or replaced policies and text
  - New policy and text for Local Reserve housing sites (Policy H.1 and provision for housing development)
  - Replacement of Policies H.3 and H.4 (development in built-up areas) and paragraphs 6.29 – 6.33 with a new Policy H.3 and new paragraphs 6.29 and 6.30
  - New paragraph after re-positioned paragraph 6.47 (following paragraph 6.43) on affordable housing (see below)
  - Replacement of paragraph 6.45 with revised text (addressing the need at Winchester City [North])
  - Replacement of Policy H.5 with revised wording (provision of affordable housing on market housing sites)
  - New paragraph following paragraph 6.62 (settlements where exception schemes may be considered)
- Wording changes to the policies and text of:
  - Paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 (strategic requirements)
  - Paragraph 6.7 (housing strategy)
  - Policy H.1 (housing provision)
  - Policy H.2 (development in the built-up areas)
  - Paragraph 6.35 (definition of affordable housing)
  - Paragraph 6.36 (background to affordable housing)
  - Paragraph 6.37 (background to affordable housing)
  - Paragraph 6.38 (affordable housing need)
  - Paragraph 6.39 (affordable housing need)
  - Paragraph 6.41 (affordable housing need)
  - Paragraph 6.42 (addressing the need)
  - Paragraph 6.44 (addressing the need at West of Waterlooville)
  - Paragraph 6.55 (on- and off-site provision of affordable housing)
  - Paragraph 6.56 (mechanisms for securing affordable housing)
  - Policy H.6 (rural exception schemes)
  - Paragraph 6.59 (availability of housing in rural exception schemes)
  - Paragraph 6.60 / RD06.22 (location of exception sites)
  - Paragraph RD06.23 (maximum size of small dwellings and planning conditions)
  - Policy H.7 (housing mix and density)

- Deletion of:
  - Paragraph 6.24 (release of housing land at Whiteley)
- Repositioning of
  - Paragraph 6.47 (re-positioning it after paragraph 6.43) (previous proportions and thresholds for affordable housing)
  - Relevant wording in paragraphs 6.51 – 6.54 (proportions and thresholds for affordable housing)

**NB. Details of proposed modifications to the Appendices, Glossary and the Proposals and Inset Maps, included in the Inspectors’ recommendations for this Chapter, are set out in Chapter 15 following the Plan Chapters.**

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 6.1	Paragraph 6.3 (Update figures with latest information available when the Plan is adopted).	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.2.5
MOD 6.2	Paragraph 6.4 (Update figures with latest information available when the Plan is adopted).	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.2.5
MOD 6.3	<p>Paragraph 6.7</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provision for residential development or redevelopment, which achieves at least the minimum net residential densities of 30-50 dwellings per hectare recommended by Government (Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing) and which provides for greater housing choice and environmental enhancement on sites within the defined policy boundaries <del>or development frontages of specified settlements;</del></li> </ul> <p>....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• resisting development beyond the defined boundaries of the built-up areas, other than in the cases of the implementation of Local Reserve sites for urban extensions allocated in the Plan, the development of sites in accordance with the criteria of Policy H.3, and <del>ef</del> approved housing “exceptions” schemes to meet proven rural housing needs; .....</li> </ul>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.4.7

MOD 6.4	Heading before paragraph 6.5 <b>Strategic “Reserve” Provision</b>	Clarification and consequential changes to reflect Inspectors’ recommendation, paragraph 6.5.20
MOD 6.5	Paragraph 6.6 If the regional housing requirement and the results of monitoring the supply of dwellings coming forward during the Structure Plan Review period ( <u>by the Strategic Planning Authorities</u> ) reveal a shortfall in provision, one or more of the <u>strategic</u> reserve sites may have to be released. <del>The implications of this for the Local Plan will depend on the stage in the adoption process that has been reached, if and when a decision to release the reserve provision is made.</del> The Local Plan identifies the location of the <u>strategic</u> reserve provision and sets out requirements relating to it, including the need for the production of masterplans, in Proposals NC.2 and NC.3.	Clarification, updating and consequential changes to reflect Inspectors’ recommendation, paragraph 6.5.20
MOD 6.6	<b>Policy H.1</b> (Update figures with latest information available when the Plan is adopted).	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 6.6.9
MOD 6.7	<b>Table 1</b> (Update figures with latest information available when the Plan is adopted).	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 6.6.9
MOD 6.8	Paragraph 6.19 ...In some circumstances it will be appropriate to produce a <del>Neighbourhood Plan</del> <u>community plan</u> . Such a plan could....  (See Chapter 14, MOD 14.2 for Proposed Modification, amplifying the role of community plans).	Consequence of Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 6.8.3.
MOD 6.9	<b>Table 2</b> (Update figures with latest information available when the Plan is adopted).	Consequential to Inspector’s recommendations, paragraphs 12.1.11, 13.10.2, and 11.5.8, and to reflect completed allocations.
MOD 6.10	Paragraph 6.24 <del>The current Local Plan’s only allocated ‘greenfield’ site which does not yet have planning permission is situated at Area 2, Whiteley (WDLP 1998, Proposal NC.4).</del>	Inspector’s recommendation, paragraphs 6.55.11 and consequential to



	<del>In accordance with the sequential approach, this site will be held back unless monitoring of the housing supply indicates that it needs to be brought forward, in which case its development will be permitted in preference to the release of the Structure Plan's "reserve" provision at West of Waterlooville or Winchester City (North).</del>	recommendation 13.17.7(d).															
MOD 6.11	<p>Following paragraph 6.24 (Additional policy and text, to be drafted, identifying the following Local Reserve Sites and setting out how they will be released).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SITE</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Est. Capacity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pitt Manor</td> <td>Winchester</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Worthy Rd / Francis Gardens</td> <td>Winchester</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Little Frenchies Field</td> <td>Denmead</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring Gardens</td> <td>New Alresford</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>See Maps in Chapter 15: Appendices, Glossary and Maps</p>	SITE	Location	Est. Capacity	Pitt Manor	Winchester	200	Worthy Rd / Francis Gardens	Winchester	80	Little Frenchies Field	Denmead	70	Spring Gardens	New Alresford	35	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.5.20.
SITE	Location	Est. Capacity															
Pitt Manor	Winchester	200															
Worthy Rd / Francis Gardens	Winchester	80															
Little Frenchies Field	Denmead	70															
Spring Gardens	New Alresford	35															
MOD 6.12	<p><b>Policy H.2</b> <del>..provided that development proposals accord with Proposals DP.3, DP.10, DP.11 and other relevant proposals of the Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11(a).															
MOD 6.13	<p><b>Policy H.3</b> <del>Residential — development — or redevelopment will be permitted within the defined development frontages of:</del></p> <p><del>Abbots Worthy — North Boarhunt Compton Street — Owslebury Curdrige — Shawford — Durley — Shedfield — Durley Street — Shirrell Heath Itchen Abbas (part) — Soberton Lower Upham — Soberton Heath Meonstoke — Stoke Charity Newtown — Upham</del></p> <p><del>provided that development proposals accord with Proposals DP.3, DP.10, DP.11 and other relevant proposals of this Plan and:</del></p> <p><del>(i) respect and respond positively to the particular character of the locality, whilst making efficient</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11(b)															

	<p><del>use of the site;</del></p> <p><del>(ii) avoid the development of plots in depth, in such a manner as to create backland or tandem development, or place existing properties in a backland position;</del></p> <p><del>(iii) provide for vehicles to turn and park within the site and combine access points wherever possible, to avoid the proliferation of accesses.</del></p> <p><del>Proposals for terraced or other dwellings, especially those suitable for smaller households, will be encouraged where they reflect the character of the area or would enhance the street scene.</del></p> <p><u>Outside the built-up areas of settlements listed in Policy H.2, schemes for limited infill residential development will only be permitted where the proposal accords with other relevant policies of the Plan and satisfies all of the following criteria:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>the site is well related to an existing village or settlement in that at least one side would adjoin an existing residential boundary;</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>the principle of development on the site and the scale and form of the proposal would not harm the rural character and appearance of the area and that of the existing village or settlement to which it relates;</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>the development would be consistent with the Council's objectives for the promotion of a sustainable pattern of development of the area.</u></p>	
MOD 6.14	<p>Paragraph 6.29</p> <p><del>The settlements listed in Proposal H.3 consist mainly of development which follows the frontages of existing roads. Although these frequently have a semi rural setting, such settlements have an identity and integrity that clearly incorporates built-up area characteristics. In defining development frontages, the Local Planning Authority has taken</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11(b).</p>

	<p><del>account of the existing form of each settlement and opportunities for consolidation, without materially harming intrinsic local character. The 'urban capacity' opportunities identified in these settlements were subject to the same assessment criteria used for Winchester and other built-up area settlements referred to under Proposal H.2 and, therefore, fully respect existing gaps or open spaces which are an important feature of these settlements and their identity.</del></p> <p><u>Outside the defined policy boundaries of the settlements listed in Proposal H.2, development will need to be strictly controlled to protect the countryside and to prevent intrusive development which fails to conform to the overall housing strategy described above. The policy boundaries define the areas within which development is acceptable in principle, even though these may not correspond to property boundaries or the fullest extent of a settlement as local people understand it. To permit development beyond the specified boundaries of the built-up settlements would normally release land for development which would not be acceptable according to the 'brownfield first, greenfield last' principles of the sequential approach. Areas of land that should remain undeveloped, for example because of the existence of important open areas or the significance of such areas to the setting of the settlement, are excluded from the defined policy boundaries. These areas are treated as countryside in policy terms as are villages, hamlets and areas of scattered development.</u></p>	
MOD 6.15	<p><del>Paragraph 6.30 The frontages defined are intended to indicate the acceptable extent of development for that settlement. In accordance with the Plan Review's aim to make the most efficient and effective use of land resources, development within the defined frontages should aim to conform to the target range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare, required by Government policy.</del></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this strict control of residential development in the countryside, development will be permitted on 'Local Reserve' sites as extensions to Proposal H.2 settlements if</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11(b).

	<p><u>considered necessary to meet the housing provision required under Proposal H.1. Other housing development that relates to existing development in the countryside or that has a need to be there is described in Proposals C.18 - C.26 in Chapter 4. However Proposal H.3 also recognises that there may be some scope for limited infilling in the villages and settlements in the designated countryside outside the settlement policy boundaries of Proposal H.2. The criteria listed in Proposal H.3 will ensure that any proposal is consistent with Government guidance in PPS7: 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' in that it meets local needs but does not harm the character of the countryside or result in the formation or consolidation of unsustainable patterns of development. The Council will prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance to assist in the interpretation of the policy.</u></p> <p>(Add explanatory text explaining the criteria for infilling outside H.2 settlements – detail subject to further work).</p>	
MOD 6.16	<p><b>Paragraph 6.31</b>  <del>As with all new development in other parts of the District, a positive and creative design-led approach is required (see the Proposals contained in Chapter 3). Development should be sensitive to the townscape and/or landscape setting of each location. A design-led strategy puts emphasis on respecting established local character and is not intended to suggest that development "in depth" is being promoted or that important trees or other features can be lost. Nevertheless, in order to develop sustainable site opportunities in a creative way which responds to traditional patterns and layouts of development, it may be possible to achieve imaginative designs involving more than a strictly "single-house" depth, from the road frontage. Such schemes may, for example, be appropriate where terraced or other grouped or linked dwellings are concerned, particularly, those suitable for smaller households.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11(b).
MOD 6.17	<p><b>Paragraph 6.32</b>  <del>Outside defined policy boundaries and development frontages development will need to be strictly controlled, to protect the countryside of the area and to</del></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 6.10.11(b) and 6.11.3.

	<p><del>prevent intrusive development which fails to conform to the overall housing strategy described above. The policy boundaries and development frontages define the areas within which development is acceptable in principle, even though these may not correspond to property boundaries or the fullest extent of a settlement as local people understand it. To permit development beyond the specified boundaries of the built-up settlements would release land for development which would not be acceptable according to the "brownfield first, greenfield last" principles of the sequential approach.</del></p>	
MOD 6.18	<p>Paragraph 6.33  <del>Areas of land that should remain undeveloped, for example, because of the existence of important open areas or the importance of such areas to the setting of the settlement, are excluded from the defined policy boundaries and frontages. These areas are treated as countryside in policy terms, as are some smaller villages, hamlets and areas of scattered development. These settlements not listed in Proposals H.2 and H.3 are considered unsuitable for further development, without harm to their character or the appearance of the countryside, because they are too small, loosely developed and/or remote from facilities and services.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 6.10.11(b) and 6.11.3.
MOD 6.19	<p><b><del>Proposal H.4</del></b>  <del><b>Residential development, redevelopment or changes of use outside the defined policy boundaries and development frontages set out in Proposals H.2 and H.3 will not be permitted unless the proposal complies with Proposals C.17 - C.26.</b></del></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 6.10.11(b) and 6.11.3.
MOD 6.20	<p>Paragraph 6.35  This Plan defines "affordable housing" as "housing provided, with subsidy, for <del>local</del> people who are unable to resolve their housing <del>needs</del> <u>requirements</u> in the <del>private sector</del> <u>local housing sector</u> market because of the relationship between housing costs and incomes". <u>This definition is based on that provided by the Winchester Housing Needs Survey 2002.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.12.7(a), in accordance with PIC06.01 with additional clarification.
MOD 6.21	<p>Paragraph 6.36  ... In addition <u>to subsidised housing, the Plan promotes the provision of smaller open market homes, to address an</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.12.7(b).

	<p><u>identified imbalance in the housing stock and to bring home ownership within financial reach of more households</u> <del>there is a need for additional small dwellings for sale at market prices in the District, which may be more affordable to those on modest incomes.</del></p>	
MOD 6.22	<p>Paragraph 6.37 (Update to refer to relevant Government advice which is current at the time of adoption of the Local Plan).</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.12.7(c).
MOD 6.23	<p>Paragraph 6.38 The need for affordable housing in the District has been assessed in the Winchester Housing Needs Survey, carried out by consultants on behalf of the Local Authority in <del>1999</del> <u>2002</u>. This Survey examined the level of housing need in the District during the period <del>1999—2004, with a projected need to 2006, the mid-point in the period covered by this Local Plan up to 2011.</del> It examined incomes, house prices and other local data to assess the ability of households to access accommodation. The Local Authority will ensure that this housing needs information is kept up to date, <del>and therefore a Survey update will be undertaken to cover the latter part of the Plan period.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.13.8(a), in accordance with PIC06.03.
MOD 6.24	<p>Paragraph 6.39 The Survey took account of existing and concealed households in need, and made an allowance for re-lets of the existing affordable stock. It identified a <u>net annual outstanding need for 779</u> <del>1220</del> new subsidised affordable homes by <del>2004, which would be likely to increase to 1310 by 2006, which, projected over the period of the Survey to 2011, would result in a total of 7,011 units.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.13.8(b), in accordance with PIC06.04.
MOD 6.25	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 6.41 <b><u>Addressing the need</u></b> (moved forward from its position in front of paragraph 6.42)</p> <p>The <del>1999</del> <u>2002</u> Winchester Housing Needs Survey recognises the problem of meeting the high level of need found, <del>and recommends a target of 90 subsidised homes per year. This would amount to 450 new subsidised homes for the Survey period to 2004. If the annual figure were applied to the whole Plan period (2001 - 2011), this would amount</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.13.8(c), in accordance with PIC06.05 (modified as suggested), and the suggestion in paragraph 6.13.7 regarding the section to which this paragraph relates.

	<p><del>to a target of 900 new subsidised homes, although this figure may be subject to revision when the Survey is updated to cover the latter part of the Plan period. This represents the number of affordable homes that would be needed to prevent an increase in households in housing need. This figure should therefore be a minimum target to be achieved as it falls short of the amount of housing that would be required to address the need for subsidised housing fully in the District.</del></p> <p><u>and the substantially increased level of need since the last Survey was carried out in 1999. It therefore recommends that that the maximum achievable target level of affordable housing is sought from new developments. To achieve this, it recommends that a higher proportion of affordable homes should be sought within the District than is currently the case, increasing the proportion sought on suitable sites up to 40%.</u></p>	
MOD 6.26	<p>Paragraph 6.42</p> <p><del>Addressing the need</del></p> <p>There are two main ways that affordable housing needs can be addressed through the planning system:</p> <p>(i) by seeking a proportion of subsidised affordable housing as part of market housing sites <del>developed in the settlements</del>; and</p> <p>(ii) by permitting small-scale affordable housing schemes <u>in sustainable locations outside defined settlement boundaries (rural exception sites)</u>, <del>on sites outside the District's defined and other settlements where they are well related to the settlements concerned.</del></p> <p>(See Chapter 15: Appendices, Glossary And Maps for a definition of "rural exception sites")</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(a), and the suggestion in paragraph 6.13.7 that the subheading above this paragraph should be located before paragraph 6.41 (see MOD 6.25).</p>
MOD 6.27	<p>Paragraph 6.43</p> <p>The Government advocates that most affordable housing should be provided on sites within the larger settlements, which <del>Circular 6/98</del> <u>are defined</u> as those over 3000 population. Currently these include Winchester, Bishop's Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, New Alresford and Whiteley. <u>The populations of all the settlements are reviewed annually, and therefore may from time to time move between the categories. Developers should therefore check with the Planning Department to ascertain the</u></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation paragraph 6.14.20(f), updating, and the transfer of text from paragraph RD06.17</p>

	<p><u>precise category of each settlement.</u> There is, however, also a need for affordable housing in the smaller towns and villages.</p>	
MOD 6.28	<p>Reposition paragraph 6.47, to follow paragraph 6.43 The Local Planning Authority has been seeking a proportion of 30% subsidised affordable homes on sites of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.5 hectares or more) in the larger settlements, and on sites of 5 or more dwellings elsewhere in the District. If the Local Authority continued to seek this proportion, on sites above these sizes, it is estimated that <del>fewer than</del> <u>only about</u> 200 affordable homes could be achieved <del>throughout in the remainder of the entire</del> Plan period, <del>well below the target of 900</del> <u>a very small proportion of the identified need for 7,011 units.</u> A number of changes are therefore proposed in this Plan to enable more affordable homes to be provided where they are needed.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(b), and updating of text (in accordance with PIC06.08).
MOD 6.29	<p>New paragraph following re-positioned paragraph <u>The Council has had regard to the recommendation in the 2002 Housing Needs Study that they should seek up to 40% affordable housing provision on all suitable sites coming forward for planning permission during the Plan period. They have also taken account of the findings of the 2004 study on the deliverability and impact of the affordable housing proposals they were contemplating in the Draft Deposit Plan, in order to ensure there is no negative impact on housing site viability. In light of these it is therefore considered that there should be an increase in the provision of affordable housing from the 30% figure sought hitherto on some sites to an overall target provision of 35% of housing in the District as affordable housing. The proportions of affordable housing sought and the minimum sizes of sites on which it should be provided take account of the need to maximise the provision of affordable housing in the various parts of the District, and the economics of its provision within different types of settlement.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(c), incorporating FPC06.03 as suggested.
MOD 6.30	<p>Second new paragraph following re-positioned paragraph <u>This is a modest increase in the proportion formerly sought and the</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f), and



	<p><u>additional requirement should provide for a range of types of affordable housing, including housing for key workers on suitable sites. Generally, larger housing sites will be more suitable for mixed tenure affordable housing (for rent and shared equity) but the City Council's Housing Strategy and Development Manager will advise on the types of property needed on each site. The greatest need in the District is for affordable rented housing.</u></p>	transfer of text (updated) from paragraph 6.53.
MOD 6.31	<p>Paragraph 6.44 Some affordable homes will also be provided in the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA) to meet the District's needs. A Housing Need Survey centred upon the Waterlooville MDA area, undertaken in 2002 on behalf of Winchester City Council and the neighbouring authorities of Havant Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council and Portsmouth City Council, concludes that a 50% proportion of affordable housing would be justified in the MDA. The Local Planning Authority <del>will therefore seek a 50%</del> <u>recognises the need for the MDA to fulfil its important role in the provision of affordable housing and therefore the proportion sought will need to ensure that a viable development is achieved. A proportion of up to 40% subsidised affordable homes will be sought within the MDA, including within the reserve area, should it be required.</u> <del>This area will, however, meet a wider sub-regional need, and therefore it will contribute to the affordable housing needs of a number of adjacent Local Authorities in addition to this District. It is unlikely to make a significant contribution to meeting the District target, and not until the latter part of the Plan period. A joint housing register for the MDA is likely to be the preferred means of allocating housing on the basis of priority need arising in the surrounding MDA catchment area. The actual contribution of affordable housing to meet the District's needs remains therefore uncertain at the present time.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(d).
MOD 6.32	<p>Paragraph 6.45 There is also the possibility of a Major Development Area at Winchester City (North), although this has not yet been confirmed by the three strategic authorities. Should this area be confirmed as an MDA, any affordable</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(e).

	<p>housing is likely to make a significant contribution towards the District's needs, in view of the close relationship it would have with Winchester. <del>The MDA will be subject to the same provisions as the rest of the District in establishing the proportion of affordable housing to be sought (at least 35%). This will, however, need to be reviewed should the MDA be triggered, in the light of the conclusions of the Housing Needs Survey, and the needs identified by the Masterplan to be prepared.</del> <u>The reserve MDA will be required to provide up to 40% of its housing as affordable dwellings in recognition of the considerable demand for such accommodation in the city and also to provide parity with the major greenfield urban extension site at West of Waterlooville MDA.</u></p>	
MOD 6.33	<p>New paragraph following Paragraph 6.45  <u>The Local Reserve sites adjacent to Winchester, Denmead and New Alresford, should provide a minimum of 35% of their housing as affordable dwellings, if the release of any of the four sites be required as a result of the annual monitoring of housing supply in the District. The precise proportion of affordable housing for each of the Local Reserve sites will, however, be negotiated at the time any site is released, taking account of the need for affordable housing at that time.</u></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(g).</p>
MOD 6.34	<p>Paragraph 6.46  <del>The Local Authority has therefore concluded that most of the target of 900 subsidised affordable homes will have to be provided within or adjacent to the existing settlements. The number of affordable homes likely to come forward in the larger settlements (listed in paragraph 6.43) and the smaller settlements has been assessed, using information from the Urban Capacity Study carried out as part of this Local Plan.</del></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(c).</p>
MOD 6.35	<p>Paragraph 6.47  <del>The Local Planning Authority has been seeking a proportion of 30% subsidised affordable homes on sites of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.5 hectares or more) in the larger settlements, and on sites of 5 or more dwellings elsewhere in the District. If the Local Authority continued to seek this proportion, on sites above these</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(b).</p>

	<del>sizes, it is estimated that fewer than 200 affordable homes could be achieved throughout the entire Plan period, well below the target of 900. A number of changes are therefore proposed in this Plan to enable more affordable homes to be provided where they are needed.</del>	
MOD 6.36	Paragraph 6.48 <del>If there is to be a substantial increase in the number of subsidised affordable homes in the larger settlements, the Local Authority will have to seek their provision within smaller developments of 5 or more dwellings (or 0.17 hectares or more). It is estimated that this could provide an additional 250 affordable homes during the Plan period, meeting a significantly larger proportion of the District's target.</del>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(c).
MOD 6.37	Paragraph 6.49 <del>In the smaller towns and villages, it is particularly difficult to achieve affordable housing, as only a small number of housing sites are likely to come forward for development, and most are below the threshold of 5 dwellings operated through the Winchester District Local Plan. As little affordable housing is currently being achieved in these smaller settlements, it will now be sought on sites capable of accommodating 2 or more dwellings. This is consistent with the aims of the Government's Rural White Paper (2000), which states that "There is no reason why, in small villages if there is evidence of need and subject to financial viability, every new market house should not be matched with an affordable home".</del>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(c).
MOD 6.38	Paragraph 6.50 ...The provision of affordable housing is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. <u>Proposal H.5 applies to all sites, including allocated and reserve sites, sites developable under the terms of Proposal H.2, and other sites that may come forward elsewhere in the District.</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f), transfer of text (updated to reflect housing strategy as proposed to be modified) from paragraph 6.51, with deletion of reference to Proposal H.3.
MOD 6.39	<b>Policy H.5</b> <del><b>The Local Planning Authority will permit housing development, which accords with other relevant proposals of this Plan, and includes a proportion of affordable housing on suitable sites:</b></del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(g) but not including the recommended deletion of the reference to 'in perpetuity'.

- ~~(i) within the defined built-up areas of the larger settlements where 5 or more dwellings are proposed or the site is 0.17 hectares or more;~~
- ~~(ii) within the other settlements subject to Proposals H.2 or H.3 and elsewhere in the District where the site can accommodate 2 or more additional dwellings.~~
- ~~(iii) within the Major Development Area at Waterlooville and the reserve Major Development Areas at Waterlooville and Winchester City (North), if confirmed.~~

The Local Planning Authority will permit housing development on suitable sites where affordable housing forms:

- (i) - 40% provision within the defined built-up area of Winchester; and  
- 30% provision within the defined built-up areas of the other larger settlements;

where 15 or more dwellings are proposed, or the site is 0.5 hectares or more;

- (ii) 40% provision within the Major Development Area at Waterlooville and the Strategic Reserve Major Development Areas at Waterlooville and Winchester City (North), if confirmed.

- (iii) 30% provision within the defined built-up areas of the smaller settlements and elsewhere in the District, where the site can accommodate 5 or more dwellings, or exceeds 0.17 hectares.

- (iv) 35% of the housing provision within the Local Reserve housing sites at:

- Pitt Manor, Winchester;
- Worthy Road/Francis Gardens, Winchester;
- Little Frenchies Field, Denmead;
- Spring Gardens, New Alresford;

should the need for the release of any of these sites be

	<p><u>confirmed.</u></p> <p><b>The number, type and tenure of the affordable dwellings will be negotiated for each development, taking into account the need for affordable housing, market and site conditions, and other relevant factors.</b></p> <p><b>The Local Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that appropriate arrangements are in place to ensure that the affordable housing remains genuinely available to those in housing need in perpetuity <u>(subject to any relevant statutory provisions).</u></b></p> <p><b>(subject of a separate report)</b></p>	
MOD 6.41	<p>Paragraph 6.51</p> <p><del>Proposal H.5 applies to all sites, including allocated sites and sites developable under the terms of Proposals H.2 and H.3. In assessing the proportion of new affordable homes to be sought, the Local Authority has considered the total amount of housing to be provided in the settlements during the Plan period in relation to the target for the provision of affordable housing. The District will need to accommodate an average of 310 dwellings in total annually in the settlements (excluding the Major Development Area), of which a minimum of 90 units should be affordable to meet the District target. Although this represents just under 30% of the overall housing provision a higher proportion is needed on sites above the thresholds in Proposal H.5, to compensate for the many smaller sites that are unlikely to provide any affordable housing.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f).
MOD 6.42	<p>Paragraph 6.52</p> <p><del>The Local Planning Authority estimates that, if the affordable housing target is to be met in full on the sites likely to come forward during the Plan period, a proportion of 55% would need to be sought on all sites above the thresholds. This excludes provision within the Major Development Area(s). The Authority recognises that this proportion of affordable housing is unlikely to be negotiated, but it will seek the maximum provision possible for each site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f).
MOD 6.43	<p>Paragraph RD06.17</p> <p><del>The settlements are categorised into those with a population over 3000 (the larger settlements), and those with a</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f).

	<p><del>smaller population. The larger settlements currently comprise Winchester, Bishop's Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, New Alresford and Whiteley. The settlement populations are reviewed annually, and therefore may from time to time move between the defined categories. Developers should therefore check with the Planning Department to ascertain the precise category of each settlement.</del></p>	
MOD 6.44	<p>Paragraph 6.53  <del>Within the larger settlements, the proportion of affordable housing should be at least 35% of the capacity of sites. This is a modest increase in the proportion currently sought and the additional requirement should provide some affordable housing for key workers on suitable sites. The Local Authority is currently examining ways of providing such housing, but it should not be provided at the expense of other households also in housing need. Generally, larger housing sites will be more suitable for mixed tenure affordable housing (for rent and shared equity) but the City Council's Housing Enabling Manager will advise on the types of property needed on each site. The greatest need in the District is for affordable rented housing.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(f).
MOD 6.45	<p>Paragraph 6.55  The affordable housing element of any housing scheme should <u>primarily</u> be provided on-site as part of the housing development and designed to provide a mix of sizes, types and tenures throughout the site. <u>All whole affordable units within the proportion sought should be provided as part of the development, but any part affordable units will be accepted as an equivalent financial contribution. The contributions will then be used to provide affordable housing in the locality. For developments within the smaller settlements, off-site contributions will be sought where they will be more effective in achieving affordable housing provision, having regard to site and viability considerations.</u> <del>Only in very exceptional circumstances will a contribution to off-site provision be accepted as an alternative, and only where such provision can be implemented nearby.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(h), in accordance with FPC06.08, modified as suggested.

MOD 6.46	<p>Paragraph 6.56</p> <p>The Local Authority must be satisfied that affordable homes will continue to be available to local people in need. <del>The best</del> <u>An effective</u> way of ensuring that the homes remain affordable for local people is by involving a registered social landlord in the development and management of the scheme. Developers of schemes involving a proportion of affordable housing should approach the Housing <del>Enabling</del> <u>Strategy and Development</u> Manager for advice on involving a Housing Association. <u>One of the means used to secure the implementation of affordable housing is for developers to provide</u> <del>The Council will normally expect serviced land to be made available</del> free of charge, <u>and</u> <u>The Council</u> will also seek appropriate financial contributions, where necessary, to ensure that the dwellings provided can be made available to meet local needs. It will negotiate with applicants to secure an acceptable Section 106 obligation to control the occupancy of the homes.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(j) & (k), and updating of Housing Strategy and Development Manager's title.
MOD 6.47	<p><b>Policy H.6</b></p> <p><b><i>..(iv) the development is well related to the scale and character of adjacent settlements; and accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>..Proposals within the Strategic and Local Gaps (see Proposals C.2 and C.3) will not be permitted.</i></b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.15.8(c).
MOD 6.48	<p>Paragraph 6.59</p> <p>...<del>The best</del> <u>An effective</u> way of securing this is for the scheme to be developed and managed by a registered social landlord.....</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.15.8(d).
MOD 6.49	<p>Paragraph 6.60</p> <p>... The scheme should be <del>small-scale in relation to</del> <u>sympathetic to</u> the size of the rural settlement concerned, taking account of the housing need identified, the physical characteristics of the preferred site, and the relationship of the site to the particular settlement.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.15.8(b).
MOD 6.50	<p>New paragraph, following 6.62</p> <p><u>Settlements where "exception" schemes would be considered would normally be those subject to Proposal H.2, although in certain circumstances schemes may</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.15.8(a), in accordance with PIC 06.13,

	<u>be considered in other small villages.</u>	but deleting reference to the procedure for exceptions schemes in Winchester.
MOD 6.51	<p>Paragraph RD06.23</p> <p>The gross floor area of these small units should normally not exceed <del>70</del><u>75</u>m<sup>2</sup> floorspace. Exceptionally, in conversion schemes, where higher standard units are needed to reflect the physical characteristics of the building, this may be exceeded. The Local Authority may also impose conditions to <del>ensure that the enlargement of small dwellings is brought within planning control. This would involve controlling proposals for extensions, conversion of two small dwellings into one, and conversion of roofspace to provide additional living space or bedrooms.</del> <u>prevent the conversion of two small dwellings into one.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 6.16.10(a), in accordance with PIC06.14, and 6.16.10(b).
MOD 6.52	<p>Paragraph 6.74</p> <p>...Every development should take account of the wider context, and have regard to Village <u>or Neighbourhood</u> Design Statements <del>or Neighbourhood Plans</del> where they have been prepared and adopted for the area.</p>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.8.3
MOD 6.53	<p><b>Policy H.7</b></p> <p><del>..(i) it includes a range of dwelling types and sizes, with at least 50% of the properties provided as small 1 or 2 bedroomed units suitable for small households, including any small properties provided as subsidised affordable housing in accordance with Proposal H.5;...</del></p> <p><del>..(iii) it accords with the density and design requirements of Proposal DP.3(i) and (ii). <u>it achieves a net density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare, and potential for a higher density is utilised on sites close to town centres or public transport corridors. Where the site contains features that contribute to the character of the wider area (whether natural or man-made) it may be appropriate to exclude these from the developable area for the purposes of calculating net density.</u></del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.17.5(a) and (b), and as a consequence of the Inspector's recommendation at paragraph 3.5.13(b) and comments about moving text to the Housing Chapter at paragraph 3.5.5.



## Chapter 7: Employment

### Introduction

The Employment Chapter was subject to a significant number of objections. A number of these expressed concern regarding the specific expression of Plan policy, others focussed on matters of more detailed policy/text wording.

In response to the objections made to the Chapter in the Revised Deposit Plan, the City Council proposed 4 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) relating to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. With the exception of a Inquiry Changes.

Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording, or specify what the recommended change is to cover, allowing the Council to devise appropriate wording. In general, therefore, the recommendations have not required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations, except for:**

- revisions to paragraph 7.46 (HMS Dryad) – MOD 7.16

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### All policies

- The deletion of cross-references to other Plan policies, where these have been shown in the body of policies contained in the Revised Deposit Plan.

#### Specific policies and text

- The deletion of policies E.5 and E.6 (Ministry of Defence land) and their partial transfer into the text.
- Wording changes to the policies and text of:
  - paragraph 7.12, paragraph 7.13, E.1, paragraph 7.14 (new development)
  - paragraph 7.21, E.2 (existing employment)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 7.1	<b>Table 3 and Table 4</b> Transfer the following site from Table 3 to Table 4:  Abbey Mill                      S.4                      1.9ha. Bishop's Waltham	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7.
MOD 7.2	Paragraph 7.12 The assessment of allocated sites indicates that there can be a more flexible approach to certain sites, hence their designation as mixed use allocations in Table 4. Employment	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.2.13 (a).

	use <del>should form the largest proportion of the development, but</del> can be incorporated with other uses, including the possibility of housing or 'live-work' units (see Glossary)....	
MOD 7.3	Paragraph 7.13 There is also some scope for employment development, appropriate in scale and type, in the settlements. Such development, other than where already committed or allocated, will generally be limited to small-scale workshops, industries, <del>or</del> offices, <u>or other uses appropriate to their surroundings and</u> <del>in appropriate</del> locations....	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.2.13 (b) in accordance with PIC07.01.
MOD 7.4	<b>Policy E.1</b> <b><u>Small scale employment commercial or business development, redevelopment or changes of use (normally falling within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8) will be permitted within the built-up areas of settlements (as defined by Proposals H.2 and H.3), provided:</u></b> <b><u>(i) it falls within Class B1, B2 or B8 of the Use Classes Order (but in the built-up area of Winchester, see there is no conflict with Proposals E.3 and E.4);...</u></b>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.2.13 (c), which amends PIC07.02.
MOD 7.5	Paragraph 7.14 Small-scale employment development <u>usually</u> falling within Use Classes B1 (offices, research and development, and light industry), B2 (storage or distribution) can often be accommodated in the settlements...	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.2.13 (b) in accordance with PIC07.03.
MOD 7.6	Paragraph 7.21 <del>Proposal</del> <u>Policy E.2</u> applies throughout the Plan area, including employment uses in the countryside. The retention of business uses in converted rural buildings will be encouraged, <del>but proposals to expand or redevelop such employment sites are unlikely to be acceptable, in view of the need to conserve and enhance the countryside.</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.3.5(a).
MOD 7.7	<b>Policy E.2</b> <b><u>... (iii) the proposed development accords with other relevant proposals of this Plan, including the countryside proposals if it is outside the areas defined in Proposal H.2 and H.3.</u></b>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.3.5(b).

MOD 7.8	<p>Paragraph 7.22</p> <p>There are also other businesses in the countryside that are not in converted rural buildings, but are <b>established lawful</b> employment <b>uses sites</b> and these firms may from time to time need to replace buildings. Where such a need is demonstrated, planning permission may be granted, but each proposal will be judged on its merits...</p>	Change consequent upon Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.20.10 (a).
MOD 7.9	<p>Paragraph 7.35</p> <p>There are a number of sites throughout the District that are currently owned and operated by the Ministry of Defence (MoD). <del>Where the MoD requires new development for operational purposes, planning permission is not required. The Local Planning Authority is consulted on the proposal, and may either raise objection or not, but does not determine the development proposal itself. However, if development proposed is for non-operational purposes, planning permission is required.</del> <u>Planning permission is required for development by the Ministry of Defence and its proposals will, therefore, be subject to the relevant policies of this Plan. The paragraphs below set out the approach that will be taken where development is proposed on MOD sites, or where such sites become surplus to requirements.</u></p>	Change consequent upon Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.
MOD 7.10	<p><b><i>Policy E.5</i></b></p> <p><del><i>Within existing operational MoD sites in the countryside, the Local Planning Authority will not raise objection to proposed defence-related development, provided that:</i></del></p> <p><del><i>(i) the development and location proposed are essential for defence purposes and there is no suitable alternative site within a settlement or another establishment;</i></del></p> <p><del><i>(ii) any new buildings are either in replacement of existing development or are of a small scale and sensitively located so as not to increase visual intrusion;</i></del></p> <p><del><i>(iii) in the case of development of a more substantial scale, the proposal is accompanied by a full site appraisal and/or planning brief which respects the physical and</i></del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.

	<p><del>policy constraints and opportunities affecting the site;</del></p> <p><del>(iv) it accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of the Plan, particularly C.2-C.4, C.6-C.10, C.17, HE.1-HE.2, HE.13-HE.16 and T.1-T.5.</del></p>	
MOD 7.11	<p>Paragraph 7.37</p> <p><del>Proposal E.5 applies to MoD within the countryside as defined on the Proposals and Inset Maps. To be acceptable, development on MoD sites within the countryside should be operationally essential, with no reasonable scope for it to be accommodated on an alternative site (whether or not in existing MoD use or ownership) within a settlement or another establishment. Operational MoD development should minimise harm to the character of the countryside. Early consultation with the Local Planning and Highway Authorities will assist preparation of a site assessment and is encouraged.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.
MOD 7.12	<p>New paragraph, after Paragraph 7.37</p> <p><u>In the case of development on operational MOD sites in the countryside, development should be small scale and sensitively located so as not to increase visual intrusion. If more substantial development is essential, proposals should be accompanied by a full site appraisal and/or planning brief which respects the physical and policy constraints and opportunities affecting the site. Early consultation with the Local Planning and Highway Authorities will assist with preparation of a site assessment and is encouraged.</u></p> <p>(Subsequent paragraphs to be re-numbered)</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.
MOD 7.13	<p>Paragraph 7.38</p> <p><del>The long-term future of a number of existing MoD sites is uncertain and some sites and buildings could be declared surplus to defence requirements during the Plan period. As well as free-standing military establishments, there are a number of sites located within settlements. Proposals for the redevelopment of such sites will be subject to Plan proposals relevant to the settlements.</del></p>	Change consequent upon Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.

MOD 7.14	<p>Paragraph 7.39</p> <p>Should <del>such existing MOD</del> sites in the countryside become surplus to defence requirements, <del>the provisions of Proposal E.6 will define their future development potential. their re-use or redevelopment will be permitted, provided that any resultant development proposals are appropriate to the site and its surroundings. Inappropriate or over optimistic development proposals will be strongly resisted.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.
MOD 7.15	<p><b><del>Policy E.6</del></b></p> <p><b><del>Where MoD sites in the Countryside are declared surplus to defence requirements, their re-use or redevelopment will be permitted, provided that:</del></b></p> <p><b><del>(i) in the case of the small-scale re-use of buildings, any new uses are confined to existing buildings and accord with the provisions of Proposal C.16;</del></b></p> <p><b><del>(ii) in the case of redevelopment, it is confined to areas of the site that are substantially built-up and does not intrude into existing open or undeveloped areas;</del></b></p> <p><b><del>(iii) there is no increase in built development over that existing (and preferably a reduction), and any visually intrusive buildings, or structures of temporary construction, are removed;</del></b></p> <p><b><del>(iv) large scale development proposals are accompanied by a full site analysis and planning brief, which demonstrates that the development will respect the physical and policy constraints and opportunities of the site;</del></b></p> <p><b><del>(v) it accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of the Plan, particularly C.2-C.4, C.6-C.10, C.17, HE.1-HE.2, HE.13-HE.16 and T.1-T.5.</del></b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 7.5.3.
MOD 7.16	<p>Paragraph 7.46</p> <p><del>HMS Dryad, Southwick Park: The Ministry of Defence has announced that HMS Dryad will become surplus to requirements and will close by 2011 at the latest. It may be used for other</del></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 7.5.3 and 7.7.4, in accordance with PIC 07.04, amended to update

	<p><del>MOD or Government uses or sold.</del> <u>The former 'HMS Dryad' has been largely vacated by the Royal Navy and has become the Defence College of Police and Personnel Administration. However, a wider review of defence training needs is ongoing and may result in further changes.</u> The site is located in the countryside beyond the defined built-up area of Southwick <del>and.</del> <del>Therefore Proposals E.5 and E.6 are applicable</del> <u>and the Local Plan's Countryside and Natural Environment Chapter and paragraphs 7.35 - 7.40 above</u> provide appropriate guidance that will be relevant whether the site is retained in defence use or becomes surplus to requirements.</p>	<p>the situation at the former HMS Dryad.</p>
--	--	---

## Chapter 8: Town Centres, Shopping and Facilities

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 8: Town Centres, Shopping and Facilities related to a number of sections of the Chapter, and the City Council proposed 2 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) in response to objections to this Chapter. Three Further Proposed Changes were also put forward to the Inspector during the Inquiry.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

Wording changes to:

- Paragraph RD08.02 (overall approach)
- Paragraph RD08.04 (overall approach and the Winchester Retail Study)
- Paragraph 8.7 and subheading (Town, Local and District Centres)
- Policy SF.4 (Primary Shopping Areas) Paragraph RD08.02 (overall approach)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 8.1	Paragraph RD08.02 ...Any other significant retail development proposals <u>which are unable to be located in the Broadway/Friarsgate development (now known as Silver Hill), or elsewhere in the town centre,</u> will be required to demonstrate a need for the development <u>in the proposed location</u> and to meet the other requirements of Proposal SF.1, <u>including the sequential test.</u>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 8.2.6, in accordance with PIC 08.01 and FPC 08.A, amended to make reference to the new name for the Broadway/Friarsgate development.
MOD 8.2	Paragraph RD08.04  The Winchester Retail Study recommends that Winchester provides additional floorspace of approximately 8,500m <sup>2</sup> <u>gross (6000m<sup>2</sup> net)</u> for 'comparison' shopping and 5,000m <sup>2</sup> <u>gross (3300m<sup>2</sup> net)</u> for 'convenience' shopping. This would meet projected growth in retail spending during the Plan period and help Winchester regain a realistic proportion of the expenditure growth, claw-back, turnover levels, etc.The Broadway/Friarsgate area is	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 8.2.6, in accordance with PIC 08.02.

	<p>the most suitable location for such development, and as much of the additional <u>comparison</u> floorspace as can be reasonably accommodated should be provided there, as part of an overall redevelopment scheme (see Proposal SF.1). <u>It is thought unlikely that the full recommended provision of convenience floorspace can be built within the town centre. How much can be accommodated will depend largely on the final format of the Broadway/Frairsgate scheme.</u> If further retail floorspace is needed <u>in Winchester</u>, it should be provided in accordance with the 'sequential approach' contained within Proposal SF.1.</p>	
MOD 8.3	<p>Subheading and Paragraph 8.7  <b>Town, <u>Village and Local</u> and <del>District</del> Centres</b>            ..Other Town/Village/<del>District</del> Centres</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 8.3.11, in accordance with FPCs 08.B, 08.C,</p>
MOD 8.4	<p><b><i>Policy SF.4</i></b>  <i>...Within the Primary Shopping Areas permission will not <u>therefore</u> be granted for the change of use of the ground floor of a building from Use Class A1 (Retail) to uses falling within Use Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) or A3 (Food and Drink) except:....</i></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 8.4.5</p>



## Chapter 9: Recreation and Tourism

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 9: Recreation and Tourism related to a number of sections of the Chapter, and the City Council proposed 1 Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC) in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, or require limited updating of the text. In relation to Policy RD09.05 and the accompanying paragraphs, the Inspector has recommended the inclusion of a size threshold for important small areas of open space not shown on the Proposals and Inset Maps, which are covered by this Policy. A threshold figure of about 0.4 hectares has therefore been included in paragraph RD09.04 (MOD 09.04). This is considered to be the minimum area that can readily be identified on the Proposals and Inset Maps. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of the Inspector's recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Maps

- Changes to RT.1 and RT.2 designations on:
  - Inset Map 45: Winchester (St John's Croft, Winton House and land between Berewecke Road and Berewecke Way).
  - Inset Map 20: New Alresford (Sun Hill School and the former railway cutting east of New Farm Road)
  - Inset Map 8: Denmead (Denmead Junior School)
- Changes to RT.4 designations on:
  - Inset Map 45: Winchester (land between Harestock Road, Kennel Lane and Littleton Road)
  - Inset Map 20: New Alresford (land west of Arlebury Park)

#### Tables

- Table 5 (the recreational space standard)

#### Wording changes to:

- Paragraphs 9.4 and 9.6 (protecting important open areas)
- Policy RT.2 (important recreational space)
- Paragraph RD09.04 (smaller important open spaces)
- Policy RD09.05 (smaller important open spaces)
- Paragraph RD09.06 (the recreational space standard)
- Policy RT.3 (recreational space for new housing development)
- Policy RT.7 (formal recreation facilities in the countryside)
- Policy RT.8 (recreational routes in the countryside)
- Paragraph 9.50 (indoor leisure uses)
- Policy RT.14 (facilities for visitors in the settlements)

**NB. Details of proposed modifications to the Appendices, Glossary or Proposals and Inset Maps, included in the Inspectors' recommendations for this Chapter, are set out in Chapter 15 following the Plan Chapters.**

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 9.1	<p>Paragraph 9.4            Proposal RT.1 protects areas important for their amenity value, and Proposal RT.2 protects areas that are of significant local recreational value. Proposal RT.1 and Proposal RT.2(i) apply to settlements with defined policy boundaries (subject to Proposal H.2). <del>They do not apply to settlements subject to Proposal H.3, as the development frontages have been defined to exclude important open areas in these settlements.</del></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 9.3.19(a) and 6.10.11.</p>
MOD 9.2	<p>Paragraph 9.6  <del>Areas beyond defined settlement boundaries, but important for their existing or potential open recreational value, are subject to Proposal RT.2(ii).</del>            .....</p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.3.19(a).</p>
MOD 9.3	<p><b>Policy RT.2</b>  <i>Development proposals or changes of use will not be permitted where they would result in the loss or reduction of the recreational value of:</i> <del>(i) the important recreational areas within settlements which are subject to Proposal H.2 of this Plan, as identified on the Proposals and Inset Maps;</del>  <del>..(ii) other recreational land or facilities of significant recreational value located outside the areas subject to Proposal H.2. These areas are not identified on the Proposals and Inset Maps, but are shown in the Winchester District Open Space Strategy.</del>  <i>Within these areas, the development of additional, ancillary buildings or hard-surfaced areas may will only be permitted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the recreational value of the site would be maintained or enhanced,...</i></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.3.19(a) and (b).</p>
MOD 9.4	<p>New paragraph RD 09.04            In addition to identified open areas, there are often other smaller areas of open space which are an intrinsic part of the surrounding housing. <del>They</del> <u>Areas of open space of less than 0.4 hectares</u> are too small to be separately identified <u>on the Proposals and Inset Maps</u>, but they have generally been</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.3.19(d).</p>

	provided in conjunction with the surrounding development, contributing to its appearance, and providing opportunities for informal recreation. .....							
MOD 9.5	<p><b>Policy RD09.05</b>  <b>Built development will not be permitted on important small areas of <u>informal open space</u>—<del>provided within housing developments, where they are in active use, well maintained and contribute substantially to the appearance of the surrounding area.</del></b></p> <p><del>(i) contribute substantially to the appearance of the surrounding area; and</del></p> <p><del>(ii) have been well used as informal recreational space over a period of time.</del></p> <p><del>Proposals to redevelop the housing and open spaces comprehensively will only be permitted where they meet the requirements of Proposal DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, RT.3 and other relevant proposals of this plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.3.19(c).						
MOD 9.6	<p>Paragraph RD09.06</p> <p>..The Council is currently undertaking a District-wide audit of open space and a needs assessment of the recreation requirements of residents and visitors.  <del>This may result in the creation of revised standards which would supersede those currently referred to at 9.13 above.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.4.8(a).						
MOD 9.7	<p><b>Table 5: Minimum requirements for recreational space</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Space required per 1000 population (hectares)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Children's play</td> <td><del>0.7</del> <u>0.8</u> (to include equipped playgrounds, other opportunities for outdoor play and casual play space)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sports grounds</td> <td><del>1.7</del> <u>1.6</u> (of which at least 1.2ha should be for pitch sports)...</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Space required per 1000 population (hectares)	Children's play	<del>0.7</del> <u>0.8</u> (to include equipped playgrounds, other opportunities for outdoor play and casual play space)	Sports grounds	<del>1.7</del> <u>1.6</u> (of which at least 1.2ha should be for pitch sports)...	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.4.8(b).
Category	Space required per 1000 population (hectares)							
Children's play	<del>0.7</del> <u>0.8</u> (to include equipped playgrounds, other opportunities for outdoor play and casual play space)							
Sports grounds	<del>1.7</del> <u>1.6</u> (of which at least 1.2ha should be for pitch sports)...							
MOD 9.8	<p><b>Policy RT.3</b>  .. <b>The provision should be well-</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation,						

	<i>related to the housing development it serves, but the exact form and type should take into account the nature and size of the development, and the principles of the Winchester District Open Space Strategy.</i>	paragraph 9.4.8(c).
MOD 9.9	Paragraph 9.24 .... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North of Stockbridge Road/west of <del>Harestock</del> <u>Littleton</u> Road</li> </ul>	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.5.10(a).
MOD 9.10	<b>Policy RT.7</b> <i>..(i) maintain or enhance the landscape character of the area, and accord with Proposals DP.3, C.27, and other relevant proposals of this Plan;....</i>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.6.3.
MOD 9.11	<b>Policy RT.8</b> <i>.. Where a building is required, it should re-use a small-scale suitable existing building. Development should accord with Proposals DP.3, C.27, RT.14, and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</i>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.7.2.
MOD 9.12	Paragraph 9.50 The southern part of the District has poor accessibility to indoor sports facilities, and therefore <del>The possibility of making</del> <u>additional provision has been made within the area</u> by expanding the facilities at Swanmore School, <del>is currently being investigated.</del> <u>Indoor provision has also been</u> <del>It may also be possible to</del> <u>improved indoor provision</u> in Denmead, to serve the eastern part of the District. <del>The reservation in the current Local Plan at Bishop's Waltham has not been carried forward, although the site remains subject to countryside policies.</del> An increase in the joint use of indoor facilities currently in other uses, particularly educational uses, would also help to <del>achieve this aim</del> <u>improve provision</u> and will be encouraged.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.10.4.
MOD 9.21	<b>Policy RT.14</b> <i>..(iii) it accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</i>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 9.11.4.

## Chapter 10: Transport

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 10: Transport related to a number of issues, and the City Council proposed 2 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Maps

- Amend to show disused railway line from the Bushfield area to Kings Worthy
- Amend to show railway line east of New Alresford is in use

#### Wording changes to:

- Proposal T.4 (Parking standards)
- Paragraph 10.23 (Public transport)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 10.1	<p><i>Policy T.4, second clause</i></p> <p><del>Maximum parking standards have been set by Government. In some circumstances, parking provision can be reduced below these levels and sometimes omitted from development sites, particularly where they are in town centres and are well served by other means of travel. Contributions will be sought towards the relevant integrated transport strategy, where appropriate, particularly where the development has reduced levels of car parking provision in accordance with 'Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards'.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 10.6.10.
MOD 10.2	<p>Paragraph 10.23</p> <p>...Winchester is the most important station in the Local Plan area and is served by all main line services. In contrast, Botley, Shawford and Micheldever are generally only served</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 10.9.8, in accordance with PIC10.01.

	by <u>stopping</u> <del>local</del> services....	
MOD 10.3	<b>Figure 2</b> on page 107 (Amend to include the disused railway line that runs from the Bushfield area via Winnall to Kings Worthy, and to change the railway line east of New Alresford to 'in use', replacing the 'disused' notation).	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 10.9.8, in accordance with PIC10.02.

## Chapter 11: Winchester

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 11: Winchester Settlements related to a number of issues, and the City Council proposed 1 Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC) in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with both of his recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Wording changes to:

- Paragraph RD11.06 (Broadway / Friarsgate)
- Paragraph RD11.07 (Broadway / Friarsgate retail provision)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 11.1	<p><b>Subheading RD11.02</b> (Amend subheading to read:)</p> <p><b>Broadway/Friarsgate (Silver Hill)</b></p>	Updating to refer to the agreed new title for the development.
MOD 11.2	<p>Paragraph RD11.06</p> <p>The Council has prepared a <del>draft</del> Planning Brief for the site in conjunction with key stakeholders, <del>which has been published for public consultation. This Brief builds on an earlier draft that was subject to public consultation in June 1999.</del> It <del>also</del> incorporates the findings of the 'Future of Winchester Study' (see paragraphs 11.2 – 11.8 of this Plan), where relevant. Development should be in accordance with the <del>principles outlined in the</del> Brief and potential developers should be guided by the Brief when formulating their proposals. The Council will expect developers to establish and maintain a constructive dialogue with all stakeholders throughout the design and construction of the development.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 11.5.8.
MOD 11.3	<p>Paragraph RD11.07</p> <p>...Retail provision should reflect the floorspace needs in central Winchester for convenience and comparison goods as identified in the Winchester Retail</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 11.5.8, in accordance with PIC11.01.

	<p>Study 2003. <del>The site should ideally accommodate all of the identified need for additional town-centre comparison floorspace and the majority of the identified need for convenience shopping.</del></p>	
--	---	--



## Chapter 12: New Communities

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 12: New Communities related to a number of different issues, on the proposed new communities at Knowle, West of Waterlooville and the potential new community at Winchester City (North). The City Council proposed 7 Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) in response to objections to this Chapter, and 9 Further Proposed Changes were also recommended to the Inspector before and during the Inquiry.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all of these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Title

- Change to "Major Development Areas" (following the deletion of the Knowle policy and text)

#### Maps

- Inset Map 16: Knowle (update to reflect current stage of development and deletion of Policy NC.1)
- Inset Map 41: West of Waterlooville (update to reflect Masterplan Framework)

#### Wording changes to:

- Paragraph 12.39 (deleted and part incorporated in paragraph 12.30)
- Policy NC.2 (West of Waterlooville MDA)
- Paragraph 12.41 (West of Waterlooville MDA Masterplan preparation)
- Paragraph RD12.20 (West of Waterlooville MDA development)
- Paragraph 12.51 (West of Waterlooville MDA affordable housing)
- Paragraph 12.56 (West of Waterlooville MDA employment)
- Paragraph RD 12.32 (West of Waterlooville MDA Resource Centre)
- Paragraph RD12.36 (West of Waterlooville MDA transport)
- Paragraph RD12.39 (West of Waterlooville MDA transport)
- Paragraph RD12.40 and new paragraph following (West of Waterlooville MDA transport)
- Paragraph RD12.42 (West of Waterlooville MDA cemetery)
- Paragraph 12.71 (West of Waterlooville MDA open space)
- Paragraph 12.76 (West of Waterlooville MDA landscape)
- Policy NC.3 (Winchester City [North] Reserve MDA)
- Paragraph 12.93 (Winchester City [North] Reserve MDA development requirements)

#### Deletion of policy and text

- Paragraphs 12.5 – 12.27 (Knowle)
- Policy NC.1 (Knowle)

**NB. Details of proposed modifications to the Appendices, Glossary, and Proposals and Inset Maps, included in the Inspectors' recommendations for this Chapter, are set out in Chapter 15 following the Plan Chapters.**

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 12.1	<p><b>Chapter 12 title</b></p> <p><b>New Communities Major Development Areas</b></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11 and Inspector's informative suggesting a change of Chapter title.</p>
MOD 12.2	<p><b>Heading, subheading and paragraph 12.5</b></p> <p><b>Knowle</b></p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p><del>Outline planning consent for the Knowle development was granted in 1994, in accordance with the principles of the Development Brief, also adopted in 1994. The Brief requires a comprehensive Master Plan to be prepared for the site before detailed proposals are considered. A Master Plan was approved in 1998, and this establishes a framework for the development of the site. An Urban Design Framework was subsequently approved in 1999.</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.</p>
MOD 12.3	<p><b>Paragraph 12.6</b></p> <p><del>The Master Plan incorporates some changes within the site to enable a development that respects the character of all the buildings proposed for retention. Since the Development Brief was prepared, the extent and number of listed buildings has been revised, and a number of additional buildings are proposed for retention, including the prominent South Block in the southern part of the site. The Master Plan therefore proposes a rearrangement of some of the land uses within the Development Brief area, to provide for the retention of the additional buildings, and an additional open area in front of the South Block to enhance its setting. Revisions to the open space areas to be retained (subject to Proposals RT.1 and RT.2), the retained buildings, and the areas to accommodate new built development, are therefore incorporated in Inset Map 16.</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.</p>
MOD 12.4	<p><b>Paragraph 12.7</b></p> <p><del>Detailed planning permission has been</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation,</p>

	<p><del>granted for parts of the site in accordance with the principles of the Master Plan, and the new village is currently under construction. A new access road from the A32 (in the adjoining Borough of Fareham) was a prerequisite of the development and is now the primary access to the site. A legal agreement provides for complementary traffic management measures on the roads that formerly served the Hospital (Mayles Lane and River Lane). It also incorporates the provision of improved public transport services, and safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the adjacent settlements of Wickham and Fareham.</del></p>	<p>paragraph 12.1.11.</p>
<p>MOD 12.5</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.8  <del>Some areas within the area subject to Proposal H.2 of this Plan are not covered by the Master Plan. This includes the business uses on land between the Hospital site and the railway, and existing residential uses around the edge of the development. If any development takes place in these adjoining areas, the Local Planning Authority will need to ensure that proposals relate well to the new community, and its access arrangements.</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.</p>
<p>MOD 12.6</p>	<p><del><b>Proposal NC.1</b></del>  <del><b>Within the defined policy boundary for Knowle, planning permission will be granted for the re-use of the site and buildings to create a new rural community, provided that development proposals:</b></del>  <del><b>(i) provide a range of appropriate uses to include:</b></del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• a mix of dwelling sizes and types, including affordable housing, in accordance with Proposals H.5 and H.7;</del></li> <li><del>• employment uses falling within Use Class B1 (Business);</del></li> <li><del>• adequate facilities and services to serve the community, in accordance with Proposal DP.12, the provisions of the Development Brief and</del></li> </ul>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.</p>

	<p><del>Master Plan;</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• adequate public, private and amenity recreational/open space, in accordance with Proposals DP.6, DP.7 and RT.3;</del></li> </ul> <p><del>(ii) provide, or contribute to the provision of, the physical and social infrastructure necessary to serve the community both on and off-site. This will include:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• the completion of the new primary access between the site and the A32 prior to the occupation of the dwellings, traffic management measures to discourage the use of existing accesses, and adequate links to the local footpath and bridleway network, including provision for a bridleway link, to provide a continuous bridleway route from Fareham to Wickham (as part of Proposal RT.9);</del></li> <li><del>• appropriately enhanced public transport arrangements and pedestrian and cycle links to and from the site;</del></li> <li><del>• upgrading/renewal of the sewerage and water supply systems, and other physical infrastructure;</del></li> <li><del>• the use of the Church as a community hall;</del></li> <li><del>• local shopping and associated social facilities in a new village centre;</del></li> <li><del>• adequate recreational and educational facilities;</del></li> </ul> <p><del>(iii) retain and bring into beneficial use the listed and other buildings that make a positive contribution to the whole complex. Proposals for these buildings will be expected to:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• conserve their</del></li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p><del>architectural features and scale;</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• ensure their upkeep and maintenance prior to conversion, which should be undertaken in accordance with an agreed phasing programme;</del></li> <li><del>• accommodate car parking, private amenity space, etc, whilst conserving the relationship of the buildings to the surrounding spaces, landscaping and other features;</del></li> </ul> <p><del>(iv) incorporate new development/redevelopment, which will be expected to:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• relate well to existing buildings in terms of size, height and location to create an attractive community and a sense of place;</del></li> <li><del>• conserve the main landscape features of the site and incorporate them into the development proposals. Of particular importance are the trees in the enclosed courtyard areas and around the edge of the site. New planting will be expected to reinforce and maintain or enhance the landscape features of the site, taking into account its prominent countryside location;</del></li> <li><del>• conserve the main features of nature conservation interest. Development proposals will be expected to incorporate protective measures, where appropriate, in accordance with Proposals C.8 – C.10;</del></li> <li><del>• include appropriate noise attenuation measures, particularly in relation to the western part of the</del></li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p style="text-align: center;"><del>site;</del></p> <p><del>(v) be planned and managed comprehensively to ensure that new facilities and services are provided in conjunction with development, in accordance with the requirements of Proposal DP.12, having regard to the provisions of the Development Brief and Master Plan;</del></p> <p><del>(vi) accord with Proposal DP.3, other relevant proposals of this Plan, and the provisions of the Knowle Village Development Brief and Master Plan.</del></p>	
MOD 12.7	<p><b>Subheading</b> and paragraph 12.9 <b>General principles</b></p> <p><del>The Development Brief and Master Plan together provide an overall framework for the development of the site, setting out in more detail how the requirements of Proposal NC.1 should be implemented.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.8	<p>Paragraph 12.10</p> <p><del>New development should relate well to the retained buildings and landscape features and form an integral part of the overall complex.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.9	<p>Paragraph 12.11</p> <p><del>Development should be phased in accordance with the provisions of the Master Plan, to ensure that the retained buildings are restored and converted, infrastructure is provided in step with development, and proper provision is made for community facilities. Development proposals should incorporate structural landscaping, retain existing important trees in the enclosed courtyard areas, and provide car parking, open space and recreation areas whilst retaining the important features of the site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.10	<p>Paragraph 12.12</p> <p><del>The established landscape features on the site should be reinforced by substantial structural landscaping. This should soften the appearance of the development, provide a new edge to the settlement, and protect the amenities of patients remaining at Ravenswood and occupiers of existing and proposed</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.

	<p><del>housing. The layout of the site should also provide for the retention of existing landscape features within the site and the provision of new landscaping to enhance the appearance of the development.</del></p>	
MOD 12.11	<p>Paragraph 12.13  <del>There is a woodland area of some ecological value in the south-western part of the site. It is to be retained and incorporated within the development, providing the opportunity for limited public access. A footpath is to be provided to link with the proposed bridleway between Fareham and Wickham (Proposal RT.9).</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.12	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 12.14  <b>Housing</b></p> <p><del>About 575 dwellings are expected to be developed at Knowle, and the development should be complete by 2005. The Local Planning Authority has sought a proportion of affordable homes, in accordance with the requirements of Proposal H.5, and these are being provided as an integral part of the development. The development should include a mix of dwelling types and sizes, and achieve a net density of 30 – 50 dwellings per hectare, in accordance with Government guidance and Proposal H.7 of this Plan. At least 50% of units, including those provided as subsidised affordable homes, should be 1 or 2 bedroom units, to increase the availability of units currently in short supply in the area.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.13	<p>Paragraph 12.15  <del>The site is bounded to the west by a live railway line, and to the west of the railway line there is a shooting ground which may cause noise disturbance from time to time. Any development on the western part of the site should, therefore, incorporate noise attenuation measures, although it may be possible to resolve some of the difficulties off the development site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.14	<p>Paragraph 12.16  <del>Development proposals should be of a high design standard, complementing and enhancing the character of the retained buildings, which are shown on Inset Map 9. The design and layout</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.

	<del>should particularly address the Hospital's institutional character, whilst maintaining its overall sense of scale and massing.</del>	
MOD 12.15	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 12.17 <b>Employment</b></p> <p><del>The area between the former Hospital access road and the railway is suitable for small industrial and business uses, subject to their use falling within Use Class B1 (Business). Uses falling within Class B2 (General Industry) may exceptionally be permitted where these would not harm the environment of the area, the amenities of residential properties, or lead to excessive traffic generation, bearing in mind the location of existing and possible proposed new dwellings and the means of access to the site. The existing avenue of mature trees that borders this area should be retained and reinforced as appropriate with additional planting to screen the eastern side of the site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.16	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 12.18 <b>Community facilities</b></p> <p><del>Development should provide adequate community and indoor recreational facilities. The Chapel is to be retained, and may provide suitable accommodation for some of these facilities.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.17	<p>Paragraph 12.19</p> <p><del>The creation of a new "village centre" is proposed within one of the retained buildings. Provision should be made within the centre for community and leisure facilities, including some retail uses. All facilities and services provided in conjunction with the new development should be in accordance with the requirements and phasing set out in the Master Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.18	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 12.20 <b>Open space and recreational facilities</b></p> <p><del>The developer is required to submit details of all the recreational and sporting provision to the Local Planning Authority for approval, prior to the occupation of any part of the development. This provision should accommodate children's play areas,</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.



	<del>sports grounds and general informal open space in accordance with the requirements of Proposal RT.3 of this Plan.</del>	
MOD 12.19	<p>Paragraph 12.21</p> <p><del>Suitable equipped children's play areas, casual play space and space for general informal use should be dispersed around the Knowle development, so that all housing areas have ready access to these facilities. The woodland area to the west of the site is also suitable for some general informal use, although any public access will need to have regard to the features of nature conservation interest.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.20	<p>Paragraph 12.22</p> <p><del>Most of the sports grounds required should be provided on the retained playing field area on the north east side of the site, but a small amount of the provision should be made in Wickham, in association with other sports grounds needed to serve the parish. The developers are to make a financial contribution to allow the land and facilities to serve Knowle to be provided there. Land to the east of Mill Lane, adjacent to the Community Centre, is reserved on Inset Map 44, in accordance with Proposal RT.4 of this Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.21	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 12.23 <b>Access and services</b></p> <p><del>A new road to serve the development has been constructed from the A32 to the east of the site, most of which is off-site and in the administrative area of Fareham Borough Council.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.22	<p>Paragraph 12.24</p> <p><del>Developers will be responsible for providing or upgrading all the roads and sewers needed as a result of development. This will include measures necessary to discourage the use of the existing access roads. The existing on-site roads are to be rationalised and a new road hierarchy created as part of the overall development of the site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.23	<p>Paragraph 12.25</p> <p><del>Developers will need to ensure that an efficient public transport service is available before the new village</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.

	<del>becomes established, and this will require discussions with the rail and bus operators. Whichever service is adopted, developers will need to provide appropriate bus and/or train stopping facilities as part of the development at Knowle.</del>	
MOD 12.24	<p>Paragraph 12.26</p> <p><del>The new community will need good access to footpaths, cycleways and bridleways in the adjacent countryside, and Proposal RT.9 of this Local Plan provides for the full implementation of a long-distance bridleway. It is already in use to the north of Knowle to Wickham and beyond and to the south of Knowle to Fareham, but a link adjacent to the Knowle area is yet to be provided. The Local Authority will seek to enable its provision, and the preferred route is indicated on Inset Map 16. There may, however, need to be variations to this route, which would be undertaken through the formal bridleway dedication procedures. The developers are to make a financial contribution to improve pedestrian and cycle access to the site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.25	<p>Paragraph 12.27</p> <p><del>The developers are also to make financial contributions towards improving educational facilities at Wickham School. These will fund the cost of the four additional classrooms needed to serve the Knowle development.</del></p> <p>(Redraft paragraphs 12.1 to 12.4 to reflect the deletion of the Knowle section and the up-to-date position on the MDAs. Renumber the Policies and paragraphs on West of Waterlooville and Winchester City [North]).</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 12.26	<p>Paragraph 12.29</p> <p>...The <u>adopted</u> Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan, prepared by Havant Borough Council, <del>will</del> <u>sets</u> out complementary proposals for that part of the <u>MDA</u> development within its own area. <del>Havant Borough Council has published a revised draft deposit Local Plan for the Borough, which includes specific proposals for part of the MDA.</del></p>	Updating of text to reflect current status of the Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan.
MOD 12.27	<p>Paragraph 12.30</p> <p><u>Inset Map 41 identifies land sufficient to accommodate a comprehensively planned, mixed use new community</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.2.5(b), to incorporate text of paragraph

	<p><u>comprising at least 2000 dwellings, 30 hectares of employment land and associated physical and social infrastructure. The development of this area will not be permitted until a comprehensive Masterplan for the whole site has been adopted by the Local Planning Authority.</u> <del>Although the development area straddles two local authority boundaries, a comprehensive Masterplan for the whole development area will be required and it is the intention that this will be jointly prepared and agreed by Winchester City and Havant Borough Councils. Development will not be permitted until the Masterplan has been prepared and adopted.</del>—The proposals for the MDA set out in this Plan are based upon a Masterplan Framework which will form the basis for more detailed work. The main features of the Masterplan Framework, most of which have also been agreed by Havant Borough Council, are shown for illustrative purposes at Diagram 1 (loose in folder).</p>	<p>12.39 within the introductory text.</p>
<p>MOD 12.28</p>	<p><b>Policy NC.2</b>  <b><i>A new, mixed use community comprising <del>up to</del> at least 2000 dwellings, employment provision, and associated physical and social infrastructure is proposed at West of Waterlooville. ...</i></b></p> <p><del>..(ii) it accords with Proposals DP.1 and DP.3 and secures a high quality of design, and Proposal DP.8 which seeks to minimise the use of resources;</del></p> <p>(re-number remaining criteria)</p> <p><del>..(iv) an integrated and balanced mix of housing, employment, recreation, education, social and community facilities</del> <b><i>development is proposed, which contributes towards a sense of identity for the new community including:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>a mix of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing to meet identified local needs (see Proposals H.5 and H.7);</i></b></li> <li>..</li> <li>• <b><i>adequate formal and informal public, private</i></b></li> </ul>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.2.5(b) and (c), in accordance with FPCs 12.A and 12.A(i), and paragraph 12.3.2(a).</p>

	<p>and amenity recreation land / open space, <del>in accordance with Proposals DP.6, DP.7 and RT.3</del> <u>to serve the new community;</u></p> <p>..(v)...  (a) the completion of appropriate access routes, including a southern access route linking to <del>Purbrook Heath Road</del> <u>the A3</u> in the vicinity of <del>the</del> Ladybridge roundabout,....</p> <p>..(vii)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>extending and/or improving the recreational opportunities <u>to the west of</u> <del>at</del> Purbrook Heath;</li> </ul> </p> <p>..(viii)...  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the <del>main</del> <u>ridgeline highest point</u> that runs east-west across the development area..</li> </ul> </p> <p>..(ix) the main nature conservation interests are protected <u>in accordance with Proposals C.9 and C.10</u>. ....</p> <p>..(x) the local gap between Waterlooville and Denmead as defined on the Inset and Proposals Maps is maintained <del>in accordance with Proposal C.3;</del></p> <p>.. The maximum extent of a reserve area sufficient to accommodate <del>an</del> <u>additional up to</u> 1000 dwellings is also identified.</p> <p>.. If the reserve housing is required, the precise extent of the area identified on Inset Map 41 within which housing and associated buildings will be permitted will depend upon the density proposed and the extent of the land permitted to accommodate the 2000 dwellings. <u>The reserve area identified on Inset Map 41 may be reduced in size if higher densities than currently envisaged are achieved in the Baseline allocation.</u></p>	
MOD 12.29	Paragraph 12.39 <del>Inset Map 41 identifies land sufficient to</del>	Inspector's recommendation,

	<p><del>accommodate a comprehensively planned, mixed use new community comprising up to 2000 dwellings, 30 hectares of employment land and associated physical and social infrastructure. The development of this area will not be permitted until a comprehensive Masterplan for the whole site has been adopted by the Local Planning Authority.</del></p>	<p>paragraph 12.2.5(b), to incorporate text of paragraph 12.39 within introductory text.</p>
MOD 12.30	<p>Paragraph 12.41  <del>Community involvement in the preparation of the Masterplan will be necessary, particularly in examining the merits of different design solutions, including higher density development options.</del></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.3.2(b).</p>
MOD 12.31	<p>Paragraph RD12.20  Inset Map 41 identifies <del>the maximum extent of the land required for up to 2000 dwellings</del> <u>areas for residential, mixed-use, employment, community facilities and other associated buildings uses and infrastructure to accommodate the Baseline provision of at least 2000 dwellings in the overall MDA area that straddles the boundary with the neighbouring Havant Borough Council. It is envisaged that development of the MDA will commence in several locations simultaneously and it will be necessary to secure a comprehensive development programme to ensure the implementation of all the ancillary infrastructure proceeds in a coherent manner. The Inset Map also indicates the maximum extent of the Reserve site for up to 1000 dwellings, which may</u> <del>It is based on an average net residential density of approximately 40 dwellings per hectare. However, in the interests of creating a compact new community and minimising land take, developers will be encouraged to build at the highest appropriate density. A phased release of the land for up to 2000 dwellings is therefore proposed to enable the land take to be reduced in size if higher densities than currently presently envisaged are achieved in the early phases</del> <u>Baseline allocation.</u></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.4.3, amplified to reflect recommendation at 12.2.5 (b).</p>
MOD 12.32	<p>Paragraph 12.46  <del>Inset Map 41 also shows a "reserve area" for up to an additional 1000 dwellings. Some or all of this the Reserve area may be required to meet strategic housing needs, should a</del></p>	<p>Change to reflect Inspector's recommendations at paragraphs 12.2.5(c) and 12.4.3.</p>

	<p>compelling justification be identified. The strategic planning authorities (Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council) will determine whether such a justification has been established. <del>The Masterplan process will determine how much of the reserve area would be required to provide the additional 1000 dwellings, taking account of the capacity of the allocated development area.</del></p>	
MOD 12.33	<p>Paragraph 12.51 The development will be expected to provide affordable housing and other housing to meet any special housing needs that may be identified within the south-east Hampshire area. This Plan seeks <del>35%</del> <u>up to 40%</u> affordable housing <u>in the MDA</u> within Winchester District (see <u>Proposal Policy H.5</u>). <del>However the MDA will</del> <u>which is intended to</u> meet a wider sub-regional need, and will contribute to the affordable housing needs of a number of adjacent Local Authorities (<u>Havant Borough Council, Portsmouth City Council, and part of East Hampshire District Council</u>), in addition to <u>parts of</u> this District. <del>The updated housing need survey referred to above concludes that a 50% proportion of affordable housing would be justified in the MDA, and split between rented and shared equity, the proportions to be determined in the light of up to date survey work. The Local Planning Authority will therefore seek a proportion of 50% subsidised affordable homes within the MDA.</del> Affordable housing provision will be expected to be fully integrated with the development of market housing and to be dispersed within the development area. Concentrations of large numbers of affordable housing should be avoided in one location.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.7.3.
MOD 12.34	<p>Paragraph 12.56 <u>The development will provide an opportunity to contribute to</u> <del>Developers will be expected to contribute to the provision of</del> training schemes for local people, which will assist with development and business take-up. This will be especially important where new businesses are likely to require skills that are not available locally. There may be scope for linkage to Single Regeneration Budget funding,</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.8.3.

	where benefits to the areas such as Wecock and Leigh Park can be shown.	
MOD 12.35	<p><b>Subheading</b>, and Paragraph RD 12.32  <b>Resource Centre <u>Recovery Park</u></b></p> <p>The employment allocation includes a reservation of approximately 2.8 ha. for a 'resource <del>centre</del> <u>recovery park</u>', the purpose of which is to make the community as sustainable as possible in terms of the consumption of natural resources....</p> <p>.....The exact nature of other uses required by Hampshire County Council as Waste Disposal Authority would be determined by the precise location of the site, its access, proximity to dwellings and the needs in the area at the time of site availability. <del>The resource centre could also include a site of approximately 0.5 ha for a small 'biomass plant'. This would be a facility to generate a small amount of heat and power from coppice arisings and similar material that would provide a source of sustainable and renewable energy to serve part of the needs of the new development.</del> Detailed proposals for any of the elements of the resource <u>centre recovery park</u> will need to provide for the satisfactory routeing of heavy goods vehicles to minimise any adverse impact on <u>nearby settlements and residential areas, including Denmead, Hambledon, and <u>Purbrook, Southwick, <u>Widley and Waterlooville.</u></u></u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.9.5 (a), (b), (c), and (d), in accordance with PIC12.03 and FPC12.A(iii).
MOD 12.36	<p>Paragraph 12.61</p> <p>The South Hampshire Rapid Transit proposals are integral to the local transport strategy for the Waterlooville area. The A3 bus priority corridor proposals <del>are already being implemented and improvements along the corridor are being phased over the next few years and are due to reach Waterlooville town centre by 2004/5.</del> <u>have recently been implemented, including improvements adjacent to the MDA site.</u> Provision for a new bus priority link through the development area should be secured to ensure an integrated transport system for the whole area.</p>	Updating of text to reflect current situation.
MOD 12.37	<p>Paragraph RD12.36</p> <p>..They include an access from the A3 <del>at</del> <del>of</del> in the vicinity of the Ladybridge</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.10.17(a).

	roundabout to provide a southern access road for the new community.	
MOD 12.38	<p>Paragraph RD12.39</p> <p><del>There will be</del> vehicular, <u>pedestrian and cycle links</u> <del>access</del> to the main new employment areas <u>to integrate them with the existing Brambles Business Park and the remainder of the MDA.</u> <del>is proposed from Elettra Avenue and Waterberry Drive (within the Brambles Business Park) to minimise the volume of heavy goods vehicles needing to use the roads within the MDA. It is also expected that there will be vehicular connections, as well as pedestrian and cycle links, between the employment areas and the remainder of the MDA, to facilitate access for other traffic including buses.</del> <u>A Transport Assessment will be needed to inform decisions regarding appropriate measures required for lorry routing.</u> <del>Appropriate traffic management measures will need to be considered to restrict the use of these connections by heavy goods vehicles.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.10.17(b).
MOD 12.39	<p>Paragraph RD12.40</p> <p><del>No</del> Vehicular access to the MDA will <u>only</u> be permitted from <u>the locations referred to above, and not from</u> Closewood Road, <del>or</del> Newlands Lane, Forest End, Windrush Gardens or Purbrook Heath Road. Careful consideration will be given to the appropriate routing of construction traffic before planning permission is granted for any development.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.10.17(c), in accordance with PIC12.04.
MOD 12.40	<p>New paragraph following RD12.40</p> <p><u>Any planning application for development should be supported by a full Transport Assessment. Measures to stimulate walking, cycling and bus usage will be required and these facilities, together with access routes to the development and possibly improvements to the trunk road network, will need to be provided, secured and paid for by the developers of the MDA.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.10.17(c), in accordance with PIC12.05.
MOD 12.41	<p>Paragraph RD12.42</p> <p>A cemetery is proposed on <del>the</del> land to the north of <del>the Rowans Hospice with vehicular access from the proposed southern access road.</del> <u>Milk Lane, adjacent to the A3.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.11.2, in accordance with FPC12.03.



MOD 12.42	<p>Paragraph 12.71</p> <p><del>Provision should be made for formal and informal recreation and open space in line with Winchester's and Havant's standards of provision, taking into account existing deficiencies in the local area. This should include provision for children's play, sports grounds (including playing pitches) and general open space. There is an identified shortfall of playing fields and sports pitches in both the Waterlooville and Denmead areas, which new development will exacerbate unless appropriate new provision is made. An area of land within Havant Borough's part of the MDA adjoining London Road and Plant Farm is proposed in the Havant Borough-Wide Local Plan as an urban park. The proposed urban park is intended to include provision for part of the MDA sports pitch requirement.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.13.3.
MOD 12.43	<p>Paragraph 12.73</p> <p><del>..The area to the south of Purbrook Heath Road has been specifically highlighted on Inset Map 41 as an area for improved and enhanced recreation and public access, both to serve the needs of the new community and to protect its character and value to the setting of Portsdown Hill.</del></p>	To avoid conflict with Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.2.5(a), in accordance with FPC 12.03.
MOD 12.44	<p>Paragraph 12.76</p> <p>The <del>ridgeline</del> <u>highest point</u> running across the centre of the area should form part of the structural landscape framework.... ..The <del>ridgeline</del> <u>highest point</u> is visible in long distance views from Portsdown Hill in the south and the East Hampshire AONB to the north, and this will need to be taken into account when devising the structural landscaping framework.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.2.5(f), in accordance with FPC12.B(i).
MOD 12.45	<p>Paragraph 12.80</p> <p>A local gap to protect the separate identity of Denmead has been designated. <del>The area of south of Purbrook Heath Road should also be kept free from development and is set aside for recreational use and to enable improvements in public access to the countryside. This will respect the landscape quality of the area and help to protect the setting of Portsdown Hill.</del></p>	To avoid conflict with Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.2.5(a), in accordance with FPC 12.03.
MOD 12.46	<p><b>Policy NC.3</b></p> <p><b>..(i) a comprehensive Masterplan for the development has</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.15.59 (a) and

	<p><i>been prepared <u>with the opportunity for the full participation and co-operation of</u> <del>and adopted by</del> <u>the Local Planning Authority, and which has received their endorsement.</u></i></p> <p>..(iv)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>adequate formal and informal public, private and amenity recreation land / open space, in accordance with Proposals DP.6, DP.7 and RT.3;</del> <u>adequate facilities and services to support the new community and to help integrate the development with the adjoining northern suburbs of Winchester. Facilities should include provision for local shopping, including a small / medium sized food-store, education, healthcare and other necessary community facilities.</u></li> </ul>	(b).
MOD 12.47	<p>Paragraph RD12.93</p> <p><del>Hampshire County Council is currently preparing supplementary planning guidance on developer contributions for a range of facilities, which will help to guide and determine developer contributions towards infrastructure and facilities for the new community.</del> The paragraphs above set out some of the main provision that will be required...</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.15.59 (a)

## Chapter 13: Settlements

### Introduction

The objections to the Proposals and text of Chapter 13: Settlements related to a number of different issues, and the City Council proposed no Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) in response to objections to this Chapter, but 5 Further Proposed Changes were put forward during the Inquiry.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. Most of the Inspector's recommendations give specific wording changes, and therefore none of his recommendations have required significant further work. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with all his recommendations, except for:**

- **Policy S.4 Abbey Mill**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Maps

- Inset Map 43 (Whiteley)

#### Wording changes to:

- Policy S.1 (Bishop's Waltham ponds)
- Policy S.2 (Land at Winchester Road / Malt Lane, Bishop's Waltham)
- Policy S.4 (Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham)
- Paragraphs 13.11 – 13.13 (Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham)
- Policy S.5 (Abbey Field, Bishop's Waltham)
- Paragraph 13.17 (Abbey Field, Bishop's Waltham)
- Policy S.7 (Freeman's Yard, Cheriton)
- Policy S.9 (Land at Hillsons Road Industrial Estate, Curdridge)
- Paragraph 13.66 (Development briefs for Whiteley)
- Policy S.19 (Whiteley Green, Whiteley)
- Paragraph 13.71 (Whiteley Green, Whiteley)
- Policy S.21 (Solent 2, Whiteley)

#### Deletion of policy and text:

- Policy S.12 (housing allocation at Forest Road/Southwick Road, Denmead) and paragraphs 13.39 – 13.42
- Policy S.13 (business allocation south of Forest Road, Denmead) and paragraphs 13.43 – 13.45
- Policy S.17 (mixed use allocation north and east of Rose Hill Garage, Waltham Chase) and paragraphs 13.60 – 13.64.

**NB. Details of proposed modifications to the Appendices, Glossary, and Proposals and Inset Maps, included in the Inspectors' recommendations for this Chapter, are set out in Chapter 15 following the Plan Chapters.**

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 13.1	<p><b>Policy S.1</b></p> <p><del>..(iii) the proposal accords with Proposals DP.3, HE.1, RT.1 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.3.4
MOD 13.2	<p><b>Policy S.2</b></p> <p><del>..(iii) accord with Proposals DP.3, H.5, H.7 and other relevant proposals of this Plan, and the general aims of the draft Malt Lane, Bishop's Waltham, Development Brief.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.3.4.
MOD 13.3	<p><b>Subheading</b> and paragraph 13.10 / RD13.07</p> <p><del>Employment</del> <b>Mixed Uses</b></p> <p>Land at Abbey Mill is currently not intensively used and is in need of environmental improvement. The area offers an opportunity for significant redevelopment for <del>business</del> <b>mixed residential and employment</b> uses, which will be encouraged so as to improve the environment and economic prosperity of the area.</p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7
MOD 13.4	<p><b>Policy S.4</b></p> <p><del>Approximately Mixed employment and residential development will be permitted on 1.9 hectares of land at Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham is suitable for business and general industrial development. Development proposals will be permitted provided that they:</del></p> <p>(i) <del>employment uses fall within [Use Classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industry), or B8 (Storage and Distribution)] constitute the majority of floorspace on the site and are integrated well with adjoining housing. A reduced level of employment provision may be accepted if it is necessitated by constraints and the need to achieve a viable development which meets other requirements of the Plan;</del></p> <p>(ii) <del>provide an adequate means of</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7, but excluding specific reference to the appeal and extant planning permission.

	<p>access to, and within, the site <u>is provided</u> from the B2177 roundabout, including any off-site improvements to Station Road and its junction, and/or traffic management and parking control measures, that may be required;</p> <p>(iii) <del>establish</del> a substantial landscape framework <u>is established</u> around and within the site by the retention of existing planting and the provision of substantial new planting, particularly along the southern boundary of the site, <del>in accordance with Proposal DP.5;</del></p> <p>(iv) <del>by means of</del> careful design and landscaping <u>are incorporated to</u> ensure that development does not intrude into both short and long views of the area;</p> <p>(v) <del>avoid harm to</del> the Bishop's Waltham Conservation Area and the Bishop's Waltham Palace and Ponds Scheduled Ancient Monument <u>are not adversely affected;</u></p> <p>(vi) <del>carry out site investigations, risk assessment and implement</del> appropriate remedial measures to deal with any contamination affecting the site or causing a threat to its surroundings <u>are investigated and implemented.</u> <del>(in accordance with Proposal DP.16);</del></p> <p><del>(vii) accord with Proposals HE.1 – HE.2, DP.3, DP.10 – DP.11, E.1 other relevant proposals of this Plan, and have regard to the provisions of the Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham, Development Brief.</del></p>	
MOD 13.5	<p>Paragraph 13.11          Proposal S.4 allows for a range of <del>employment</del> uses, but the site is in a very sensitive location, partly within Bishop's Waltham Conservation Area and the Bishop's Waltham Palace and Ponds Scheduled Ancient Monument. Any development must be very carefully designed and developers will need to investigate the extent of any contamination and put forward</p>	<p>Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7</p>

	<p>appropriate remediation measures. Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority will be flexible about the exact proportions of different types of <del>business</del> development that will be accepted, although it will encourage provision to be made for the inclusion of <del>businesses</del> <u>employment uses</u> already on the site.</p> <p>(Create new paragraph)  <u>The development could take the form of separate employment and housing areas, or live/work units, provided that the amount of employment floorspace exceeds the residential floorspace. A lower proportion would only be justified if further detailed studies identified a need for a lower amount of employment floorspace, taking account of relevant factors, for example, local employment needs and the effect on viability of</u> <del>If it is demonstrated that</del> requirements such as those relating to contamination <del>necessitate other uses to achieve viable development, these may exceptionally be permitted, in accordance with</del> <u>or flooding (see Policies Proposal DP.10 and DP.16).</u></p>	
MOD 13.6	<p>Paragraph 13.12  <del>The Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham Development Brief provides detailed guidance for the development of land in the Abbey Mill area. Proposals for the site will be expected to comply with the Development Brief, which will require updating, and the provisions of Proposal S.4.</del> A new access from Station Road will be required to serve the development, as well as the carrying out of improvements to Station Road and its junctions and the introduction of traffic management measures. <u>Proposals should include a Travel Plan (see Policy T.1) and provision is also likely to be needed for contributions to off-site works to improve access and maximise the sustainability of the overall transport solution (see Policy T.5).</u> Some car parking provision could be made within Abbey Field (see also Proposal S.5) subject to approximately half the spaces provided being for public use. Before granting planning permission for such proposals, the Local Planning Authority will wish to secure satisfactory planning obligations to ensure that the provision of public car</p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7

	parking and open space is achieved.	
MOD 13.7	<p>New paragraph (after existing paragraph 13.12)</p> <p><u>Developers will be expected to enter into planning obligations to ensure the agreed proportions of employment and residential development (including affordable housing) are provided through a phased programme. This should encourage retention of existing employment uses and address works and/or contributions for decontamination, flood measures, access and transport infrastructure improvements, landscaping (including, if possible, restoration of the open water course), open space and other requirements of the Policy.</u></p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7
MOD 13.8	<p>Paragraph 13.13</p> <p>Landscaping will need to be reinforced and new planting provided, as required by Proposal DP.5 <del>and the Development Brief</del>. The development should incorporate an interesting roofscape and attractive ancillary and parking areas.</p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7
MOD 13.9	<p>Paragraph 13.16</p> <p>The open area between Abbey Mill and the Palace House is part of an important open area running through the centre of Bishop's Waltham. It provides an attractive setting for the Bishop's Palace and its environs, is part of the Bishop's Waltham Palace and Ponds Scheduled Ancient Monument, and acts as a buffer between the Palace and <del>the existing and proposed business uses at</del> Abbey Mill.</p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7
MOD 13.10	<p><b>Policy S.5</b></p> <p><b><i>The area between between Abbey Mill and Palace House is suitable for development as informal public open space and for the provision of a carefully designed and landscaped car park (confined to the lower part of the site), <del>provided such development has regard to the provisions of the Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham, Development Brief (which sets out detailed guidance for the development of this site) and accords with Proposals HE.1 - HE.2, DP.3, DP.10 - DP.11 and other relevant proposals of this Plan. Development which threatens</del></i></b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.5.3, and consequential changes reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7.

	<i>the retention of this area, both as an important open space and as a buffer between the existing and proposed <b>business</b> uses at Abbey Mill and the Palace and its setting, will not be permitted.</i>	
MOD 13.11	<p>Paragraph 13.17</p> <p>Proposal S.5 provides for part of the area to be laid out and managed as an amenity public open space, which may also be of benefit to visitors to the Palace and <b>residents or</b> employees at the proposed <b>business mixed use</b> site at Abbey Mill. The development of some of the site for car parking may also be permitted, in association with the development of the Abbey Mill site, subject to the need to avoid harm to the Bishop's Waltham Conservation Area and the Palace and Ponds ancient monument. Legal safeguards will be needed to secure the provision of public car parking and open space (see also Proposal S.4 and accompanying text). <del>The Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham, Development Brief provides more detailed guidance on the development of this sensitive site and will be updated.</del></p>	Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7
MOD 13.12	<p><b>Policy S.7</b></p> <p><i>(i) <b>business uses (Use Class B1) constitute <del>the majority of not less than 35% of</del> floorspace on the site, and are integrated well with adjoining housing. —A reduced level of employment provision may be accepted if it is necessitated by constraints such as access, and the need to accommodate <del>other requirements of the Plan;</del></b></i></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.7.8.
MOD 13.13	<p><b>Policy S.9</b></p> <p><i>In order to encourage improvements to industrial, warehouse, and business premises within the Hillsons Road Industrial Estate, development and redevelopment will be permitted, <del>provided that it accords with Proposals DP.3, E.1 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></i></p> <p><del>..(v) accord with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.9.5.



MOD 13.14	<p><b>Policy S.12</b>  <del>Approximately 2.5 hectares of land north of Forest Road and west of Southwick Road, Denmead, is suitable for residential development, which will be permitted, provided that:</del></p> <p><del>(i) it provides appropriate access from Forest Road and contributes to any off-site highway or other infrastructure provision/improvements required as a result of development;</del></p> <p><del>(ii) it includes measures to avoid harm to the nature conservation interest of the adjoining land to the north-west, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, including the maintenance of an appropriate supply of water, in accordance with Proposal C.9;</del></p> <p><del>(iii) it provides appropriate landscaping on the boundaries of the site and within it, to create a new landscape edge to the settlement and a landscape framework for the development;</del></p> <p><del>(iv) it provides adequate public, private and amenity recreation/open space, in accordance with Proposals RT.3, DP.6 and DP.7;</del></p> <p><del>(v) it accords with Proposals DP.3, H.5, H.7, other relevant proposals of this Plan, and the Harvest Home, Forest Road, Denmead, Development Brief (2001).</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.10.2.
MOD 13.15	<p>Paragraph 13.39  <del>The site is suitable for a variety of house types and sizes, which should be provided to ensure a balanced mix of housing, including affordable housing, in accordance with Proposals H.5 and H.7. Its layout should reflect the location of the site on the edge of the settlement and protect the amenities of surrounding development, whilst satisfying the density requirements of Proposal H.7. A planning brief ("Land to the Rear of Harvest Home, Forest Road, Denmead</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.10.2.

	<del>Development Brief") has been adopted, giving more detailed guidance on these matters.</del>	
MOD 13.16	Paragraph 13.40 <del>Vehicular access should be from Forest Road. Parking provision for the existing public house should be retained or replaced.</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.10.2.
MOD 13.17	Paragraph 13.41 <del>A substantial amount of planting along Forest Road will be needed to provide a new edge to the village and soften the appearance of the development. The north-western boundary, adjoining the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), will also require appropriate treatment, taking account of the need to avoid harm to the nature conservation interest of the site. The development should incorporate appropriate measures to prevent damage to this area, particularly by avoiding harmful changes to the hydrology of the area. Scope exists for the existing stream passing through the site to be retained and enhanced as a feature within the development (see the Development Brief).</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.10.2.
MOD 13.18	Paragraph 13.42 <del>The provision of children's play space, which is well related to the residential properties and forms an integral part of the development, will be expected in accordance with Proposals RT.3 and RT.5.</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.10.2.
MOD 13.19	<b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 13.43 <b>Employment</b> <del>The current Winchester District Local Plan allocates land to the south of Forest Road for business development. Most of the site is now developed, but the allocation is carried forward into this Plan so as to ensure that remaining development accords with the principles applied to the early units.</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.11.7.
MOD 13.20	<b>Policy S.13</b> <del>Approximately 2.8 hectares of land south of Forest Road, Denmead is suitable for business development (Use Class B1), which will be permitted, provided that:</del>  <del>(i) it achieves a high standard of design appropriate to the site and is restricted in height to 7</del>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.11.7.

	<p><del>metres to minimise intrusion in views into the site;</del></p> <p><del>(ii) it retains and reinforces existing landscaping around and within the site and provides substantial new planting to create a landscape framework for the development, in accordance with Proposal DP.5. This should include the provision of a perimeter tree belt of at least 20 metres in width;</del></p> <p><del>(iii) it accords with Proposals DP.3, E.1 and other relevant proposals of this Plan, and the provisions of the Pottery Site, Denmead, Industrial Development Brief.</del></p>	
MOD 13.21	<p>Paragraph 13.44</p> <p><del>The Pottery Site Industrial Development Brief sets out the Local Planning Authority's detailed requirements for this site. The area is within a woodland setting and the existing development is designed to a high standard. This should be reflected in any new development. To prevent new development being prominent and intrusive in views from the surrounding countryside, the maximum height of buildings above the existing ground level should not exceed 7 metres.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.11.7.
MOD 13.22	<p>Paragraph 13.45</p> <p><del>The layout of the site should provide for the retention and reinforcement of existing landscape features within the site and for substantial new landscaping to enhance the appearance of the development and create enclosures around the clusters of buildings. Development proposals should not encroach on structural landscaping around the perimeter of the industrial area, which is to be provided at a minimum width of 20 metres, nor result in the loss of open amenity or parking areas.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.11.7.
MOD 13.23	<p><b>Subheadings</b> and paragraph 13.60</p> <p><b>Waltham Chase</b></p> <p><b>Mixed use</b></p> <p><del>Waltham Chase has very few employment opportunities within the</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.

	<p><del>village. A large site comprising the area to the north of Rose Hill Garage and the adjoining vehicle breakers yard is likely to become available for redevelopment and is suitable for accommodating a significant proportion of employment uses within a mixed use development.</del></p>	
MOD 13.24	<p><b>Policy S.17</b>  <del>Mixed business and residential development will be permitted on approximately 2.2 hectares of land to the north and east of Rose Hill Garage, Waltham Chase, provided that:</del></p> <p><del>(i) business uses (Use Class B1) constitute the majority of floorspace on the site and are integrated well with adjoining housing;</del></p> <p><del>(ii) a planning brief is produced and agreed by the Local Planning Authority, presenting the best options for locating the intended uses within the site;</del></p> <p><del>(iii) it is accessed by a new junction on Winchester Road, enabling the closure and visual improvement of the existing vehicle breaker's access in Solomons Lane;</del></p> <p><del>(iv) provision is made for a footpath link from Winchester Road to the Primary School;</del></p> <p><del>(v) it retains and reinforces existing planting on the northern boundary of the site and makes other provision, as necessary, to protect the valuable ecology of the Waltham Chase Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest to the north, in accordance with Proposals DP.5 and G.8;</del></p> <p><del>(vi) provision is made for the improvement of local recreational space and facilities in accordance with the requirements of Proposal RT.3;</del></p> <p><del>(vii) it accords with Proposals DP.3, H.5, H.7, E.1 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.
MOD 13.25	<p>Paragraph 13.61  <del>Part of this site is allocated for employment use in the current</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.

	<p><del>Winchester District Local Plan and most of the remainder of the site is in employment type use. Accordingly, employment should be the dominant use of the site. The site is more suitable for uses falling within Use Class B1 (Business), than those in Classes B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) as these would be more likely to affect nearby housing adversely and/or generate higher levels of traffic.</del></p>	
MOD 13.26	<p>Paragraph 13.62</p> <p><del>Although the site is in several ownerships, which could be developed separately, it should be comprehensively planned. Developers will be required to produce a planning brief, which should address the relationships between the uses proposed, the site constraints and opportunities (including the proximity of the adjoining SSSI and the scope to provide a footpath link and open space well related to the school), and the phasing of development. This should include measures to ensure that employment development takes place in the early phases.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.
MOD 13.27	<p>Paragraph 13.63</p> <p><del>The site is in a prominent position on Winchester Road. The design of buildings and landscaping should take this into account. Particular care should be exercised to ensure that the valuable ecology of the Waltham Chase Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest, to the north, is not harmed. Existing trees and hedges on the northern boundary should be retained and additional planting undertaken, to provide a "buffer zone" between the SSSI and the development site.</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.
MOD 13.28	<p>Paragraph 13.64</p> <p><del>Access to the site should be from Winchester Road (B2177) by a new junction, possibly a roundabout, also serving Brooklynn Close. The existing breaker's yard access to Solomons Lane should be closed, enabling traffic and visual improvements to be achieved. In order to improve pedestrian safety, a footpath should be provided through the site, from Winchester Road to the Primary School. In meeting the requirements</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.15.5.

	<p><del>for any housing development to provide adequate recreational open space, there may be an opportunity to provide a children's play area, well related to the school and in a part of the village with limited current provision.</del></p>	
MOD 13.29	<p>Paragraph 13.66 Development briefs have been prepared for all of the development areas within the Winchester District part of Whiteley. All development proposals should take account of the guidance contained in these, and any future documents. <del>Generally, they do not override the policies of this Plan. Rather they</del> <u>Development briefs</u> are intended to amplify <del>its</del> <u>the</u> policies of <u>this Plan</u>, for example to illustrate possible layouts of development areas, or include matters of administrative detail inappropriate in a local plan.</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.16.2.
MOD 13.30	<p><b>Policy S.19</b>  <i>..(i) includes provision for landscaping and tree planting belts of at least 20 metres <del>width</del> adjoining the M27 to <u>protect the amenities of occupiers of the proposed housing from noise and to screen the development from external views</u> <del>minimise road traffic noise so as to protect the amenities of the occupiers of the proposed housing;</del></i>  <i>..(iv) ...Provision should be made for <u>a safe and attractive footpath and cycleway network</u>, and for the development to <u>have convenient access to</u> <del>be fully served by</del> public transport <del>(see also Proposal T.3);</del></i>  <i>..(v) provides <u>a</u> neighbourhood greens within <u>the</u> new housing areas <del>(see also Proposal RT.3);</del></i>  <i>..(vii) <del>accords with Proposals DP.3, H.5, H.7 and other relevant proposals of this Plan, and the requirements of the Whiteley Area 2 Development Brief.</del></i></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.17.7 (a), (b) and (c).
MOD 13.31	<p>Paragraph 13.71 <del>The Whiteley Green site is a greenfield area that does not yet have the benefit of planning permission. In accordance with the "sequential approach" being</del></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.17.7 (d).

	<p><del>promoted for housing development, it is appropriate to hold back its development in favour of alternatives within built-up areas. Accordingly, development of this site will only be permitted if monitoring of housing land availability in this housing market area indicates a shortfall of supply that the site could help to meet. It is expected, however, that the site would be released in advance of the “reserve” housing sites at West of Waterlooville and Winchester City (North).</del></p>	
MOD 13.32	<p><b>Policy S.21</b>  <i>....provided that it:</i>  <del>(i) is not developed until the Solent 1 Business Park is substantially completed;....</del>    (ii) ..., and by carrying out additional planting, <del>in accordance with Proposal DP.5,</del> having particular regard to areas of ecological interest within the site;    <del>(iv) complies with criteria (ii)-(vi) of Proposal S.20 and the provisions of the Solent 2 Development Brief.</del></p>	<p>Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 13.18.7 (a), in accordance with FPC13.E, 3.18.7(b) and 3.18.7(c).</p>
MOD 13.33	<p><b>Subheading</b> and Paragraph 13.84  <b>District Town Centre</b>  The <u>former</u> District Centre has now been developed...</p>	<p>Inspector’s recommendation, paragraph 8.3.11, in accordance with FPCs 13.A and 13.B.</p>





## Chapter 14: Implementation

### Introduction

The objections to Chapter 14: Implementation related to each of the sections of the Chapter, and the City Council proposed no Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) or Further Proposed Changes (FPCs) in response to objections to this Chapter.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations and his Addendum to this Chapter. The Addendum cross-refers to his recommendation in relation to Chapter 6, at paragraph 6.8.3, which recommends the inclusion of additional text on neighbourhood plans within this Chapter. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with these recommendations.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Wording change to:

- Paragraph 14.11 (developers' contributions)

#### New section:

- New subheading and paragraph following paragraph 14.21 (Community Involvement)

Modification Number	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification / Source
MOD 14.1	<p>Paragraph 14.11</p> <p>In the case of new housing developments, developers should <del>make provision for the</del> provide appropriate <del>amount of</del> recreational space where <u>their development would exacerbate current</u> <del>there are currently</del> deficiencies <u>of recreational land, in terms of land area, standard or quality.</u> <del>and, where it</del> <u>If recreational space and facilities are</u> <del>is</del> provided on the site, <u>developers should</u> contribute towards <u>their</u> <del>its</del> maintenance. Where a development is too small for the recreational space required to be provided on the site (as is likely to be the case in many new housing developments), recreational land should be provided off the site, or contributions made to enable it to be provided by the <del>Local Authorities</del> <u>City or Parish Councils, through the Open Space Funding System.</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 14.2.2.
MOD 14.2	<p>New paragraph, following paragraph 14.21</p> <p><u>There are a number of ways that local</u></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.8.3 and his addendum in paragraph

	<p><u>communities can become involved in the implementation process in their areas. The preparation of Village or Neighbourhood Design Statements by local communities is an established way of influencing the design process, and Local Area Design Statements can also be prepared for smaller areas within neighbourhoods, where there are particular design issues. Once completed, these Design Statements can be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents, and therefore will be material considerations in planning decisions.</u></p>	<p>14.5.1.</p>
<p>MOD 14.3</p>	<p>Second new paragraph, following paragraph 14.21  <u>Local communities may also become involved in other types of community plans. However, unless they are aimed at providing more detailed guidance to supplement a specific Local Plan policy, and therefore can be used to determine planning applications in the area, they would not be appropriate for adoption as supplementary planning guidance. Some may focus on a single issue, like the community plans referred to in paragraph 6.19 of this Plan, which were aimed at identifying development opportunities within particular areas. Others may cover a range of different issues, such as those addressed in parish plans. Although not appropriate for adoption as Supplementary Planning Documents, they may be used to inform the planning process.</u></p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.8.3.</p>

## Chapter 15: Appendices, Glossary and Maps

### Introduction

The Inspectors' Report covers objections to the Appendices, Glossary and Maps in Chapter 15. They related to a number of different issues, and the City Council proposed no Pre Inquiry Changes (PICs) in response to objections to this Chapter. However, 5 Further Proposed Changes were proposed during the Inquiry.

### Proposed Modifications

Within the attached schedule, Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review are put forward to reflect the Inspector's recommendations. **The Council proposes to modify the Plan in accordance with these recommendations, except:**

- **the extension of the Sparsholt settlement boundary – MOD 6.59.**

### Summary of Inspector's recommendations

#### Maps:

- Identification of Local Reserve allocations at:
  - Pitt Manor, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
  - Worthy Road/Francis Gardens, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
  - Little Frenchies Field, Denmead (Inset Map 8)
  - Spring Gardens, New Alresford (Inset Map 20)
- Changes to the defined policy boundaries of:
  - Colden Common (Inset Map 3)
  - Corhampton (Inset Map 6)
  - Droxford Inset Map (Inset Map 9)
  - Kings Worthy (Inset Map 15)
  - New Alresford (Inset Map 20)
  - Sparsholt (Inset Map 34)
  - Swanmore (Inset Map 37)
  - Twyford (Inset Map 38)
- Changes to RT.1 and/or RT.2 designations at:
  - Denmead Junior School (Inset Map 8)
  - Former railway cutting between New Farm Road and Bridge Road, New Alresford (Inset Map 20)
  - Land at Sun Hill School, New Alresford (Inset Map 20)
  - Land between Berewecke Road and Berewecke Way, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
  - St John's Croft, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
  - Winton House, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
- Changes to the RT.4 allocation:
  - West of Arlebury Park, New Alresford (Inset Map 20)
  - Between Harestock Road, Kennel Lane and Littleton Road, Winchester (Inset Map 45)
- Changes to, or deletion of, other designations at:
  - Bishop's Waltham (Inset Map 1)
  - Denmead (Inset Map 8)
  - Knowle (Inset Map 16)
  - Waltham Chase (Inset Map 40)
  - West of Waterlooville (Inset Map 41) (see MOD12.27)
  - Whiteley (Inset Map 43)
  - Wickham (Inset Map 44)

- Replacement of the map in Appendix 2 with a larger scale map on an OS base (Landscape Character Areas)
- Inclusion of a map as Appendix 4, showing all designations (Nature Conservation Sites)
- Amendment of Proposals Map and Inset Maps to include 10km radius consultation area for wind turbine developments within the Southampton Airport Safeguarding Zones

**Wording change to:**

- Glossary (Built-up Area and Affordable Housing)

<b>Modification Number</b>	<b>Proposed Modification</b>	<b>Reason for Modification / Source</b>
MOD 15.1	<b>Appendix 2</b> Replace the Landscape Character Area Map with a larger scale map on an OS base.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 4.7.8 (a).
MOD 15.2	<b>Appendix 4</b> Include Map showing nature conservation sites of all designations.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraphs 4.10.5 and 4.12.5.
MOD 15.3	<b>Glossary</b> Amend definitions for:  <b>..Built-up Area</b> An area within a settlement defined by a policy boundary ( <del>Proposal Policy H.2</del> or a development frontage (H.3)). ....  <b>..Affordable Housing</b> Housing provided, with subsidy, for <del>local</del> people who are unable to resolve their housing <del>needs</del> requirements in the <del>private—sector</del> local housing sector market because of the relationship between housing costs and incomes.	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 15.3.3 (a).  Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 15.3.3 (b), and to provide consistency with the definition in paragraph 6.35 of the Plan, proposed to be modified in accordance with Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.12.7(a), with additional clarification.
MOD 15.4	<b>Glossary</b> Add the following definitions:  <u>Neighbourhood Design Statement</u> An advisory document, usually produced by the local community, suggesting how development might be carried out in harmony with the neighbourhood. A Neighbourhood Design Statement can be given weight by being approved as a Supplementary Planning Document.  <u>Local Area Design Statement</u> An advisory document, usually	Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.8.3  Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph

	<p><u>produced for part of a neighbourhood with specific design issues. The Statement might address how development should be carried out in the area in a way which respects the character of the neighbourhood. A Local Area Design Statement can be given weight by being approved as a Supplementary Planning Document.</u></p> <p><b>Rural Exception Sites</b>  <u>Small sites, within and adjoining existing villages, which the Local Plan would not otherwise release for housing, which may be developed specifically for affordable housing, to meet local needs in perpetuity.</u></p>	<p>6.8.3</p> <p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.14.20(a).</p>
MOD 15.5	<p><b>Maps: Key Sheet</b>  In the section "Within the policy boundaries and development frontages of the settlements, the following general proposals may apply:" <u>add, after DP.1 – DP.18, CE.6 – CE.10</u> (including re-numbered new proposals).</p> <p><u>Add symbol and notation for Conservation Areas.</u></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendations, paragraph 4.1.11(b), in accordance with PIC04.01 and FPC04.01, and 4.1.11(d).</p>
MOD 15.6	<p><b>Maps: Proposals Map, Inset Maps and Key Sheet</b>  <u>Add current Plan stage and date in an appropriate location. Improve clarity of overlaying notations.</u></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 4.1.11(b), in accordance with PIC04.01, 4.1.11(c), and 4.4.14.</p>
MOD 15.7	<p><b>Inset Map 1: Bishop's Waltham</b>  <u>Amend S.4 notation from 'Employment Use Proposed' (blue) to 'Mixed Use Proposed' (violet).</u></p>	<p>Consequential change reflecting Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.4.7</p>
MOD 15.8	<p><b>Inset Map 3: Colden Common</b>  <u>Revise settlement boundary to include the eastern end of Dunford's scrap yard.</u></p> <p><b>See Map 1 attached</b></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.22.11.</p>
MOD 15.9	<p><b>Inset Map 6: Corhampton</b>  <u>Revise settlement boundary to include land west of New Cottages up to and including Corhampton Cottage, and land within the domestic curtilage of Stocks Meadow.</u></p> <p><b>See Maps 2 and 3 attached</b></p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.24.6.</p>

MOD 15.10	<p><b>Inset Map 8: Denmead</b> Revise Inset Map to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Revise Inset Map to identify Little Frenchies Field as a Local Reserve housing allocation).</li> <li>• Delete RT.1 designation from Denmead Junior School. (NB RT.2 designation remains)</li> <li>• Delete Policy S.12 and housing notation, and Policy S.13, and employment use notation)</li> </ul> <p><b>See Maps 4 - 7 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 6.26.23, 9.3.19(j), 13.10.12 and 13.11.7.
MOD 15.11	<p><b>Inset Map 9: Droxford</b> Revise settlement boundary to include existing development at Union Lane.</p> <p><b>See Map 8 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.27.7.
MOD 15.12	<p><b>Inset Map 15: Kings Worthy</b> Revise settlement boundary to include the car park in Springvale Road, Headbourne Worthy.</p> <p><b>See Map 9 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.32.20.
MOD 15.13	<p><b>Inset Map 16: Knowle</b> Update to reflect deletion of the Knowle Policy NC.1.</p>	Consequential to Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 12.1.11.
MOD 15.14	<p><b>Inset Map 20: New Alresford</b> Revise Inset Map to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete the RT.1 designation from the former railway cutting;</li> <li>• Add RT.1 designation to the open land in the north-east corner of Sun Hill School;</li> <li>• Extend the RT.4 allocation northwards on land west of Arlebury Park, to encompass the remainder of the field, so that its northern limit co-incides with the existing field boundary;</li> <li>• Identify land at Spring Gardens as a Local Reserve housing allocation;</li> <li>• Extend settlement boundary to include the affordable housing at Watercress Meadows (see Appendix 2 Map 6)</li> </ul> <p><b>See Maps 10 - 14 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 6.36.20(a), (b), (c), and (d), 9.3.19(h) and (i), and 9.5.10(b), but including deletion of the RT.1 designation of the whole area of the former railway cutting, for consistency.

MOD 15.15	<p><b>Inset Map 34: Sparsholt</b> Extend settlement boundary to include land at Church Farm and the existing affordable housing at Bostock Close.</p> <p><b>See Map 15 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.48.15, but excluding land at and adjacent to Sparsholt School.
MOD 15.16	<p><b>Inset Map 37: Swanmore</b> Extend settlement boundary to include the remaining garden area of Michaelmas House.</p> <p><b>See Map 16 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.51.9.
MOD 15.17	<p><b>Inset Map 38: Twyford</b> Extend settlement boundary to include the Doctor's surgery and car park.</p> <p><b>See Map 17 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.52.15
MOD 15.18	<p><b>Inset Map 40: Waltham Chase</b> Delete Policy S.17 and mixed use notation.</p> <p><b>See Map 18 attached</b></p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.5.5.
MOD 15.19	<p><b>Inset Map 41: West of Waterlooville</b> Update to relocate the cemetery notation, adjust housing and 'reserve' housing notations, adjust employment/housing to reflect mixed-use areas, and delete 'informal recreation' notation south of Purbrook Heath Road, to reflect the approved Masterplan Layout.</p>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 12.2.5(a), 12.11.2 in accordance with FPC 12.03, and 15.4.7.
MOD 15.20	<p><b>Inset Map 43: Whiteley</b> Revise area of Policy S.20 (Solent 1) to reflect the area of the allocation still to be developed (if any) at the time the Plan is adopted)</p>	Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 13.18.7 (a), in accordance with FPC13.D.
MOD 15.21	<p><b>Inset Map 44: Wickham</b> Revise area subject to Policy SF.4 (primary shopping area)</p> <p><b>See Map 19 attached</b></p>	To reflect the recognised extent of the Primary Shopping Area.
MOD 15.22	<p><b>Inset Map 45: Winchester</b> Revise Inset Map to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify land at Pitt Manor and at Worthy Road / Francis Gardens as Local Reserve housing allocations.</li> <li>• Delete the RT.1 designation from St John's Croft.</li> <li>• Delete RT.2 designation from Winton House, Winchester, where there is no recreational</li> </ul>	Inspector's recommendations, paragraphs 6.57.28(a) & (b), 9.3.19(e), (f) and (g), and 9.5.10(a).

	<p>use. (NB RT.1 designation remains).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete RT.1/RT.2 designation from the western side of the area between Bereweke Road and Bereweke Way, and from the Bereweke Way omission site.</li> <li>• Delete RT.4 designation from land between Harestock Road, Kennel Lane and Littleton Road, north of Winchester.</li> </ul> <p><b>See Maps 20 - 24 attached</b></p>	
MOD 15.21	<p><b>RD Map 46a: Aerodrome Safeguarding Map</b>  (Amend to show the area within which NATS should be consulted on wind turbine proposals (10km of Southampton Airport) and by addition to Key).</p>	<p>Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 3.11.2, in accordance PIC03.08 and FPC 03.E (which includes FPC Map. B).</p>
MOD 15.22	<p><b>Proposals Map</b>  (Delete H.3 settlement Inset Map boxes)</p>	<p>Consequence of Inspector's recommendation, paragraph 6.10.11.</p>