

PDC857
FOR DECISION
WARD(S): SPARSHOLT

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

14 June 2010

WINCHESTER NORTH MAJOR DEVELOPMENT AREA (BARTON FARM)
(09/02412/OUT and 10/01063/OUT)

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING MANAGEMENT

Contact Officer : Nicholas Parker (Tel 01962 848 573) nparker@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

PDC422 – Barton Farm Application (Update) – 26 May 2004

PDC464 – Barton Farm Application – 22 September 2004

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT:

Barton Farm Andover Road Winchester Hampshire SO22 6AX

Development of approximately 93.1 hectares of land at Barton Farm to the east of Andover Road, Winchester to provide 2000 dwellings (to include 40% affordable housing); a local centre including: a new primary school, a children's pre-school nursery, a retail food store up to 2000 sq m, a community building, a health centre, a district energy centre, car parking and other commercial, leisure and community floor space (to include use classes A1 (food and non-food retail), class A2 (financial and professional services), class A3 (restaurants and cafes), class A4 (drinking establishments), class A5 (hot food take away), class D1 (non-residential institutions), class D2 (assembly/leisure) and class B1 (a) (offices)); formal and informal recreational spaces; park and ride facility for up to 200 cars; land for allotments; hard and soft landscaping; storm water attenuation and foul and surface water drainage measures; the re-routing of Andover Road through the site; the closure of Andover Road to vehicular traffic in the vicinity of Henry Beaufort School; the creation of a pedestrian and cycle route along the route of Andover Road; new roads infrastructure; the formation of new public rights-of-way across the site and new route linking the railway underpass to Worthy Road; improvement and upgrading of existing public rights of way; provision of and diversion of services as necessary and provision of on- and off-site infrastructure necessary to facilitate development of the site (OUTLINE).

RECOMMENDATION:

That the applications be refused for the reasons set out in pages 67 and 69 of this Report.

INTRODUCTION

This report considers the two identical planning applications (09/02412/OUT and 10/01063/OUT) that have been submitted by Cala Homes (South) Ltd for the Reserve Winchester North Major Development Area (MDA) on land at Barton Farm.

In relation to the first application submitted in November last year (09/2412/OUT) Cala Homes lodged an appeal against non-determination on 19th April 2010 and therefore this proposal is scheduled to the subject of a public inquiry in September this year after which a decision regarding whether or not to grant outline planning permission will be made by the Secretary of State. The Council cannot therefore permit or refuse permission as the Secretary of State now has jurisdiction over the application. The purpose therefore of reporting this application to committee is to establish how the Council would have decided the proposal if an appeal against non-determination had not been lodged.

On 6th April 2010 Cala Homes submitted supplementary information in response to the advice received from consultees and stakeholders on the first outline planning application (09/02412/OUT). The supplementary information related to the following planning issues:

- Planning Policy
- Affordable Housing
- Green Infrastructure/Landscape
- Community Infrastructure
- Ecology/Biodiversity
- Design and Access Statement
- Design/Commission for Architecture & Built Environment (CABE)
- Waste Management/Environmental Performance
- Transport

Re-consultation took place on the supplementary information with the relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees and stakeholders. The period for this exercise expired on 30th April 2010. Consideration of the updated application will be detailed in the planning considerations section of this report.

This report also considers the duplicate application ref. 10/01063/OUT submitted by Cala Homes (South) Ltd submitted on 27th April 2010. The duplicate planning application is identical to the updated original application. The applicant has chosen to submit a duplicate application to allow the Council the opportunity to determine the proposal. In the event that the Council resolves to grant permission for the second application the applicant would be able to withdraw the appeal.

The duplicate application has been subject to the necessary publicity and consultation but in doing so, the Council has made it clear that all comments received on the original application would also be taken into account in determining the duplicate application and therefore, unless consultees or members of the public wished to, there was no need for them to resubmit (in respect of the second application) their original comments which they had made on the first.

All comments (on both applications) from members of the public are summarised in section 8.0 below. A summary of all consultation responses are appended to this report.

SITE DESCRIPTION

1.1 The application site relates to the area of land occupying approximately 93.1 hectares identified as the Winchester City (North) Major Development Area Reserve Site by policy MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan.

1.2 The application site relates to an area of undulating arable farm land located approximately 1km north of Winchester railway station and 2km from the city centre. The land within the application site comprises 87 hectares of land owned by CALA Homes and a further 6 hectares of land within the limits of the public highway required to deliver the access proposals.

1.3 The site is bounded to the west by the residential areas of Weeke and Harestock, which adjoin the Andover Road corridor; to the east by the London to Southampton railway line, which runs along an embankment for the majority of the length of the eastern boundary; and to the north by open farmland that gently rises upwards from Well House Lane. The northern boundary of the site is defined by Well House Lane and the mature evergreen hedgerow that adjoins the highway.

1.4 A ridgeline running from the west to the north-east across the site divides the site into two similarly sized parcels of land. To the south of the ridgeline the land is relatively enclosed, while north of the ridge the aspect is far more open and visible on approach from the north. The ridgeline comprises a shelter belt of mature beech trees at its eastern end and a semi-mature hedgerow containing young copper beech trees to the west. The western boundary, adjoining Andover Road, is defined to the south of the ridgeline by a linear group of mature sycamores. To the north of the central ridgeline the feature continues, although the size and quality of the trees diminishes towards the junction with Well House Lane.

1.5 Barton Farm itself, and the associated buildings located to the south of the ridgeline and Well House Cottage/Well House Farm close to the northern site boundary, are excluded from the application site.

1.6 The application site includes the entire length of Andover Road/Andover Road North between the southern boundary of the site and the junction with Harestock Road and Well House Lane in the north. Sections of Harestock Road and Well House Lane are included within the application site to facilitate the proposed access strategy.

1.7 The area of farm land to the east of the railway line is not included within the application boundary of the site but is shown to be within the ownership of the applicant. The area of farmland is bounded by Worthy Lane to the east, and the rear boundaries of properties on Courtney Road and Colley Close to the south. To the north is a mature landscape boundary to dwellings in Headbourne Worthy.

PLANNING HISTORY

The adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review – Policy MDA2

2.1 The Hampshire County Structure Plan Review (2001) allocated a 'reserve' MDA of 2000 dwellings for land to the north of Winchester City, although it did not identify a specific site. The Winchester District Local Plan Review identified an 'area of search' and assessed several potential sites within it, as part of the process of finding a site. There was extensive assessment work and consultation leading to the selection and allocation of Barton Farm as a reserve MDA in the adopted Local Plan Review (2006). This was fully examined and tested by independent Inspectors, both through the Local Plan Inquiry process and the previous planning appeal (see section 2.4 below). The Local Plan Review remains part of the statutory Development Plan (alongside the South East Plan) and Barton Farm is therefore formally allocated as a strategic reserve site for 2000 dwellings through policy MDA2.

LDF Core Strategy Preferred Option

2.2 Following adoption of the Local Plan Review in 2006, work started on the Local Development Framework with the first part of the LDF being the Core Strategy. One of the purposes of the Core Strategy is to establish the planning and development strategy for the District or its sub-areas and to identify how the housing requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy (now the South East Plan) will be met. The process of preparing the Core Strategy has required considerable public involvement, through the discussion of issues, options for development, and a preferred option. In terms of housing requirements, the District is split between the 'PUSH' (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire) area and the 'rest of Hampshire' area. Winchester falls within the non-PUSH part of the District and various options for dealing with the housing requirements for this area have been developed and consulted upon.

2.3 The resulting strategy concentrates the majority of development for the non-PUSH area in Winchester because it is the largest and most sustainable settlement in this part of the District. Much of the non-PUSH part of the District is now within the South Downs National Park and the only other higher level (Core Strategy Level 1) settlement is Alresford. It is, therefore, clear that in order to achieve the scale of housing development currently required a large 'strategic allocation' is needed at Winchester. As part of the Core Strategy's production, potential sites around the town (not just to the north) were assessed and consulted on, resulting in an allocation for 2000 dwellings at Barton Farm being identified as the 'preferred option'. The Core Strategy Preferred Option document was published in 2009 and includes an allocation (policy WT2) for 2000 dwellings and supporting uses. The current application has been assessed against the requirements of this policy as well as those of the Local Plan.

Previous planning application

2.4 An earlier outline planning application was submitted to the City Council in March 2004 ref. 04/00289/OUT for 2,000 dwellings and supporting infrastructure. The application was the subject of a non-determination appeal in September 2004 and the Council initially identified 14 reasons why it would have refused permission if an appeal had not been made prior to a formal decision being taken by the Council. Through negotiations the reasons for refusal were reduced to 2 relating to housing supply and highway issues. The appeal was dismissed in February 2006 with the Secretary of State concluding that housing supply within the County at the time was sufficient and the

monitoring mechanisms to govern release of the reserve sites sufficiently robust not to justify release of the site outside of the development plan process. This was the only reason for rejecting the application.

THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The first outline planning application was received by the City Council in November 2009 for the development of the reserve Winchester City (North) Major Development Area (MDA). Supplementary information to support the planning application was received on 6th April 2010.

3.2 A duplicate outline planning application (10/01063/OUT) was received on 27th April 2010 and is identical to the original planning application.

3.3 The applications have been submitted by Cala Homes (South) Ltd and propose the development of 2000 dwellings, a local centre comprising a primary school, retail food store, community building, health centre, a district energy centre, a range of other retail and non-retail uses, office development together with car parking, open space and other supporting uses within the centre. The development proposals include the provision of formal and informal open space comprising playing pitches with changing facilities; children's and young person's equipped play areas; new areas of habitat and informal recreational open space; land for allotments and hard and soft landscaping and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System and would make provision for four new foul water pumping stations.

3.4 The applications are submitted in outline with only the details of means of access to the site and the primary infrastructure corridor formed by the new Andover Road for determination at the outline stage. Details of the secondary and tertiary roads and other highways infrastructure within the site are reserved for future determination. The layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the buildings and site are also reserved for at this point in time.

3.5 The proposals include a comprehensive access strategy involving:

- The diversion and re-routing of the Andover Road between the junction with Well House Lane and Harestock Road in the north to a point north of Park Road to the south, adjacent to Stoney Lane to the west.
- The downgrading of Andover Road involving the retention of vehicular access to properties fronting the road and the creation of a pedestrian and cycle route along this length of the Andover Road.

3.6 The applications include the provision of a park and ride facility close to the northern boundary at Well House Lane, which would be served by the principal bus route passing through the site. Because the facility is proposed to be served by existing bus services rather than a new dedicated service the facility has become known as 'park and ride light'. The facility is likely to be run by the City Council with the capacity to accommodate a minimum of 200 cars that should encourage the use of public transport and vehicle sharing for traffic coming into the city from the north.

3.7 The proposals include the establishment of a new public right-of-way linking the site to Worthy Road, via the railway underpass and the land to the east of the development site. The masterplan includes a network of pedestrian and cycle routes that connect the site to the adjoining neighbourhoods to the east and west.

Schedule of dwelling types

3.8 Whilst the planning applications do not include a fixed schedule of dwellings the developer has provided an indicative schedule to inform the masterplanning process. The following table shows the indicative mix of dwellings proposed:

Table 1 – Indicative schedule of dwellings

No. of Beds	No. of Units
1-bed	200 (10%)
2-bed	600 (30%)
3-bed	700 (35%)
4-bed	400 (20%)
5-bed	100 (5%)
Total	2,000 (100%)

Affordable housing mix

3.9 The application proposals include the provision for 40% of the dwellings to be affordable. The indicative mix would comprise 500 dwellings for social rent, 240 to be offered as intermediate forms of tenure and 60 units to be offered for extra-care housing. The following table illustrates the indicative mix of affordable house tenures and sizes:

Table 2 – Affordable housing mix

Type	Social Rent	Intermediate	Extra Care
1-bed flat	118 (15%)	36 (4%)	18 (2%)
2-bed flat	26 (3%)	78 (10%)	42 (5%)
2-bed house	96 (12%)	78 (10%)	-
3-bed house	160 (20%)	48 (6%)	-
4-bed house	90 (12%)	-	-
5-bed house	10 (1%)	-	-
Total	500 (63%)	240 (30%)	60 (7%)

Local centre

3.10 The application proposals include the provision of a local centre situated to the north of the ridgeline, either side of the new Andover Road (see masterplan drawing PL06 at appendix 5). This would provide approximately 8,000 sq.m of mixed use floor space. The masterplan identifies an area of approximately 2.1 hectares to be assigned to commercial and community uses, with a further 2.8 hectares identified at the eastern end of the centre for the primary school (capable of accommodating a 3 form primary school if required). Immediately to the west of the centre it is proposed to provide an area of green space of 2.03 hectares, shown as a park, which would provide a community open space linking the new local centre to the Henry Beaufort School.

3.11 A retail foodstore would be the largest element proposed within the local centre with a proposed trading area of approximately 1,200 sq.m and a gross floor area of 2,000 sq.m. Within the local centre it is also proposed to provide a local doctor's surgery/health centre with capacity for three full time GP's, a site for a children's nursery, a community building designed to accommodate indoor sports activities and a gym.

3.12 The application proposals include the provision of up to 1,000 sq.m of "A" Class uses (A1, A2, A3, A5) comprising retail shops, financial and professional services,

restaurants/cafes and hot food take-away. It is proposed to limit the size of the units to a maximum floor area of 200 sq.m. It is also proposed that the local centre would provide up to 2,000 sq.m of offices within Class B1 (a).

3.13 Table 3 summarises the proposed local centre uses and a breakdown of floor areas.

Table 3 – Local centre uses

Use class	Use	Gross external area
A1	Retail food store	2,000 sqm
D1	Health Centre	660 sq.m
D1	Children's nursery/ children's centre	0.15 ha
D1	Community hall	660 sqm
D1	Gym	550 sqm
A1, A2, A3, A5	Retail, financial services, restaurant/café, take-away	Up to 1,000 sq.m of uses within the use classes, subject to unit size threshold of 200 sq.m
B1 (a)	Offices	2,000 sq.m
A4	Public house	500 sq.m
Sui Generis	Energy centre	0.16 hectare
Total		7,970 sq.m

District energy centre

3.14 The local centre includes the provision of a district energy centre located on a site of 0.16 hectares adjacent to the proposed primary school. The energy centre would provide a gas fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility to serve the development. This system would generate electricity from a single site, while also producing heat, which is captured and used to meet heating needs of the development. The heat generated from the centre would be supplied to the buildings on the development via a district heating system (a network of buried pipes that transport heated water around the site to deliver thermal energy to the buildings). The applicant confirms that the CHP plant would become operational at a later stage of the development (years 2017/18).

Public open space

3.15 The masterplan indicates the quantum, type and location of public open space within the development site. The supplementary information confirms that the proposals include a multi-functional network of green space throughout the development. The quantity and the various types of green space are illustrated on the amended version of the Developable Areas Plan (PL02) and the Environmental Infrastructure Plan (224/P/1000).

3.15 Table 4 indicates the breakdown of public open space uses within the site:

Table 4 Public Open Space

Open Space	Quantum (hectares)
Allotments	1.0
Informal Green Space	6.30
Parks, sport and Recreation Grounds	8.50 (of which 4.5 is for outdoor sport)
Children's Play	2.26
Natural Green Space	5.20
Total	23.26

3.16 The supplementary information provides greater detail of the open space proposals along the Old Andover Road, the green fingers that feed into the northern part of the site and the land to the east of the railway line, which all form part of the strategic green infrastructure for the site.

Supporting documents

3.17 The application is supported with the following documents:

- Environmental Statement (Nov. 2009)
- Design and Access Statement (Nov. 2009, updated April 2010)
- Planning Statement (Nov. 2009)
- Flood Risk Assessment (May. 2009)
- Sustainability Checklist Statement (Nov. 2009)
- Transport Impact Assessment (Nov. 2009, updated April 2010)
- Travel Plan (Nov. 2009, updated April 2010)
- Renewable Energy Assessment (Nov. 2009)
- Retail Impact Assessment (Nov. 2009)
- Public Consultation Assessment (Nov, 2009)

Supporting Plans

3.18 The application is supported with the following plans:

- Barton Farm application boundary plan (RPS01)
- Land Use Parameters Plan (PLO1) (see appendix 6)
- Access Strategy (0710-64 Fig 4.1)
- Proposed Andover Road Tie-In (0710-64 Fig 4.6)
- Proposed Andover Road/Harestock Road Junction (0710-64 Fig 4.2)
- Proposed Andover Road/Wellhouse Lane Junction (0710-64 Fig 4.3)
- Proposed New Andover Road/Stoney Lane Junction (0710-64 Fig 4.4)
- Proposed Well House Lane Shuttle Signals (0710-64 Fig 4.5)
- Proposed New Andover Road (0710-64 Fig 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8)
- Proposed Andover Road Southern Corridor Improvements (0710-64 Fig 10.2)

Illustrative Plans

3.19 In addition the application is accompanied with the following illustrative plans:

- Masterplan (PL06 Rev B) (see appendix 5)
- Developable areas (PL02 Rev C)
- Residential densities (PL03 Rev A)
- Indicative building heights (PL04 Rev A)

- Phasing plan (PL05)
- Environmental Infrastructure plan (224/P/1000)
- Biodiversity Management plan for Land to the East of the Railway Line (Figure 1)
- Potential Andover Road/Berewecke Road Junction Improvements (0710-64 Fig. 4.8)

The masterplan

3.20 The masterplan provides an illustrative layout defining the separate development zones, the distribution of the development blocks, the position and layout of the proposed areas of formal and informal public open space, the location and extent of the local centre and the main infrastructure within the site. The masterplan also indicates the proposed access points and the re-routed alignment of the Andover Road.

3.21 The first iteration of the masterplan, prior to the appointment of the current urban design team John Thompson and Partners, influenced strongly by the grain and character of the city centre was criticised by the officers of the City Council and the stakeholders. The advice at the time confirmed that the site is a sub-urban location and as such should reflect this in the layout and masterplanning of the future development. As a result of this advice a new masterplanning team was appointed and the process re-started.

3.22 Underpinning the current masterplan is a comprehensive analysis of the character and development of Winchester, including analysis of the existing suburbs. This process has identified strengths and weaknesses and has allowed the designers to draw from the successful elements of existing suburbs and to recognise and address elements that are problematic. The current masterplanning process has also involved stakeholder engagement through several stakeholder workshops involving local groups and key consultees.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

4.1 The application is supported with an Environmental Statement as required by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. The ES has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Regulations.

4.2 The ES submitted in support of this application contains 3 volumes and a non-technical summary. Volume 1 is the main document and volumes 2 and 3 contain the ES appendices.

4.3 The main document (volume 1) of the ES covers the following areas:

Part 1: The Project

- Background and Scope of Environmental Statement
- Method and Approach
- Site and Surrounding Area
- Description of Development (including alternatives)
- Planning Policy Context

Part 2: Assessment of Environmental Impact

- Socio-Economic Assessment
- Transportation
- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Ecology
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Archaeology and Built Heritage
- Lighting
- Land and Soils
- Hydrology and Drainage
- Waste Disposal
- Services

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

5.1 Following the initial consultation period for the proposed development the consultation and stakeholder responses were reviewed by the applicant who chose to submit supplementary information to update the planning application on 6th April 2010. The supplementary information related to the following planning issues:

Planning policy

5.2 A technical note on planning policy responding to the following issues:

- Weight attached to the Core Strategy
- The need to release Barton Farm
- The publication of Planning Policy Statement 4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Development
- Small scale employment uses
- Infrastructure capacity
- Treatment of Andover Road (Phasing)

Amended versions of the following drawings:

- Land Use Parameters Plan (PL01)
- Developable Areas (PL02)
- Residential Densities (PL03)
- Indicative Building Heights (PL04)
- Phasing (PL06)
- Illustrative masterplan (PL06)

Affordable Housing

5.3 A technical note on Affordable Housing responding to the following issues:

- Design standards
- Extra care units
- Delivery

Green Infrastructure/Landscape

5.4 A technical note and supporting drawings on green infrastructure and landscape responding to the following issues:

- Policy requirements
- Quantum
- Playing pitches
- Youth facilities
- Children's play space
- Use of park opposite Henry Beaufort School
- Allotments
- Old Andover Road
- Land to the east of the railway
- Rights of Way
- Impact of the taller buildings on the view from the South Downs National Park

Community Infrastructure

5.5 A technical note on community infrastructure responding to the following issues:

- Indoor sports provision
- Scope of community services proposed
- Use of school facilities for community purposes
- Provision of youth facilities
- Community development worker
- Management of facilities
- Location of nursery
- Encouraging local retailers
- Section 106 contributions towards primary and secondary education
- Section 106 contributions towards children's centre
- Size of the school site

Ecology/Biodiversity

5.6 A technical note and supporting drawings on ecology/biodiversity responding to the following issues:

- Impact on SSSI's and SAC's
- Impact on BAP habitats
- Bat roosting activity
- Badger foraging
- Reptile mitigation
- Land to the east of the railway
- Water abstraction/discharge

Design and Access Statement

5.7 Revised versions of chapters 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 of the Design and Access Statement responding to the following issues:

- Environmental Infrastructure
- Landscaping of New Andover Road
- Landscaping of Old Andover Road

- Strategic Planting
- Phasing
- Pedestrian and cycle links
- Public art

Design/CABE

5.8 A technical note on design responding to the following issues:

- Historic grain of the City Centre
- Density
- Re-routing of Andover Road
- East/west links
- Focus on the park opposite Henry Beaufort School
- Bus link

Waste management/environmental performance

5.9 A technical note on renewable energy and environmental performance responding to the following issues:

- Sustainable waste management
- Code for Sustainable Homes
- CHP, biomass and other energy sources

Transport

5.10 A number of technical notes and supporting drawings have been prepared in relation to the issues raised by the consultation responses.

Technical note 4 (New Andover Road corridor) includes the following information:

- Cycle and pedestrian provision
- Revised operation assessments giving consideration to the Park and Ride light site

Technical note 5 (public transport strategy) has been prepared to respond to the following issues:

- Public transport
- Park and ride

Technical note 6 (trunk road impact) has been prepared to respond to the following issues raised by the Highways Agency:

- Impact on M3 (junctions 9 and 11)
- Accident reports
- Park and ride
- Residential trip rates
- Impact on the surrounding road network
- Parking strategy
- Framework travel plan

Technical note 7 (framework travel plan) has been prepared to respond to the issues raised in respect of the submitted framework travel plan:

- Framework travel plan targets and objectives

5.11 The supplementary information has been the subject of further consultation with the relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees and stakeholders. The period for this exercise expired on 30th April 2010. Consideration of the updated application will be detailed in the planning considerations section of this report.

IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 The application is supported within an indicative phasing plan illustrating the main phases of development and their order of implementation (PL05). The development of the site is proposed to be split into the following phases:

Phase	Construction works	Years
1A	Construction of 300 dwellings on land in the northern sector of the site. Construction of new access from Well House Lane.	1-3
1B	Construction of primary school.	1-3
2	Construction of 300 dwellings on land in the southern sector of the site. Construction of access onto Andover Road at junction with Stoney Lane.	4-7
3	Construction of New Andover Road through site and construction of junction improvements at Andover Road/Wellhouse Lane/Harestock Lane junction.	4-7
4	Construction of 750 dwellings on land in western sector of site and construction of local centre.	4-7
5	Construction of loop road.	4-7
6	Construction of 325 dwellings on land to the south of the ridge line.	8-10
7	Construction of 325 dwellings on land within north east corner of site. Works to Old Andover Road.	8-10

6.2 The phasing of development and the requirement to provide physical and social infrastructure at particular stages of the development would be secured through the legal agreement.

CONSULTATIONS

7.1 The following internal and external parties have been consulted on both applications:

- Adjoining Local Authorities – Basingstoke and Deane, East Hampshire, Eastleigh and Test Valley
- HCC Planning
- HCC Highways
- HCC Rights of Way
- HCC Landscape
- HCC Education
- HCC Adult Services
- HCC Estates

- WCC Drainage
- WCC Highways
- WCC Sustainable travel
- WCC Archaeology
- WCC Landscape
- WCC Urban Design
- WCC Housing
- WCC Environmental Protection
- WCC Strategic Planning
- WCC Cultural Services
- WCC Waste Management
- Hampshire Constabulary – Crime Reduction Officer
- Hampshire Fire and Rescue
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
- Southern Water
- British Gas
- Southern Electric
- National Grid
- Sports England
- CABI (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment)
- The Ramblers Association
- Network Rail
- DEFRA (Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs)
- Winchester Chamber of Commerce
- Highways Agency
- CPRE (Campaign for the Protection of Rural England) – Hampshire Group
- RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds)
- Regional Health Authority
- Winchester and Eastleigh Health Care NHS Trust
- GOSE (Government Office for the South East)
- Save Barton Farm Group
- English Heritage
- Countryside Agency
- SEERA (South east England Regional Assembly) – Now the Regional Board
- WinACC (Winchester Action on Climate Change)
- City of Winchester Trust
- Winchester City Residents Association
- Hampshire Cycling
- Southampton Astronomical Society
- Stagecoach

7.2 The majority of consultees have now responded to the original planning application, and a summary of their comments is contained at Appendix 1 of this report. Consultation responses on the supplementary information are contained at Appendix 2 of this report. Responses on the duplicate application are contained at Appendix 3 of this report.

REPRESENTATIONS

8.1 In total 607 representations have been received to date. 598 of these letters were objections to the application, 4 letters were in support of the application and 5 of these letters were neutral (neither objecting nor supporting the application).

8.2 In total 34 objections have been made on the duplicate planning application 10/01063/OUT. No new issues were raised in relation to this application. The representations raised on the original planning application have also been taken into account in relation to the duplicate application.

8.3 The following issues were raised by representations in opposition to the proposed development:

Planning policy issues

- Government housing target disputed
- Not in accordance with Government Policy (PPS3)
- Application is premature - greenfield site has not been released for development
- Not in accordance with Local Plan
- Loss of greenfield land
- Other sites available
- Previous schemes were refused, little has changed
- The Winchester local development plan is based on unrealistic government forecasts - because the forecasts do not allow for peak and decline of the global oil supply
- No demand for extra housing
- Change of Government – A review of the housing development proposals for the South of England is needed. Inappropriate to pass this planning application until any such review is completed.
- Removal of duty of Winchester City Council to meet a Central Government - set target for regional development under the new coalition government.
- Change in economic climate – Hampshire Plan needs a significant review in order to reconsider the viability and justification of such a major housing expansion.

Transportation issues

- Re-routing of Andover Road through site is dangerous
- Increased traffic / highway safety / pollution
- Loss of walking routes
- Loss of cycling route
- New park and ride inadequate
- Increased pressure on public transport
- Existing road network unable to cope
- Lack of parking
- The effect on neighbouring roads / creation of 'rat-runs'
- There is no provision for cyclists beyond Park Road, the point where the increased traffic will have its greatest impact on the narrow Andover Road.
- Consideration needs to be given for cyclists coming and going from the north
- Cycle provision within site requires careful consideration and should be direct (not meandering) routes
- Existing footways into town from site are inadequate
- Too city centre focused. Greater pedestrian and cycle connection to adjoining communities including Harestock, Weeke and Abbots Barton is required to ensure

integration.

- Cycle parking should provide for visitor parking in prominent locations with the residential and commercial areas.

Environmental

- Loss of farmland/food production
- Increased flooding
- Inadequate drainage
- Harmful to ecology
- Loss of trees
- Increased carbon footprint of Winchester
- Concern over the future of the land to the east of the application site
- Firmer commitment on how to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5
- Potential for biomass CHP needs to be planned in from the start

Infrastructure

- Current infrastructure unable to cope
- Schools unable to cope
- Medical facilities unable to cope
- Primary school must be provided early in the sites development
- Firmer commitment for Henry Beaufort expansion required
- Post office required
- No provision of places for worship

Employment

- Lack of jobs / industry locally to sustain 2000 new homes

Sports, recreation and leisure

- Loss of amenity space
- Lack of provision for sports facilities
- Loss of access to countryside

Visual amenity

- Scale too large/overdevelopment
- Adverse visual impact
- Design out of keeping with locality
- Will spoil major route into city
- Highest buildings proposed for highest point on site

Historic environment

- Damaging to historic environment of Winchester / historic landscape setting
- Loss of Roman road

Residential amenity

- Adverse impact on neighbouring properties

8.4 The following issues were raised by representations in support of the application:

- Support the re-routing of Andover Road/creation of green route
- Support the improvement of existing junctions
- Support the Park and Ride Light

- Support the 10-15 minute bus service
- Support the provision of allotment land within the development
- No objection from the 'silent majority'

8.5 In addition to individual letters of representation comments have been received from the following authorities and groups (the full Parish Council responses are attached at appendix 4 of this report):

8.6 Littleton & Harestock Parish Council – Objection (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- The need for 2,000 houses has not yet been proven
- The development lacks imagination
- Landscaping and sustainability issues have been inadequately catered for
- Flooding concerns
- Access inadequate
- Adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area
- Phasing of the development is inappropriate to the north of the site
- Insufficient measures to discourage car use
- Uncertainty over plans for the future of Henry Beaufort School
- Uncertainty over the proposed mix of units in the local centre and whether scheme would be adequately self-sufficient or unique enough
- Ruins entrance into Winchester

8.7 Headbourne Worthy Parish Council – Objection (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- The development will have a dramatic, unacceptable and long lasting severe impact on the quality of life for the village and residents of Headbourne Worthy.
- The impact of the development will also affect the adjacent nearby villages and residents including Kings Worthy with the same devastating magnitude.
- Questions viability of the Park and Ride Light provision
- Adverse impact on road safety in Headbourne Worthy
- Increased risk of flooding
- Loss of strategic gap
- Lack of existing facilities and infrastructure
- Land to the east of the railway line should be included and retained as a local gap between Winchester City and Headbourne Worthy
- Density and scale are massive and will impose a colossal and unacceptable environmental impact on the northern villages close to Winchester

8.8 Kings Worthy Parish Council – Objection (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- No provision has been made for the diversion of the current wide and heavy load route that exists via Andover Road, as the diversion of Andover Road through the development would then become part of the heavy load route. This would pass the shops and proposed school.
- The new road will not be able to cope with diverted traffic from the A34 when closed for emergencies.
- The Staffordshire site that was compared with this development is not appropriate as access is a problem.
- The provision of 200 spaces for a park and ride is not viable and is inadequate.

- No account has been taken to the problems of flooding in the area.
- Public transport has not been revisited.
- Henry Beaufort School is not adequate to take the influx of pupils from the development.

8.9 South Wonston Parish Council – Objection (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- Traffic consequences of the development.
- Major impact on traffic movements north of the city, especially at peak times
- Disagree with the proposed diversion of Andover Road which would result in a busy access route and truck road link being driven through a community of houses, playing fields and school
- This is a poorly thought out proposal

8.10 Winchester City Residents - Objection

- The proposed development detailed in the application destroys this key landscape wedge of the city.
- Loss of valuable agricultural land
- The re-routing of Andover Road through the site is unacceptable
- Adverse impact on highway junctions
- No justification for the release of this housing site
- Education and healthcare at capacity with no evidence that they could satisfactorily cope with the demand resulting from this development

8.11 Winchester City Trust – (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- Continues to consider that permitting this application at this time would be premature and detrimental to the character of Winchester.
- Considers this scheme is a great improvement on the previous proposal, and appreciates the care and thought that has been taken in designing this development.
- Remain to be convinced over the Andover Road re-routing. Would recommend that the situation is monitored and reversible if problems arise.
- Park and Ride provision should reduce the amount of traffic using the Andover Road but may have to be bigger and further thought should be given to potential users.
- Bus services should be provided early in the development to prevent early residents from becoming car dependant through lack of public transport
- Further thought should be given to cycle provision, particularly to the city centre including improvements to the railway bridge
- Crucial that the original concept and high standard of the permitted overall design should be retained, with a master plan that ensures the continuity of design and standards, whether or not a phase of the original concept has been sold on. It is therefore urged that a water-tight agreement is set in place to make sure this will happen
- Concern about the possibility of the land on the other side of the railway line being used for housing sometime in the future, and it is urged most strongly that a condition designating it as land for green infrastructure should be part of any permission.
- The inevitably long lead-in to the actual first moment of construction makes the issue of sustainability very pertinent, because standards will become much more

demanding during the period between consent and construction. The Trust therefore considers that great attention should be given to the comments and suggestions made by the Built Environment Group of WinACC, and urges that any permitted development should aim at the highest levels being set at the time each building phase actually begins, which could be some years in the future

- Although this is a considerable improvement on the previous proposal, the Trust still considers that, for the reasons given at the beginning of these comments, permission for this very large development should not be granted at this time, and therefore objects to this application.

8.12 Winchester New Allotments Society – Support (a summary of their comments is provided below):

- We welcome the provision of allotment land within the development which we assume will be designated as statutory land. We wish to offer our support to their operation subject to conditions securing timescales, design, installation, maintenance and fencing.

8.13 Save Barton Farm Group – Objection. The SBFSG represents 5,000 signatories (a summary of their comments is provided below):

No justification for this development in terms of Housing Land Availability:

- No compelling justification for the release of this site in the current plan period;
- The Winchester District AMR (Dec.2009) shows no shortfall in housing numbers in the Plan Period 2001-2011 or 2010-2015 to justify the release of a MDA for 2000 dwellings;
- Sufficient identified sites are available in the current plan period to 2011;
- Application is premature and alongside other brownfield site development would result in an over concentration of development in this area of Winchester;
- The sequential test requires brownfield sites should be built on first before green field development

Effect of the proposal on the character and setting of Winchester:

- This green wedge of countryside is a distinctive feature of the landscape setting of the historic City.
- We quote the words of the Inspector, previously refusing planning permission for this site, for significantly fewer dwellings:

“Winchester is characterised by long wedges and fingers of countryside running into the City. These create the green setting of Winchester, for which the City is famous. The Objection site forms one such wedge of countryside. Its openness and rolling character...makes a substantial contribution to the setting and character of Winchester particularly when approached from the north along Andover Road. The impact of housing would be very substantial in that it would be intrusive in the landscape and would affect the views into and over the objection site. It would bring the urban edge of Winchester out into the countryside in what I consider to be an unacceptable manner thereby seriously affecting the setting and character of Winchester and the visual amenities of the area.” Inquiry Inspector’s Report. 11.79, Jan. 1997 (WDLP)

- SBFG maintains that the impact of the current application would be even worse, resulting in a more devastating loss of landscape and more intrusive.

The highway and transportation implications of the proposal:

- Opposes the harm proposed to the existing Andover Road. The existing road is a superb entrance to Winchester, distinctive for its long-distance views, its ever-changing seasonal interest, and for its avenue of mature trees. It is an essential element of the famous ancient Roman Road extending north across the District. Its loss in historic and visual terms would be immense.
- Oppose the re-routing of a major road due to highway safety and pollution concerns and emergency services implications.
- The greatly increased volume and movement of traffic would have an adverse impact on the highway network in and around Winchester. In particular serious problems of congestion, road safety and pollution would arise at the Andover Road/Worthy Road and the Andover Road/City Road junctions.
- Numerous housing developments along the Andover Road since 2005 and the continued growth in the number of students (all potential car users) attending Peter Symonds College have already exacerbated these traffic problems.
- The developer's green traffic plans do not demonstrate sufficient infrastructure to facilitate the use of non-car modes of travel to the City.

Flood-risk:

- If Barton Farm were to be built over, the risk of flooding in central Winchester would be greatly increased.
- The Application's flood risk assessment report (ID734178) has highlighted some of the concerns voiced by others. The Report advised that sustainable drainage schemes (SUDS) instituted for a site should cope with a 1% flood risk per year. Recent floods in Cumbria were more in keeping with only a 0.1% risk and reportedly overflowed the flood barriers designed for the higher 1% risk.
- SUDS should be designed for the higher 1% risk and able to cope also with a 30% increase in rainfall intensity, as predicted in the Halcrow Report (2007).
- Another factor is the additional volume of wastewater that would be produced by the occupants of a new suburb. Concerns that insufficient capacity exists to serve the development. Requirement of an Appropriate Assessment due to the sites location next to the River Itchen. The proposal has the potential to have a significant impact on the River Itchen SAC and in times of torrential rainfall of causing harm to the fragile balance of the ecology of the SSSIs.
- No amount of amelioration can alter the fact that a built-up area produces more run-off and waste water than farmland.
- Concerns over future management of the SUDS

Loss of high quality farmland:

- This application, if granted, would not only result in the loss of 93 hectares of farmland but the rest of the farm to the east would no longer be viable for farming. The entire area, potentially a source for growing food, would be lost forever. Defra is currently urging farmers to concentrate on increasing food production, faced with world food shortages exacerbated by climate change.
- The loss of this farmland is contrary to the conclusions reached by the Planning

Inspector in his report on the WDLP in 1997 (WDLP 1997: 11.80: 11.84).

8.14 Radian Housing Association – Support proposals. The comments are summarised below:

- There is a burgeoning housing need in Winchester District with supply of new affordable homes vastly outstripped by the ever increasing demand.
- Greatest level of need is within the City itself and few opportunities exist to meet this need.
- Housing delivery nationally and locally has been frustrated and constrained by the unprecedented market conditions. This site is able and ready to deliver and meet housing need now.
- The site is ideally located for affordable housing and has been assessed internally for sustainability purposes and deemed to meet all the necessary criteria in terms of location and access to services etc.
- The proposed unit and tenure mix complies with WCC requirements to meet local housing need and the Homes and Community Agency (HCA) Regional Investment Strategy.
- The quality of the proposed affordable housing will meet recognised design and sustainability standards.
- The Society is ready and able to deliver the affordable homes.

8.14 Representations have also been received to the application from Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments who are promoters of the land to the north of Well House Lane for future development.

The comments on the original application are summarised below:

- Realignment of Andover Road – Concerns over traffic volume causing noise, severance and delay for residents; highway safety issues due to bends with tight radii; re-routing of bus service 86 causing accessibility problems to existing residents along Andover Road; Lack of provision for cyclists along re-aligned road
- Junction Capacity – Unconvinced that new junctions will provide sufficient capacity; should not prejudice opportunities for the sustainable, long term, comprehensive planning of North Winchester
- Park and Ride – Size inadequate and not provide sufficient mitigation; would be better located on land to the north of Well House Lane, on a site capable of accommodating at least 1,000 spaces as part of a sustainable transport strategy for the area.
- Modal Shift – The current land use mix is not conducive to modal shift; the inclusion of a knowledge park on land to the north of Winchester would improve the sustainability of the site and our clients have submitted representations to the Core Strategy to this effect; it would be premature for the City Council to approve this application in advance of the Core Strategy.
- Impact on Strategic Highway Network – Not in accordance with the Highways Agency's request for junction 9 of the M3 to be fully modelled and assessed within the Transport Assessment; no mitigation proposals have been put forward as to how the development's impact upon M3 J9 and the Strategic Road Network would be mitigated.

8.15 Further comment from Bovis Homes and Heron Land Development was made in response to the supplementary information and is summarised below:

Weight attached to the Core Strategy:

- Agree with direction of growth for future development in Winchester; issues of the precise boundary of the site, the quantum and type of development and the disposition of uses within the site have yet to be agreed; inappropriate to attach any weight to the Core Strategy in the determination of this application

Employment Policy:

- Lack of employment land proposed and suggest the co-location of housing and employment to the North of Winchester as part of a sustainable mixed-use urban extension.

Transport Issues:

- Development Centre: The design philosophy adopted (a 20mph shared space area) is wholly inappropriate for a corridor carrying the volumes of traffic and HGVs anticipated; the result of the proposed design would be to deter existing traffic from entering Winchester along this corridor, diverting traffic onto the Strategic Road Network and adversely affect the capacity of the M3 junctions and other corridors in Winchester.
- Lane Widths: Designed below the minimum standards likely to create a hazardous and unsafe corridor.
- Junction Capacities: Concerned that proposed junctions would not operate effectively.
- Park and Ride "Light": Not appropriate mitigation to overcome the likely significant increase in saturation, queue lengths and delay at the City Road junction.
- Strategic Road Network: Junction 9 of M3 should be remodelled using up-to-date traffic data.
- New Andover Road Corridor: Tests set out in the Highways Act and Town and Country Planning Act have not been met to justify the closure of the Old Andover Road

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

9.1 The current Development Plan context comprises the following documents:

- The South East Plan
- Adopted Winchester District Local Plan (Review 2006) (Saved policies)

The South East Plan (May 2009)

9.2 The South East Plan was adopted by the Secretary of State on 6th May 2009 and supersedes the Hampshire County Structure Plan and RPG9. It contains many strategic policies, the most directly relevant to this application being:

- SP.3 – Urban Focus for Development
- CC.4 – Sustainable Design & Construction
- CC.6 – Character of the Environment
- CC.7 – Infrastructure
- H.1 – Housing Provision
- H.3 – Affordable Housing
- H.4 – Housing Mix
- H.5 – Housing Design/Density
- T.2 – Mobility Management

- T.4 – Parking
- NRM.4 – Flood Risk
- NRM.5 - Biodiversity
- NRM.11 – Energy Efficiency/Renewables
- C.4 – Landscape & Countryside Management
- AOSR.2 – Housing Provision (non-PUSH)

The adopted Winchester District Local Plan (Review 2006)

9.3 Most Local Plan policies have been ‘saved’, including Policy MDA2 which allocates this site as a ‘Reserve’ Major Development Area for 2000 dwellings. Policy MDA2 is for a ‘strategic’ reserve allocation, the need for which would be determined by the strategic planning authorities, based on Structure Plan requirements. The site may be released if a ‘compelling justification’ has been identified, but would be subject to countryside policies until such time as it is released. Policy MDA2 includes a comprehensive list of requirements, many of which are also covered by other Local Plan Policies listed below:

Chapter 3 Design and Development Principles

- DP.1 Planning applications supporting and explanatory information
- DP.3 General design criteria
- DP.4 Landscape and the built environment
- DP.5 Design of amenity open space
- DP.9 Infrastructure for new development
- DP.10 Pollution generating development
- DP.11 Unneighbourly uses
- DP13 Contaminated land

Chapter 4 Countryside and Natural Environment

- CE.9 Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- CE.10 Other sites of nature conservation interest
- CE.11 New and enhanced sites of nature conservation value

Chapter 5 Historic Environment

- HE.1 Important archaeological sites
- HE.2 Archaeological Assessments

Chapter 6 Housing

- H.1 Provision for housing development
- H.5 Affordable housing
- H.7 Housing mix and density

Chapter 7 Employment

- E.4 Office development outside of the defined town centre

Chapter 8 Town Centres, Shopping and facilities

- SF.1 Retail development within town and village locations
- SF.6 Facilities and services within settlements

Chapter 9 Recreation and Tourism

- RT.4 Recreational space for new housing development
- RT.9 Recreational routes

Chapter 10 Transport

- T.1 Development served efficiently by public transport, cycling and walking
- T.2 Development Access
- T.3 Development Layout
- T.5 Off-site transportation contributions
- T.6 Integrated transport infrastructure

Chapter 11 Winchester

- W.4 Park and Ride

The Emerging Development Plan (The Winchester District Core Strategy)

9.4 The Core Strategy has reached the 'Preferred Option' (Regulation 25) stage. Whilst there has been much evidence gathering, 'front-loading' and consultation, the document has not yet reached any formal submission or examination stage. It cannot therefore be accorded great formal weight, but it is a relevant 'material consideration' as it proposes Barton Farm as a 'strategic allocation' to meet the proposed development strategy for Winchester. It should be noted that the options within the emerging Core Strategy reflect and are required to be consistent with, the South East Plan. Accordingly it rests upon those principal requirements of the South East Plan and it should be considered having regard to the recent direction of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government noted at paragraph 10.15 below.

9.5 Based on the South East Plan's housing requirement for the non-PUSH area (5,500 dwellings over 20 years), work on the Core Strategy continues to show that a 'strategic allocation' for housing will be needed and that Barton Farm is the most suitable site, having regard to all the alternatives put forward. Therefore the Preferred Option included a 'strategic allocation' at Barton Farm for 2000 dwellings and associated uses (Policy WT.2) along with a policy setting out general requirements for major developments (SS.2), which is also relevant.

Supplementary Local Planning Guidance (SPG)

9.5 The following SPG is considered relevant to the assessment of the planning application:

- Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted 2010)
- Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted 2008)
- Winchester Landscape Character Assessment (Adopted 2003)

Other Local Planning Guidance

9.6 The following local documents are also considered relevant to the assessment of the planning applications:

- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS): Winchester District
- Winchester District Open Space Strategy 2010-11
- The Future of Winchester Study
- The Hampshire Landscape: A Strategy for the future
- Winchester City and its Setting
- Winchester District Landscape Assessment
- Winchester District Urban Capacity Study
- Winchester Housing Needs Survey
- Winchester Retail Study (Nathan Lichfield & Partners)

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements

9.7 The following National Planning Policy is relevant to the assessment of the planning application:

- PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
- PPS 3 Housing (2006)
- PPS 4 Planning for Prosperous Economies (2009)
- PPS 5 Historic Environment (2010)
- PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004)
- PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005)
- PPG 13 Transport (2001)
- PPS 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)
- PPS 22 Renewable Energy (2004)
- PPS 23 Planning and Pollution Control (2004)
- PPG 24 Planning and Noise (1994)
- PPS 25 Development and Flood Risk (2006)

Government Circulars

9.8 The following Government Circulars are considered relevant to the assessment of the planning application:

- Circular 05/05: Planning Obligations
- Circular 02/99: Environmental Impact Assessment
- Circular 06/98: Affordable Housing
- Circular 11/95: Use of Conditions in Planning Permission

Best Practice Publications/Statements of Government Policy

9.9 The following publications are considered relevant:

- By Design (CABE/DETR)
- Manual for Streets (DCLG)
- Companion Document to Manual for Streets (Hampshire County Council April

2010)

- Urban Design Compendium (English Partnerships)
- Creating Successful Masterplans (CABE)
- Findings of the Urban Task Force – Towards an Urban Renaissance (DETR)
- Planning for Sustainable Development: Towards Better Practice (DETR, 1998)
- A Better Quality of Life: A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK (DETR, 1998)
- Better Places to Live by Design: A Companion Guide to PPG3 – (DTLR and CABE 2001)
- Town and Country Planning (Residential Density) (London and South East England) Direction (ODPM, 2002)
- Code for Sustainable Homes (Communities and Local Government 2006)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 The main issues raised by this proposal are:

- a) Whether circumstances relating to the supply of housing land in the District are such as to justify the release now of the site for housing development;
- b) Whether the proposed masterplan and access strategy provide an acceptable framework for the development of the site that would assist with the aim of creating a well designed and sustainable community that is distinctive and integrated with the surrounding area;
- c) Whether the proposed highway, access and parking arrangements would cause an unacceptable growth in traffic and reduction in highway safety; whether the proposals provide adequate access to local services and public transport and whether any potentially negative traffic impacts are identified and satisfactorily mitigated
- d) Whether the proposed mix and quantum of land uses would assist the aim of creating a sustainable community;
- e) Whether the proposed development would cause significant harm to the natural or built environment and whether any potentially negative environmental impacts are identified and satisfactorily mitigated;
- f) Whether the proposed development would provide a satisfactory level of physical, social and transport infrastructure to meet the needs of the development, and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area;

(a) Whether circumstances relating to the supply of housing land in the District are such as to justify the release now of the site for housing development.

10.2 The site is allocated as a 'strategic' Reserve Site in the saved Winchester District Local Plan, but the principle of residential development is only acceptable if there is a 'compelling justification' for the release of the site to ensure an adequate supply of housing land. The presence or absence of a 'compelling justification' remains the

relevant test even after the adoption of the South East Plan. In addition, Local Plan Policy H.2 identifies 4 'Local Reserve Sites', including 3 in the non-PUSH part of the District, which may need to be released if monitoring indicates that the baseline Structure Plan requirement for housing is unlikely to be met. Since the adoption of the Local Plan the Government has published PPS3, which requires local authorities to maintain a 5-year supply of housing land with effect from April 2007 but the housing numbers that the 5 year land supply must be sufficient to meet has been the number dictated by the South East Plan. The requirement to maintain a 5 year land supply therefore only serves to provide a 'compelling justification' for the release of sites if meeting the housing numbers required by South East Plan remains the overarching policy requirement.

The analysis provided below sets out the policy position in relevant development plan documents and the requirements they contain. These should be fully considered by the Committee in relation to this application. Comment on the status and relevance of these following the letter written to Local Planning Authorities by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on the 27th May 2010 is provided at the end of the section and again at the end of the report.

10.4 The Council published its draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and a draft Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release for consultation in March 2009. The draft Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Sites concluded that the Council could demonstrate an adequate 5-year supply of housing land to meet the requirements of the South East Plan and that no Local Reserve Site releases were justified at that time. It did not consider strategic Reserve Sites because the strategic planning authorities were responsible for monitoring and releasing these, if necessary. Various comments were received in response to the published SHLAA and the Assessment of the Need for Reserve Sites, including from the applicant. These were reported to Cabinet in October 2009, with a recommendation that the Local Reserve Sites need to be released. However, Cabinet deferred a decision on this until it had seen further work on the SHLAA and sought a meeting with the relevant Minister to discuss concerns about the way in which government advice requires the 5-year land supply to be calculated.

10.5 Nevertheless, Cabinet accepted the technical work behind the calculation of the 5-years land supply situation and the evidence therefore indicates that the Council is unable to demonstrate an adequate land supply (see CAB1902, 14.10.09). The former Council Leader wrote to the then Minister for Housing and Planning and the Minister's reply (16th December 2009) re-emphasised the requirement to demonstrate a 5-year land supply in accordance with PPS3 against the housing numbers set in the South East Plan. The Council's recent 2009 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) reports the following land supply situation:

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014			
Requirement	1845	1340	3185
Supply	1200	1099	2293
Surplus (years supply)	-645 (3.3yrs)	-241 (4.1yrs)	-886 (3.6yrs)
2010-2015			
Requirement	1920	1345	3265
Supply	1372	996	2368
Surplus (years supply)	-548 (3.6yrs)	-349 (3.7yrs)	-897 (3.6yrs)

The table above shows the situation at April 2009 and April 2010 base dates and, for the non-PUSH part of the District (which includes Barton Farm), the situation deteriorates due to the lack of large sites coming forward. The AMR predicts this situation will continue and its 'housing trajectory' suggests that sites for over 2600 dwellings will need to be brought forward over the LDF period to meet the South East Plan's housing requirement for the non-PUSH area (see also report CAB1944LDF 15.12.09 which estimates 2638 dwellings will need to be allocated through the LDF).

10.6 The applicant's planning statement suggests that the shortfall is greater than noted above, due to alleged over-estimates of large site commitments and SHLAA sites. Whilst the applicant's calculation appears questionable, it is agreed that there is a clear shortfall although there is no merit in trying to determine its precise scale. While the recent appeal relating to Francis Gardens, Winchester has been allowed following the Council's acceptance of the land supply shortfall, this only improves supply by 90 dwellings and will not overcome the shortfall. Set against this is the uncertainty around the Silver Hill development, which may threaten the estimated contribution of this site (100-200 dwellings).

10.7 The further work requested by Cabinet in October 2009 to complete the SHLAA has been completed and the SHLAA was approved by Cabinet in March 2010 and has now been published. However, this additional work related to greenfield sites, which would require allocation through the LDF before they could be classed as 'deliverable'. Therefore this does not change the land supply calculations above and, on this basis, it is concluded that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land to meet the requirements of the South East Plan, either at an April 2009 or April 2010 base date. This situation is not likely to be resolved until additional sites are either allocated or development permitted. Several sites are 'reserved' for possible release to meet such shortfalls, including the application site, and these in conjunction with LDF site allocations provide the best means of addressing the land availability issue in a planned and controlled manner.

10.8 The reserve sites within the non-PUSH part of the District include the application site ('strategic' reserve) and 3 Local Reserve Sites. As noted above, the Francis Gardens Local Reserve Site has been permitted on appeal, leaving 1 strategic reserve site and 2 Local Reserve Sites potentially available to address the shortfall. The applicant argues that the Barton Farm site should take priority over the Local Reserve Sites and that this approach would have been supported by the Local Plan Inspector if he had been procedurally able to do so. The Head of Strategic Planning considers that this is conjecture, but he does accept that the references in the Local Plan policy to the involvement of the strategic planning authorities in the triggering mechanism are now

redundant and that it is for the local planning authority alone to determine whether a 'compelling justification' has been made for the release of Barton Farm.

10.9 In terms of whether Barton Farm should take priority over the Local Reserve Sites, the Local Plan does not give a view on this so each application needs to be dealt with as and when it is submitted. The potential of this application to meet housing needs should therefore be considered, rather than seeking to determine the precise order in which reserve sites should be released. The applicant's proposed development programme means that this site could, if permitted, make a contribution to meeting the 5-year shortfall of housing land. The AMR suggests that this, or any alternative greenfield allocation, could contribute some 150 dwellings in 2013/4 and 2014/15 (within the 5-year period from 2010/11). This contribution may be greater if permission is granted in the near future (the applicant estimates the development could deliver 300 units in the first 3 years) and, along with permission at Francis Gardens, could potentially meet some or the entire expected shortfall.

10.10 As well as potentially meeting the short-term need to demonstrate a 5-year land supply, Barton Farm is the preferred site for meeting a large part of the housing requirement for the non-PUSH area. It is a key element of the Core Strategy Preferred Option's strategy for Winchester and, whilst the Core Strategy still has further stages to be undertaken, analysis of representations on the Preferred Option concludes that it will remain necessary to make a strategic allocation and that Barton Farm is the most suitable site for this (see report CAB1944LDF 15.12.09).

10.11 If a strategic allocation for 2000 dwellings is to be developed to meet the requirements of the South East Plan by 2026, dwelling completions would need to start by 2016 at the latest. To provide some contingency for delays the AMR assumes completions starting in 2013/14 and outline permission would be needed in about 2012 to achieve this. Therefore, taking a longer-term view, the Barton Farm site is the most suitable for a strategic allocation and would need to be permitted quite soon in order to be delivered. If there were no planning reason to delay permission, and the application is appropriate in all other respects, it would therefore be logical to take a longer-term view and permit the application. PPS3 is clear that "Local Planning Authorities should not refuse planning applications solely on the grounds of prematurity" (PPS3 para 72). It also encourages favourable consideration of applications where there is a 5-year land supply shortfall against the regional plan requirement.

10.12 To summarise, the application site is allocated in the Local Plan Review as a 'strategic reserve' site for 2000 houses. There was also a direct reference to land north of Winchester in the South East Plan Panel Report and the Core Strategy's Preferred Option was therefore to propose a 'strategic allocation' at Barton Farm for 2000 dwellings. Assessment of alternative sites and of representations made on the Preferred Option has concluded that it will remain necessary to make a strategic allocation in the non-PUSH part of the District and that the application site would be the most suitable for this.

10.13 Assessment of the housing land supply situation suggests that the Council cannot at present demonstrate a deliverable 5-year land supply to meet the requirements of the South East Plan and that the situation is likely to deteriorate unless additional land is released. Although the Local Plan's reserve allocation has not been triggered, and the

Core Strategy is not yet adopted, the land supply situation is an important material consideration, which PPS3 advises should result in applications being considered favourably.

10.14 The conclusion reached by the Head of Strategic Planning when originally consulted was, therefore, that there was a short-term requirement for housing land which the application could help to meet, and a longer-term need to plan for a major housing allocation, with this identified as the preferred site. He considered that these factors amounted to a 'compelling justification' which should result in the application being considered acceptable in principle when the need for housing numbers is taken, as it had to be, as being that set in the South East Plan.

10.15 On the 27th May 2010 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to Local Planning Authorities and his letter is attached to the report as Appendix 7. The Secretary of State reiterated the intention of the Government to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and to allow Local Planning Authorities to determine for themselves the appropriate scale of development in their area. Importantly he states that his letter is expected to be considered a material consideration in any current decision making process.

10.16 Officers have considered the situation in the light of the Secretary of State's letter, which unfortunately does not give any indication of what guidance, if any, will be provided on establishing local housing needs/requirements. The situation at the time of writing this report is that the South East Plan and its housing requirements have not been withdrawn by the Secretary of State and remain part of the development plan. PPS3 is also extant, including the requirement to demonstrate a 5-year land supply in accordance with regional housing requirements. However the Secretary of State has the power to summarily withdraw regional spatial strategies and/or PPS3 and a clear statement of his intention to do so set out in formal terms is a material consideration and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for each Local Planning Authority to judge in relation to each particular application. As such, although regard must still be had to the South East Plan, the Secretary of State has, in the view of your officers given local planning authorities a sound basis on which to make decisions without being bound to meet the requirements of the South East Plan. The corollary of this is that even greater regard should be had to local considerations and evidence in reaching decisions.

10.17 During the course of producing the LDF Core Strategy and considering the Barton Farm planning application evidence on housing needs has been considered, albeit within the context of a requirement within the South East Plan. This has shown some need for housing provision within the District, particularly at Winchester and for affordable housing. The Core Strategy Economic Study showed the importance of maintaining Winchester's economy but also highlighted the unsustainable levels of commuting caused largely by the imbalance between the number of jobs in Winchester and the resident working population, and exacerbated by high house prices. Work on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and housing land supply has shown that there are only a very limited number of committed housing sites in Winchester.

10.18 (a) There is, therefore, a clear need for some level of additional housing in Winchester and there has been much work through the Core Strategy on the options for accommodating it. However this has always been carried out within the context of the South East Plan's 'top down' housing requirements. There has not been a comprehensive assessment of housing needs which is 'untainted' by regional guidance

and it is not, therefore, possible to advise on whether such needs would be higher, lower, or the same as the South East Plan's requirements. Accordingly, whilst it is open to Members to conclude that local housing needs warrant approval of the application (subject to other matters being satisfactory), the Secretary of State's letter also makes clear that it may come to a decision 'without the framework of regional numbers' that the development is not needed or that such need cannot be determined and so considered as a "compelling justification" in advance of a reassessment of the situation through the Core Strategy

(b) Whether the proposed masterplan and access strategy provide an acceptable framework for the development of the site that would assist with the aim of creating a well designed and sustainable community that is distinctive and integrated with the surrounding area;

10.18 A Major Development Area of 2,000 dwellings provides the opportunity to create a new community which sets a high standard of urban design. The expectation is that the Barton Farm development will create a high quality, well designed and balanced new community with a strong sense of identity and place, which will compliment Winchester's environmental character and result in an attractive and integrated new neighbourhood. The adopted policy MDA.2 of the WDLPR requires, as a precursor of the development, the submission of a comprehensive masterplan for the development with the opportunity for the full participation and co-operation of the local planning authority, which has received their endorsement. A further requirement of policy MDA.2 is to secure a high quality of design which seeks to minimise the use of resources. Policy WT2 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy requires the development at Barton Farm to lead to the creation of a distinctive, well integrated neighbourhood of Winchester City.

10.19 The application is supported with a Design and Access Statement that sets out the design principles and concepts for the comprehensive development of the site. The document explains the design rationale behind the proposals and explains how the physical characteristics of the proposals have been informed by a process of consultation, testing and assessment with the co-operation of the local planning authority and other stakeholder groups. The document also demonstrates how issues relating to access have been dealt with. Through this analysis a strategy has been established for the development of the site to provide 2,000 houses and associated infrastructure and is represented through the illustrative masterplan (plan ref. PL06).

10.20 The detailed background analysis carried out by the applicant has led to the formulation of the masterplan and has involved:

- A study looking at the growth of Winchester from 1874 to the present;
- An assessment of the urban form of Winchester including an understanding of its historical layers, city edges, radial routes, Winchester's suburbs, open space and the city's topography;
- An assessment of mixed used centres and the suburbs of Winchester.
- A detailed site and contextural analysis to look at local uses, the setting, topography, connections and constraints associated with the site.

Design principles

10.21 The masterplan seeks to deliver a sustainable 21st Century suburb that actually connects with neighbouring development by re-routing the Andover Road through the development and connecting across its current alignment to draw the communities of Harestock and Weeke towards the site by removing the substantial barrier created by the road. The masterplan is underpinned by a series of key design principles:

Connecting communities

- Providing a new park to the west of Barton Farm off Andover Road creating the opportunity to bring together the existing communities of Harestock and Weeke with the new residents of Barton Farm.
- Placing Henry Beaufort School as a focus for north Winchester.

Creating a “heart” for Barton Farm

- Locating the new mixed use centre to the north of the ridgeline aligned with the park and school to the west

Linking community assets

- Provision of a new primary school at the eastern end of the axis of community facilities, supporting activity in the “heart”.

Serving the “heart”

- Provision of a new north-south street through the site, serving the “heart” and establishing passing trade.

A new space for Winchester

- A new public space formed on the intersection of the north-south street and the local centre.

A gateway to the city

- Vehicular traffic diverted from Andover Road into the site creating a new gateway into the city.
- Controlling vehicular speeds through design ensuring safe and convenient pedestrian connectivity between the community facilities.

Ensuring good connectivity

- New Andover Road designed in accordance with “Manual for Streets” providing high levels of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connectivity between east and west of the site, neighbouring communities and the city centre.

Reinforcing the landscape character

- The “T” of strategic landscape reinforced through the north-south new Andover Road and east-west along the ridgeline.
- Old Andover Road becomes a green corridor into the city for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The new park, public space and primary school support the existing strategic tree line and landscape along the ridgeline.

Imposing an east-west landscape grain

- The existing east-west landscape grain visible in Harestock continues into the site

running along the contours creating a green network.

- To the south-east the green network would create links to the Itchen Valley and city centre
- To the north-east the green network creates links to Well House Lane and routes to Headbourne Worthy and Worthy Down.

Forming a northern edge to the city

- The existing green character of the northern edge of the city is continued along the northern boundary of the site.
- Residential frontages would overlook a lane and open countryside
- From distant views to the north buildings are hidden behind significant landscaping and trees form the skyline.

Responding to the southern orientation

- The southern area of the site would be arranged with east-west streets following the contours to respond to and exploit the southern aspect for passive solar gain.

Contrasting character

- Northern area of site that is characterised by north facing slopes and the development will adopt a contrasting north-south orientation across the contours.
- Green fingers will extend from the countryside beyond the northern boundary into the site incorporating SUDS and local play.

The Access Strategy

10.22 The developer has also analysed the approach to accessing the development site. The masterplan proposes a radical approach to accessing the site involving the diversion and re-routing of the Andover Road between the junction with Well House Lane and Harestock Road in the north to a point north of Park Road to the south.

10.23 The proposals also involve the downgrading of Andover Road, involving the retention of vehicular access to properties fronting the road and the creation of a green corridor, providing a pedestrian and cycle route along this length of the Andover Road.

10.24 The justification for the access proposals focuses on removing the current east/west barrier between the site and the neighbouring communities formed by the existing Andover Road so that the existing northern suburbs of Harestock and Weeke are integrated with the new development. The applicant proposes that the removal of traffic from the section of Andover Road adjacent to Henry Beaufort School would offer future opportunities for the school to expand.

10.25 A further objective of the proposed access strategy is to create a new green corridor along the length of the Old Andover Road where existing highway land be given over to amenity land and recreation space.

10.26 More detailed drawings have been provided through the supplementary information indicating how the road would change as a result of the proposals. The plans indicate that where the road is retained it would be narrowed to 4.1m with local narrowing to 3.7m which would create a "lane" character providing access to dwellings along the route. The plans also show where the road is proposed for closure and devoted to green space. In addition six sketches and associated sections have been provided illustrating the

proposed down grading of the existing Andover Road into a country lane formed by a linear parkway.

10.27 The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) have commented on the proposed masterplan. Whilst CABE support the comprehensive background analysis of the character and development of Winchester undertaken by the applicant, they raise concerns with regard to the proposed access strategy. CABE have criticised the decision to re-direct the Andover Road through the site as historically inappropriate. The views expressed by CABE arise because the Andover Road is an important radial route into the City Centre that has existed as such since Roman times. CABE consider that the “downgrading” of the road is inappropriate and it is suggested that the masterplan should instead focus on providing frontage to the existing road as a means of “bridging” the route and drawing Barton Farm and Harestock together along the existing alignment.

10.28 The developer has provided a response to the criticism from CABE. The developer considers that the response does not appreciate fully the extensive work undertaken which underpins the very significant decision to re-align the main route for vehicles into Winchester from the north. The developer provides further clarification in relation to the plans to re-direct Andover Road through the application site:

- The existing road is not being removed or broken up;
- The existing route will remain in place and will follow its existing and original alignment;
- The only significant changes to the route will be the removal of the duelling north of Henry Beaufort School (which is understood to date from the 1950s and not historically significant);
- The removal of most vehicular traffic from this route should be seen as a benefit to the historic integrity of the road, not a negative aspect of the proposals;
- The existing wide and straight road allows vehicles to travel at speed and it is widely acknowledged to be an unpleasant environment dominated by the car to the detriment of walkers and cyclists;
- This unpleasant environment should not be preserved at the cost of creating a new route for vehicles, while maintaining the historically significant Roman route for lower-key use;
- The changes involve the narrowing of the northern sections, increasing the area of greenspace and creating public realm;
- This proposal offers a real opportunity to create a linear-park/gateway to Winchester at the point of route deviation that emphasises the importance of the multiple Roman routes into the City;
- The re-aligned route allows for a design that prioritises local traffic and create an environment in which pedestrians and cyclists co-exist without coming into contact with fast traffic;

10.29 The developer has also provided comments on CABE’s suggestion to use the existing Andover Road as the focus of development. The developer does not consider that the suggestion is a practical or realistic response to this particular site. The developer confirms that the existing carriageway is dominated in large part by mature trees that act as a defining feature on approach from the north. The developer considers that to re-characterise the Andover Road would require an increase in the number of accesses across the road, requiring the removal of a significant number of mature trees which would be extremely detrimental to the character of the approach. The developer considers that the creation of a route onto which shops and services front is not

achievable due to the level of physical alteration necessary and the position of existing residential development along the Harestock side of the road.

10.30 It is considered that the proposed access strategy is based upon a thorough understanding of the constraints and opportunities that arise from the proposed re-routing of the Andover Road through the site. The strategy is considered to provide significant benefits to the existing Andover Road corridor through improved integration and environmental improvements. The access strategy also provides a logical solution to deal with traffic through Barton Farm whilst also creating a vibrant heart to the development. It is therefore considered that the proposed access strategy offers an appropriate design solution to providing access for the development of the site.

10.31 The detailed technical highway implications of the access proposals are dealt with separately within this report.

10.32 The following sections examine the urban design merits of the proposed masterplan and are based upon the seven *By Design* urban design objectives and the advice received from the Council's Urban Design Officer.

Character

10.33 The scheme is primarily residential (2000 dwellings) but includes a local centre (with commercial, retail and community uses) and a school. A hierarchy of streets are proposed which includes a main street running north to south through the scheme (and through the local centre). Traffic currently using Andover Road will be diverted onto the main street (rejoining Andover Road at south and north points). This will allow the narrowing and 'greening' of Andover Road along the entire west side of the site (for pedestrians and cyclists) and will facilitate much better connections from the site to residential areas to the west.

10.34 The three dimensional shape of the landform and landscape have been expressed in the layout and the massing of the development. The masterplan proposes a hierarchy of well designed streets and green spaces which align with the contours. Development south of the ridgeline will align east to west exploiting the southern aspect and opportunities for passive solar gain. Most of the mature trees will be preserved and significant numbers of new trees will be planted along streets and within new green areas and parkland.

10.35 The proposal seeks to reinforce and enhance the landscape character of the site and Andover Road. Andover Road will be narrowed and 'greened'. The mature tall ridgeline of trees (east/west) will be reinforced with new planting. To complement this, a wide green northern edge, with green fingers projecting south into the scheme is proposed along the south side of Well House Lane. Towards the southern end of the site, in the dry valley, and along the west side of the railway a major area of public open space is proposed. The existing and proposed landscape structure will help the development integrate into the wider landscape and reinforce local distinctiveness. It will provide significant levels of amenity, recreation and ecological value.

10.36 The detail of the scheme has not yet been designed. It is expected that the detailed designs of streets, spaces and buildings will be set out in the 'design codes'. These codes (which will have to be approved by the local planning authority) will promote the use of locally sourced materials in the designs of buildings, interpreted in a contemporary

way to ensure that a modern suburb with interconnected smaller character areas is developed. The proposal to incorporate a diversity of building typologies, dwelling types and tenures will provide an opportunity to introduce a variety of house designs to add definition and identity to streets and places in a cohesive way.

Continuity and Enclosure

10.37 The master plan shows that the majority of development will be set out as perimeter blocks. All public places are enclosed by either buildings or significant physical features (i.e. the railway embankment and strong tree lines). This pattern of development will afford clear definition between the public and the private realm and will offer good levels of comfort, privacy and security for residents and visitors. A clear hierarchy of streets is proposed with active frontages and a good degree of enclosure. Design guidance on how to achieve the right amount of enclosure and continuity of frontages within streets and spaces will be included within the 'design codes'. The hierarchy of different street widths and building heights, together with a cohesive set of building designs and excellent hard and soft landscaping within the public realm will ensure a legible development.

Quality of the Public Realm

10.38 The public realm includes; the proposed greened and re-landscaped Andover Road, all the new streets, squares, footpaths and cycle ways, the village centre, parks, sports and recreation grounds, children's play areas, informal amenity and natural green space, allotments and the proposed park and ride.

10.39 The master plan shows well designed streets connecting all parts of the development. It will be a highly permeable layout with many different routes connecting one place with another.

10.40 At the heart of the development a local centre is proposed (which includes shops and restaurants, a new school and children's nursery, a doctors' surgery and community and leisure facilities). The local centre overlooks a new large park which will extend up to the re-landscaped and greened Andover Road. This park has the potential to be connected to Henry Beaufort School. There will be other good connections within the scheme to Harestock and Weeke via footpaths and cycle ways.

10.41 The quality of the public realm will depend to a large degree on the way that buildings enclose space, building designs, the alignment of active frontages and the contribution that the hard and soft landscape structure will make. The masterplan provides a convincing framework of blocks, streets and public spaces which enable this to be achieved. However achieving quality in the public realm will depend on getting the detail right in terms of building form, height and proportion, detailed street designs and detailed hard and soft landscape design. Guidance on these will be included in the design codes.

10.42 Part of the proposal is to redirect traffic from Andover Road through the scheme which will facilitate the narrowing and greening of Andover Road so that it becomes a shared space for pedestrians and cyclists and provides access to existing properties. This will safeguard the majority of mature trees along the western boundary and provide many opportunities for new tree planting and landscaping. The narrowing and greening of this route will facilitate better east/west connections between Barton Farm and

Harestock.

10.43 The greening of Andover Road together with the green northern fringe (including the green fingers), the large parkland in the south (dry valley), the new central park and the trees along the main spine road are strategically important to the success of the scheme and are included on the Land Use Parameters Plan included at appendix 6.

Ease of Movement

10.44 The master plan displays a high degree of permeability. The majority of streets and houses are laid out as perimeter blocks which provides many alternative routes for people to move around. Some cul-de-sac development is proposed at the south of the site and this is the right solution where development will back onto houses in Park Road.

10.45 The scheme is very well connected to the surrounding areas. A footpath and cycleway is provided under the railway and across land to the east where it will connect to Worthy Road, then Nuns Walk and then further south into the city centre. A footpath is provided to Well House Lane, in the north east, which will connect to Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy. Footpaths and cycle ways are provided that will connect to footpaths on the west side of Andover Road into Harestock and on to Stoney Lane and into the local centre at Weeke.

10.46 A circular bus route has been designed into the scheme which will connect to the city centre and which is proposed to operate on a daytime 15 minute frequency (10 minute frequency during peak hours). All residents within Barton Farm will be within 5 minutes of a bus stop. A bus priority lane is proposed from the railway bridge over Andover Road south to the junction with Worthy Lane.

10.47 A park and ride “light” is proposed at the north of the site which will accommodate up to 200 vehicles. It is proposed to serve the park and ride by the circular bus route. It is intended that the park and ride will intercept traffic and provide a sustainable alternative to driving into the city centre and other destinations nearby.

Legibility

10.48 The masterplan proposes 6 character areas: Village centre; Main Street; Andover Road; Northern Fringe; Solar village and Southern fringe. It is proposed that each character area would have a specific identity and each character area has developed through a thorough understanding of the varying character of the site and surrounding area.

10.49 The updated design and access statement describes the five character areas and a set of defining characteristics of each area. A brief summary of the key characteristics that define the character areas is provided below:

- The Village Centre – Located at the heart of the development to the north of the ridgeline. A dense mixed use town square with a multi-functional use, providing for the needs of the community. Provision of a generous public open space including a square and green. A shared surface street is proposed with a path/cycleway positioned either side of the street delineated by setts. Buildings would be located closer to the street to form enclosure and act as passive traffic control measures.
- The Main Street – Relates to the development zone adjacent to the main Andover Road running through the site. The masterplan proposes a changing character of

the street from rural to dense urban. It begins as wide boulevard streets, from the north and the south, which then narrows down and has closed urban frontages towards the centre. The varied character along the length of the road is part of the traffic speed reduction strategy. The main street character area is further subdivided into six sub-character areas including the north entrance to the site; the semi-rural street; the village street; the urban street with SUDS; the tree-lined road and the southern entrance. The design and access statement provides typical sections, sketches and technical road details of the main street.

- Andover Road – Residential zone in which there are two distinct character types envisaged for development. Large detached houses set within larger plots with softer edges are proposed facing Andover Road located on the fringes of the character area. Semi-detached and Mews houses at a higher density are proposed within the middles of the blocks.
- Northern Fringe – Residential zone located along the northern part of the site. The character of this area would be defined by the landscape setting and topography of this area of the site. A series of five green fingers are proposed into the site from the north affording views north to the open countryside and views into the development from the north. The street pattern in this area would generally follow a north-south orientation, sloping down to the north.
- Solar Village – This area relates to a residential zone located south of the ridgeline, towards the east of the site. The streets will be orientated in a west east direction so that the buildings can exploit solar gain from the south. It is envisaged that wider streets would be provided to accommodate a south-facing landscape strip and front gardens to houses north of the streets. Shorter terraces are envisaged on the south of the street to let sunlight in. Asymmetrical roof pitches are also proposed to capitalise on sunlight for PVs and to allow sunlight into the streets. It is also intended to provide north-south green lanes providing space for play, drainage swales, planting of low trees providing solar shading and community space.
- Southern Fringe – This is the area north of the dry valley and the area south of it that backs onto Park Road and the allotments. The large dry valley running across the site is designated public open space. It will be enclosed by development frontages to the north and the south, with perimeter blocks to the north and cul de sac to the south.

10.50 Each character area will have a unique identity provided by variances in building scales and dimensions, building typologies, the dimensions and enclosure of streets, the design of landscaping, layout of streets and the disposition of buildings along streets and around spaces. This will mean that the development will not appear as a sprawling suburb but a series of interconnected smaller areas with their own identity. This will provide clear legibility for residents and visitors.

Adaptability

10.50 The applicant has stated that all houses will be designed to lifetime homes standards. This means that they can be adapted for young families, growing families, for older people or adapted for special needs. (10% of the units will be wheelchair accessible). A sustainability strategy has been submitted by the applicant which is referred to in subsequent paragraphs.

10.51 No information on the adaptability of the other buildings has been provided, however this would not normally be provided at 'outline' stage. It will be important to

include this information in the 'design codes', which will be submitted at a later date and secured by condition in the event that permission is granted.

10.52 An allotment area is proposed within the scheme and 'edible streets' and gardens are proposed which will have good solar penetration for growing food. There are large areas of public recreation and amenity open space which lend themselves to conversion and adaptation in the future.

10.53 The greening of Andover Road and redirecting traffic through the scheme is an important and positive part of the proposal. However it is a radical proposal which deserves to be tested. The applicant therefore proposes to reroute traffic through the scheme as an early phase in the development process and not carry out the landscaping work to Andover Road until it can be shown conclusively that the new traffic management measures work effectively.

Diversity

10.54 Although the development is predominantly residential there is a good diversity of other uses within the local centre and a variety of recreational and amenity open spaces. The character areas will provide visual diversity because of different dwelling types and sizes and densities. 40% of the housing will be affordable and within this provision there will be a mix of tenure (rent and shared equity). Overall the development will be diverse, and vibrant.

Conclusion of urban design merits

10.55 It is considered the proposed masterplan and access strategy provide a high quality framework for the comprehensive development of the site and will contribute to the creation of a well designed and sustainable community that is distinctive and integrates with the surrounding area. It therefore accords with policy MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan (Review). It is fundamental that the detailed design is secured by the submission of Design Codes, which are necessary to secure a quality development throughout the various phases of the development.

c) Whether the proposed highway, access and parking arrangements associated with the development would cause an unacceptable growth in traffic and reduction in highway safety, and whether the proposals provide adequate access to local services and public transport.

10.56 The application is supported with by a comprehensive Transport Assessment (TA) and a Travel Plan. The supplementary information submitted on 6th April provides further details and clarification in relation to highway matters. The TA has examined the effect of the development on traffic and transport issues in the area. In particular the assessment examines the following issues:

- The magnitude and consequences of changes in traffic flows on the local and strategic road network;
- The implication of the proposed development traffic on traffic flows at key local junctions;
- Pedestrian/cycle accessibility;
- Linkages to existing and future planned development;
- Car parking;
- Travel Plan obligations; and

- Construction and traffic routes

10.57 The supplementary information document examines further highway issues that have arisen during the initial assessment of the application. It considers:

- The New Andover Road Corridor
- Public Transport Strategy
- Trunk Road Impact
- Framework Travel Plan

10.58 The conclusions of the TA have found that the forecast traffic flows when the development is anticipated to be completed in 2023 will generally have a major impact. The TA outlines a package of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts including a Travel Plan; a new bus service, new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes/crossing facilities and a Park and Ride “light” site.

10.59 The findings of the TA and the supplementary information have been examined by Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority (herein after referred to as ‘HCC Highways’) and a number of transport issues have been resolved through the submission of the supplementary information.

10.60 HCC Highways acknowledge the benefits of re-routing the Andover Road through the development site in order to provide a more vibrant centre to the development but originally had concerns over the accommodation of abnormal loads through the route. The supplementary information indicates that the new Andover Road would provide a minimum 6.5m high by 6.5m wide corridor free of any obstructions such as traffic islands, parking bays, street furniture and tree canopies. HCC Highways have confirmed that the additional information satisfies the physical requirements in this regard.

10.61 HCC Highways also welcome the provision of the park and ride “light” as it supports the overall strategy for dealing with the high level of in commuting traffic to Winchester as set out in the Local Transport Plan (LTP). Provision to secure its design, construction, future management and operation is required for the purposes of the Section 106 Legal Agreement. In the absence of a completed S106 Legal Agreement the proposals are considered unacceptable in this regard.

10.62 HCC Highways have highlighted a number of unresolved issues in relation to traffic and transport matters that cause concern and therefore object to the proposed development. The areas of concern relate to:

- Lack of food store trip generation data
- The extent of assessment and unknown impact on the Stockbridge Road corridor & routes to Kings Worthy / A33
- Re-routing of Andover Road – Unknown delays into City Centre and the proposed layout / safety / operation and delivery of the proposed route
- The proposed junctions of:

1. Andover Road / Harestock Road
2. New Andover Road / Well House Lane
3. New Andover Road / Stoney Lane
4. Andover Road / City Road / Sussex Street / Stockbridge Road
5. Well House Lane Arch
6. Andover Road Toucan

- Phasing of development, particularly access via the existing Harestock Road / Well House Lane staggered cross roads for up to 300 dwellings.
- Inadequacy of pedestrian and cycle routes to the west
- The unsuitability of the proposed Well House Lane Rail Arch works
- The inadequacy of the travel plan
- The inadequacy of the passenger transport contribution

10.63 As a result of these objections HCC Highways have recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- The proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13 in that it fails to make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance on the private car. The failure to utilise alternative means of transport to the private car would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the objectives of PPG13 and PPS4 and policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East and does not comply with saved policies T1, T3 and T5 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.
- It has not been demonstrated that the local road network is capable of operating satisfactorily with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the site proposals, particularly along the proposed and existing Andover Road corridor including its junctions with Harestock Road, Well House Lane, Stoney Lane and City Road and also along the existing Stockbridge Road corridor particularly at its junctions with Harestock Road, Stoney Lane and Berewecke Road and on those parts of the network to the east of the site particularly Park Road and its junction with Worthy Lane and at the A33 junction with the B3047. Consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network which is contrary to policies T2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East.
- The junction of Andover Road / Harestock Road / Well House Lane is unsuitable in its present condition to take the type and amount of traffic likely to be generated by the first phase of the proposal.
- The design of the proposed New Andover Road is unsuitable in its present condition to safely and satisfactorily accommodate the type and amount of multi-modal traffic likely to be generated by the proposal and using that route to access the City Centre.

10.64 HCC Highways have confirmed that these reasons for refusal could be overcome should the developer submit further transport assessment information and enter a Section 106 Agreement with the County Council to secure off site highway works and the payment of financial contributions in line with an agreed mitigation package. This has not been achieved at the date of finalising the recommendation.

Strategic Road Network

10.65 In response to comments by the Highways Agency (which is responsible for the management of the strategic road network of trunk roads and motorways) on the application the supplementary information examines the impact of the development on the network. The Highways Agency has concerns over the impact of the development on the M3 and A34/A272 junction which is experiencing congestion at peak periods and requested that an analysis of the impact of the development on the M3 junctions 9 and 11 is required. The developer is willing to provide similar mitigation measures to address this concern as was indicated in the earlier 2005 planning application. The mitigation involved the revision of the existing road markings along the southern over-bridge to provide a third lane to reduce queuing and this would replicate the arrangement on the northern over-bridge. The Highways Agency welcome this mitigation measure but is concerned that due to the time passed since the last application (5 years), and the likely background traffic growth that has occurred in that time, it is not clear if the measure remains appropriate. For this reason the Highways Agency has concluded that it is not able to assess the full impact of the development on the M3/A34 trunk roads. Additionally the Highways Agency is concerned that the proposed mitigation measure will not appropriately mitigate the impact of the development in line with Circular 02/2007. It therefore recommends refusal at this point in time because it has not been able to draw conclusions from the additional information it requires.

Parking Strategy

10.66 Given the outline nature of the proposal the detailed parking layout and distribution within the site have yet to be developed. The Design and Access Statement indicates the parking strategy for the development. The proposed parking strategy involves a variety of car parking design solutions across the site to reflect the different requirements and spatial configuration of the character areas including a mix of in curtilage parking, rear courtyard parking (limited to serving a maximum of 6 dwellings), on-street parking and disabled parking. It is stated that the proposed parking provision will be in accordance with the local authority's parking standards and will follow guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency's document "Car parking, what works where". The proposed parking strategy is considered appropriate for the development and should inform an appropriate mix of parking at the detailed stage.

d) Whether the proposed mix and quantum of land uses would assist the aim of creating a sustainable community;

10.67 In assessing whether the proposed mix and quantum of land uses would assist the aim of creating a sustainable community the following factors shall be assessed:

- (i) The location and density of residential development*
- (ii) The mix of dwelling sizes and tenures*
- (iii) The location of a local centre and open space*
- (iv) Improved accessibility to the town centre and railway station by sustainable transport systems to reduce the need to travel by car, public transport provision, park and ride light, footpath and cycleway provision*
- (v) Other sustainable development principles*

- (i) Location and density of residential development*

10.68 Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) and Planning policy Statement 3 (PPS3) set out the Government's approach to planning for housing and mixed use development. PPS1 reiterates the Government's commitment to promoting more sustainable patterns of development and states that local authorities should, amongst other objectives:

- Provide improved access for all to jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities, open space, sport and recreation by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car.
- Reduce the need to travel and encourage accessible public transport provision to secure more sustainable patterns of transport development.
- Promote the more efficient use of land through higher density, mixed use development and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings.
- Enhance as well as protect biodiversity, natural habitats, the historic environment, landscape and townscape character.

10.69 It is broadly accepted through PPS1 and PPS3 and by policy H7 of the adopted WDLPR that higher residential densities are required to make the best use of land, particularly on sites close to town centres and public transport corridors.

10.70 The site is located approximately 1km north of the Winchester train station and 2km north of the city centre. The proposed masterplan indicates the re-routing of Andover Road through the site. Therefore it is considered that the site represents a sustainable location, close to the city centre and train station and also positioned alongside a major public transport corridor linking the site to key destinations. The development of the site should make the maximum effort to exploit this asset.

10.71 The provision of 2,000 houses across the site gives an average net density of 38.5 dwellings per hectare (dph) which is accordance with criteria (iii) of policy H7 of the adopted WDLPR and the range suggested in paragraph 47 of PPS3 which stipulates that 30 dwellings per hectare should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide development.

10.72 The application is accompanied with an updated illustrative residential density plan (PLO3) and building height plan (PL04) which indicates the residential densities and building heights across the site. Lower density development (20-30 dph) is indicated along the Old Andover Road with larger detached and semi-detached dwellings proposed to reflect the lower density of development along the opposite side of the Old Andover Road. In addition lower density development is indicated along the southern boundary of the site, backing onto Park Road, and to the north east corner of the site, establishing a transition to the settlement of Kings Worthy. Medium density development (30-50 dph) is indicated along the main transport corridor through the site and it is indicated that three storey houses and town houses would be provided, creating an appropriate sense of enclosure to the street. Higher density development (50-60 dph) is indicated around the local centre, where a combination of houses, town houses and apartments are likely to vary in height between two and four storeys.

10.73 The masterplan indicates a coherent and logical hierarchy of building heights, with the tallest buildings and the CHP flue stack concentrated around the local centre where they can form a distinctive focal point. Taller three storey buildings are also located along the new Andover Road to the south of the local centre and are intended to create an appropriate sense of enclosure to the public space and to the southern fringe denoting

the eastern edge of the city. Three storey buildings are also proposed bordering the large equipped play area to the south of the ridgeline. The remaining residential areas of the site would consist of two and two and a half storey buildings.

10.74 The landscape and visual impact chapter of the ES concludes that the development will generate many landscape and visual impacts, both of a temporary and permanent nature. The ES acknowledges that the main residential development and associated elements (local centre, school and CHP unit) will generate the most significant visual impacts but the severity of the majority of the identified visual impacts can be mitigated through exemplary design following the principles set out in the masterplan and parameter plans. The issue of landscape and visual impact is addressed further in subsequent paragraphs.

(ii) The proposed mix of dwelling sizes and tenures

10.75 The ability for the development to deliver a balanced mix of dwelling sizes that reflects current and future housing needs and also delivers a high proportion of affordable housing is considered a key objective in securing a mixed and integrated community at Barton Farm and is a requirement of policy MDA.2 of the adopted WDLPR and policy WT2 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy.

Housing mix

10.76 In relation to the type and size of proposed accommodation and its potential to create a mixed and integrated community policy H7 of the WDLPR is relevant. This policy seeks to increase the number of smaller dwellings in new development and sets a target of at least 50% dwellings to comprise 1 or 2 bed properties.

10.77 The proposed development comprises 2,000 dwellings and an indicative mix of housing is provided. The indicative mix of dwellings show that 800 (40%) of the units will consist of 1 and 2 bed units. Whilst this is short of the 50% required by policy H7, the emerging policy CP17 of the Winchester Core Strategy emphasises the need to provide a flexible policy framework that establishes basic principles and objectives e.g. placing an emphasis on providing 2 and 3 bed houses and prioritising affordable housing, whilst having regard to the local circumstances. Policy CP17 is based on a more up to date assessment of housing needs (than the adopted policy H7) in Winchester and therefore, whilst it is not adopted policy, it is considered a more accurate reflection of future housing needs in the area. Given that the proposed dwellings would be delivered in a phased fashion within an approximate 10 year time frame it is considered appropriate to base the housing mix on a more up-to-date data set as set out in policy CP17. On this basis the proposals are considered to deliver an acceptable mix of dwelling sizes, including a high proportion of smaller and family size housing that has the potential to create a mixed and integrated community.

Affordable Housing

10.78 Criteria (ii) of policy H5 of the WDLPR places a requirement for the development to deliver 40% affordable housing. The proposals indicate the provision of 40% affordable housing including the provision of 60 extra care homes. The Council's Strategic Housing Manager welcomes the provision and considers that the proposals have the potential to make a significant contribution towards meeting affordable housing needs with a broad range of affordable housing types, sizes and affordable tenures being proposed, including

extra care housing. The applicant has been involved in discussions with a Registered Social Landlord.

10.79 Discussions have taken place between the applicant and the Council's Strategic Housing Manager in relation to the proposed affordable housing mix. The indicative mix comprises 500 dwellings offered for social rent, 240 units offered for intermediate forms of tenure and 60 units offered for extra care housing. This mix offers a high proportion of socially rented affordable housing and has been agreed in principle with the Council's Strategic Housing Manager. The final mix will be influenced by the success or otherwise of gaining a grant from the Homes and Communities Agency but a S106 legal agreement will ensure the level of socially rented affordable housing is maintained at a reasonable level.

10.80 It is anticipated that the provision of affordable housing will be dispersed throughout the development thus avoiding large concentrations in any particular location. Affordable housing should normally be provided in blocks of no more than 10-15 dwellings, although precise numbers will be influenced by good urban design principles as well as the scale of development proposed.

10.81 The affordable housing tenure arrangements, standard of the dwellings, the method of allocating the housing and the long term availability of the affordable dwellings are to be determined and set out in the S106 agreement in consultation with the Strategic Housing Manager. The nature of the affordable housing provision will be based on the local need at the time of implementation and be delivered through appropriate planning conditions and legal agreements, in line with policy H5 of the WDLPR.

10.82 However in the absence of a completed S106 agreement securing the affordable housing requirement the proposals fail to deliver the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to policies H5 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

(iii) The location of the local centre and open space

The Local Centre

10.83 The provision of a local centre and appropriate facilities and services to meet the needs of the development is a requirement of policy MDA.2 of the WDLPR and policy WT2 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy. The location of the local centre has been informed by the masterplan. The local centre is proposed to the north of the ridgeline with the "New Andover Road" passing through the centre. The local centre is envisaged to become the "heart" of the development and the "New Andover Road" would operate as a High Street with a vibrant level of activity concentrated within this central area. The local centre uses would include a retail food store, a health centre, a children's nursery, a community hall, a gym, a mix of retail and service facilities, offices and a public house. A public park is positioned to the west of the public square and the proposed primary school would be located to the east of the local centre, adjacent to the proposed energy centre. In addition to passing trade the location of the local centre would be accessible from within Barton Farm through the provision of east-west connecting streets, cycleways and footways. It is considered that the proposed location of the local centre is in a highly accessible location and in a position appropriate to serve the needs of the development.

Open Space

10.84 The open space strategy has also been developed as a key element of the masterplan. The proposals for Barton Farm include a multi-functional network of green space throughout the development which accords with the approach required by policy CC8 (green infrastructure) of the South East Plan. Policy CP1 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy requires new housing to make provision for public open space in accordance with the standards set out in the Council's "Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2008)". Policy CP5 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy advises support of development that incorporates provision for multifunctional and well managed Green Infrastructure to meet recognised standards.

10.85 The quantity and the various types of green space to be provided within the development are illustrated on the Developable Areas Plan and the Environmental Infrastructure Plan and a detailed account of the linkages between the various green spaces, both from north to south and from east to west, are contained within the Design and Access Statement.

10.86 It is proposed to provide 1ha of allotments, 6.3ha of informal green space, 8.5ha of parks, sport and recreation grounds, 2.26ha of children's play and 5.2ha of natural green space. In addition to the above it is acknowledged that a substantial area of public open space will be created along the Old Andover Road and through the green fingers that feed into the northern part of the site. The land to the east of the railway line is to be provided by the applicant as supportive space, adding to the strategic green infrastructure for the development.

Allotments

10.87 The original illustrative Masterplan (PL06) submitted with the application included two areas of allotments which together marginally exceeded the requirement. The accessibility of these facilities to the whole of site was questioned. The question was also asked whether smaller 'doorstep' growing areas could be provided to off-set this problem. The supplementary information confirms the proposal to include smaller growing areas and these can be identified on the submitted Environmental Infrastructure Plan and are welcomed. The allotment area, whilst still slightly in excess of the quantum required at 1.00 ha, has been consolidated into one area in the far south east of the site. Whilst it is recognised that some parts of the site will be further away from the allotment area than others it will be well connected through a network of pedestrian and cycle ways to allow relatively easy access for all of the occupiers of the development.

Children's Play space

10.88 Quantity required = 2.26 Ha. Quantity provided = 2.26 Ha. The masterplan meets the requirement by providing children's equipped play areas in the form of four Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs), one at either end of the ridge and one each in the northern and southern halves of the site. A larger Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) is located to the south of the ridge, close to the primary school and generally central to the development. Further space for children's play will be available within the extensive areas of informal green amenity space distributed through the site and within the areas set out as parks, sports fields and recreation grounds. The supplementary information indicates a change in the position of the NEAP to the south of the ridgeline, which has been pulled away to protect the ridgeline tree belt, and this is considered

acceptable. The proposed play space is considered acceptable in relation to the quantity, type and location.

Informal green amenity space

10.89 Quantity required = 3.62 Ha. Quantity provided = approximately 6.30 Ha. The masterplan proposes large quantities of informal green space: along the principal treed ridge line; beside the Old Andover Road; to the south of the site in the area of the dry valley and in the five 'fingers' of connecting green space (or 'landscape infiltration zones') to the north of the site. There are also other areas of informal green space provided in association with the children's play areas. Much of the Old Andover Road would become a green corridor and a key amenity feature for the site with access for pedestrians and cyclists and limited vehicular access for local residents. Much of this informal green space will have multiple benefits. The requirement has been met and exceeded and the supplementary information provides further clarification on the provision of the five 'green fingers' that emanate from the area of natural green space in the north of the site. The proposed informal green space is considered acceptable in relation to quantity, type and location.

Natural green space

10.90 Quantity required = 4.52 Ha. Quantity provided = 5.7 Ha. The overwhelming majority of the land proposed for natural green space on the masterplan is located on the steeply sloping northern boundary of the site. Elsewhere, other areas of informal green space will also act as important habitat, particularly the 'landscaped infiltration zones' extending southwards from the main body of natural green space into the residential neighbourhoods north of the ridge. There will also be additional habitat found in conjunction with the proposed parkland in the south and east of the site. The provision is considered acceptable.

Parks, sports and recreation grounds

10.91 Space required 6.78 ha of which at least half (3.39 ha) should be for 'outdoor sport'. Space provided 8.5 ha of which 4.5 ha is provided for outdoor sport. This requirement has been met by extending the area next to the railway line (where the other allotment site was) and including more land in the north west corner. The proposed parks, sports and recreation grounds are considered acceptable in relation to quantity, type and location.

Use of park opposite Henry Beaufort School

10.92 The land opposite Henry Beaufort School is identified as a park for public use and will be provided as part of the open space network. It is not classified as outdoor sports space and is not dedicated for use by the school. The masterplan states that this space has the potential for the relocation or expansion of the school, which is a requirement within the emerging Winchester Core Strategy. The precise use of the land in the future would be a matter for discussion between WCC and HCC.

Land to the east of the railway line

10.93 The land to the east of the railway line is to be provided by the applicant as supportive space adding to the strategic green infrastructure provided as part of the

development, which while not strictly public open space, will provide wider opportunity for recreation and dog walking via the paths that will be created across and around the perimeter of the site. The land also offers significant nature conservation value.

10.94 In summary it can be seen in the table below how the application comfortably meets the Council's minimum on site public open space quantity standards. The Council's Open Space Officer is content with the level of provision proposed subject to securing an appropriate management agreement through the S106 legal agreement. However in the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement the POS provision and management strategy cannot be secured. In light of this the proposal would fail to make adequate provision for POS and is contrary to policies RT4 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Use	Requirement for Barton Farm	Provision at Barton Farm
Allotments	0.90 ha	1.00 ha
Children's play space	2.26 ha	2.26 ha
Informal green amenity space	3.62 ha	6.30 ha
Natural green space	4.52 ha	5.20 ha
Parks, sport & recreation grounds	6.78 ha of which 3.39 should be for outdoor sport	8.50 ha of which 4.50 is for Outdoor Sport
Total	18.08 ha	23.26 ha

(iv) Improved accessibility and connections by sustainable transport systems to reduce the need to travel by car.

10.95 Policy MDA.2 of the adopted WDLPR requires the development at Barton Farm to provide appropriate access routes to link the development to the transport network for public, commercial and private vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Policy WT2 of the emerging Winchester Core Strategy is relevant and requires the development at Barton Farm to provide improved accessibility to the town centre and the railway station by sustainable transport systems to reduce the need to travel by car, including public transport provision and enhancement, footpaths, cycleways, bridleways, and green corridors.

10.96 The success of the Barton Farm development will rely not only on its integration and sustainable connections with Winchester City Centre and the surrounding neighbourhoods, but also on it creating a well connected and permeable internal layout to ensure that the facilities and services provided are accessible to all. An objective of the masterplan is to "embed alternatives to the private car, incorporating excellent public transport accessibility, footways, paths and cycle links. Pedestrian and cycle priority will be provided throughout creating streets not highways".

Connections to the surrounding area

10.97 The proposals are considered to respond to the location of Barton Farm in relation to its proximity to the City Centre and the train station and also the adjoining neighbourhoods and countryside. Sustainable travel measures include:

- The downgrading of Andover Road to a linear park - provides a dedicated and attractive pedestrian and cycle route into the City Centre which would benefit the existing neighbourhoods of Harestock and Weeke as well as the new community

of Barton Farm.

- Providing connections from the site onto the Old Andover Road at several intervals along the western edge of the site - creates the opportunity for increased walking and cycling to the City Centre but also links into neighbouring areas.
- Provision of a new footpath through the land to the east of the railway line to Worthy Road – creates an additional pedestrian/cycle link to the City Centre and other neighbouring areas to the east.
- A dedicated bus service, a park and ride light site to the north of the site and the extensive network of cycle routes - indicates a commitment to making the most of the sites accessible location.

Bus provision

10.98 The masterplan has been designed to incorporate a circular bus route which has been designed to operate in a clock-wise or anti-clockwise directing linking Barton Farm with the City Centre and train station with a dedicated service ultimately operating on a daytime 15 minute frequency and in peak hours operating at a 10 minute frequency. The design of the route is intended to ensure that all residents are within 250m (5 minutes walk) of a bus stop serving key locations including the local centre and the park and ride “light” located in the north west corner of the site. It is intended that the existing hourly no. 86 service currently connecting Basingstoke and Winchester and running along the Andover Road would be diverted into the site on the realigned primary street.

10.99 It is noted that HCC Highways are raising an objection to the details of the sustainable transport measures including the detail of the Travel Plan and the inadequacy of the passenger transport contribution. Whilst the overall strategy for sustainable travel for the development is considered acceptable the details are unresolved and therefore it is concluded that at this stage the proposals do not provide sufficient reassurance that the development would be well connected to key destinations through sustainable travel modes.

Connections within the site

10.100 To maximise connectivity the masterplan proposes a clear hierarchy of streets involving the primary street, neighbourhood streets, residential streets and living streets. The aim is to provide a movement strategy that responds both to the surrounding context and improving the overall connectivity of the area. A further aim is to provide a highly permeable network of streets in line with current guidance to ensure a sense of safety within the development that will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Homezones or living streets with passive traffic calming through design and quality landscaping are proposed on the basis that these areas would contribute to the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment, suitable for a family focused on sustainable development. The proposed hierarchy of streets are indicated on the submitted indicative plans contained within the design and access statement.

10.101 To maximise connectivity the masterplan proposes a clear hierarchy of streets involving the primary street, neighbourhood streets, residential streets and living streets. The aim is to provide a movement strategy that responds both to the surrounding context and improving the overall connectivity of the area. A further aim is to provide a highly permeable network of streets in line with current guidance to ensure a sense of safety within the development that will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Homezones or living streets with passive traffic calming through design and quality

landscaping are proposed on the basis that these areas would contribute to the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment, suitable for a family focused on sustainable development. The proposed hierarchy of streets are indicated on the submitted indicative plans contained with the DAS.

10.102. It is considered that the proposals will lead to a permeable and well connected internal street pattern that will ensure the community facilities and services provided within the site are highly accessible.

(v) Other sustainable development principles

Sustainable energy proposals

10.103 The application is supported with a Sustainability Statement and a Renewable Energy Assessment. The Renewable Energy Assessment sets out how the development would comply with regional and local plan policies regarding renewable energy and reduction of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from new developments. In order to assess the energy strategy for the development proposal the Council has appointed an independent renewable energy consultant who has provided professional advice that has informed the Council's assessment of this issue.

10.104 The energy consultant's report reviews the energy strategy on the basis of its likely compliance with national and local planning policies concerning CO₂ emissions, renewable energy generation and sustainable development. The report also provides an objective assessment of the suitability of the proposed energy strategy for the development.

10.105 Policy NRM11 of the South East Plan is relevant to the assessment of the proposed energy strategy and relates to development design for energy efficiency and renewable energy. The policy encourages local authorities to promote and secure greater uses of decentralised and renewable/low-carbon energy in new development, requiring 10% of energy to be provided from decentralised and renewable/low-carbon sources. There are no sustainable energy policies contained with the adopted WDLPR, as policy DP6 (relating to sustainability/renewable energy) was one of the policies which was not saved in the Local Plan by the Secretary of State on 8th July 2009.

10.106 The emerging Winchester Core Strategy contains two policies that relate to sustainable low and zero carbon built development. Policy CP13 relates to CO₂ emission reductions and the generation of renewable energy and seeks to set targets in line with Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards. Policy CP14 relates to renewable and decentralised energy provision. The Winchester Core Strategy has not been adopted and both policies are subject to change. Therefore no statutory weight can be given to these policies at this stage.

10.107 The applicant confirms that they are committed to exceeding Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 from the outset of development and to achieve higher levels as may be introduced during the development period. The applicant is offering a flexible approach to energy provision, to enable new technologies to be incorporated into the development as they emerge.

10.108 The preliminary energy strategy consists of three main elements:

- Minimise energy demand of buildings – Construction measures such as thicker

insulation and high performance windows and doors. These measures reduce the energy demands of the new buildings by minimising energy losses (eg. reducing the heat through windows). Other measures include: minimising heat losses with closed northern facades; ensuring high compactness of buildings (good ratio of surfaces to volume) and maximising passive solar gains with windows facing south.

- A Combined Heat and Power System (CHP) – CHP systems generate electricity locally to a development while also producing heat, which is captured and used to meet heating needs. This is a more efficient use of fuel than generating electricity from large power stations, which usually waste the heat created by venting it to the atmosphere, and generating heat to meet heating requirements with local boiler plant. In the case of this development it is proposed to provide a single CHP installed within the local centre area of the site. The heat it generates would be supplied to the buildings on the development via a district heating system (a network of buried pipes that transport heated water around the site to deliver thermal energy to the buildings). The applicant confirms that, while a gas powered system is currently proposed, the CHP has the advantage of being “future proofed” to the extent that should biomass become more reliable, sustainable and viable than at present, the boilers may be upgraded to run on such fuel.
- Production of on-site renewable electricity using photovoltaic (PV) panels – PV panels consist of a thin layer of semi-conductor material, which directly generates electricity when exposed to sunlight. PV panels would normally be mounted on the roof of buildings or fully integrated with the roof material (although they could be integrated into glass facades or mounted on the ground if there were insufficient roof space)

10.109 The proposed energy strategy has been scrutinised by the energy consultant in order to identify claims regarding the performance of the strategy and to assess their validity. Overall the proposed energy strategy predicts that the adopted approach will lead to a 70% reduction of the total site emissions, compared to the emissions that would be expected to result if Barton Farm were to be built to minimum standards permitted by the current Building Regulations.

10.110 The energy consultant has concluded that the statement does not validate the stated level of CO₂ reduction and confirms that a more accurate prediction would be closer to a 45% reduction in total site emissions. This is based on the applicant's unrealistic assumptions in achieving built fabric improvements and disagreement with the total site emission savings from the gas powered CHP system, based on industry standards.

10.111 The energy consultant's report assesses the energy strategy against the relevant planning policies at the regional and local level. The main policies of relevance are those contained within the South East Plan. The report concludes that the initial phases of the development may not comply with policy NRM11 of the South East Plan, which requires new developments to supply at least 10% of their energy requirement through renewable or low carbon technologies, though it misses the target by a small margin. The report confirms that the proposed strategy would supply 9.3% of the site energy needs through on-site micro-renewable PV technology. However once the CHP system is operational, over 28% of energy is supplied by on-site technologies. The development as a whole

exceeds the requirements of policy NRM11 of the South East Plan.

10.112 The consultant's report also examines alternative approaches to the energy provision at Barton Farm including providing a biomass CHP facility and providing power via a biomass boiler system. The consultant's report concludes that the biomass boiler system would increase savings of CO₂ by approximately 2% and that the biomass CHP facility would increase CO₂ savings by approximately 19%.

10.113 The consultant's report recognises that both schemes would cost more than the gas powered system with potential savings through Government subsidy (Renewable Heat Incentive) and these systems would require a higher ongoing burden to the operator due to biomass supply issues. The report concludes that without subsidies, the gas CHP system is more cost-effective than either biomass based solution.

10.114 The developer has assessed the implications of providing a biomass fuelled CHP System and at present does not consider that biomass is locally and economically available in sufficient quantities to serve the development. The developer has identified that biomass fuel sources have significant disadvantages; be these site-based amenity concerns or wider environmental implications. However the developer confirms that the CHP has the advantage of being "future proofed" to the extent that should biomass become more reliable, sustainable and viable than at present, the boilers may be upgraded to run on such fuel.

10.115 The energy consultant's report provides a summary of the proposed energy strategy and confirms:

- It will provide a significantly lower CO₂ development than the level required by current standards.
- Assuming that a high level of fabric improvement is achieved, then the level of CO₂ reduction achieved is expected to be compliant with Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes in all dwellings (note that the level of CO₂ reduction anticipated in the 2013 version of Building Regulations, will also be achieved)
- Once the gas CHP system is operating, expected in 2017/18, the CO₂ emissions per sq.m of built area will drop further. The reduction in regulated emissions across the site has been estimated at 69%, based on analysis within the study. (to put this into context, zero carbon homes policy will require a reduction of regulated CO₂ emissions of 70% to be achieved from measures installed on the site. On this basis, it is expected that the proposed energy strategy will deliver sufficient CO₂ reduction to achieve compliance with zero carbon policy, once the CHP system is operating).
- Recommends that biomass-fuelled plant options are explored more fully.

10.116 The approach to energy provision at Barton Farm is to reduce demand through energy efficiency measures and to provide on-site low carbon energy generation through the provision of an efficient supply of energy involving a Combined Heat and Power System using a district heating system to distribute heat; and the provision of on-site renewable energy generation (photovoltaics). This approach is considered acceptable as it would lead to a significant reduction in CO₂ emissions from the site. By providing 28% of its energy on-site, the proposed development will exceed substantially the South East Plan requirement of providing 10% of its energy on site.

10.117 In terms of implementation and operation the proposed measures contained within the energy strategy would be conditioned to be installed and operational at specific

times of the development. Full details of the construction methods proposed to improve the efficiency of the buildings would be expected to be submitted prior to the commencement of any phase of the development. The installation of PV could be conditioned for each phase of the development, depending on the mix and orientation of the buildings, to maximise the benefits of the technology. It is recognised that the CHP System cannot operate to maximum efficiency until a certain load level is generated which is suggested to be around half of the proposed dwellings being occupied. As a result the initial phases of development will not be served by the CHP. However all dwellings will be required to be linked to the district heat distribution network from the outset and therefore the installation of the distribution network should be provided at the outset and should be secured through condition.

Sustainable Drainage Strategy

10.118 In order to manage surface water run-off, and to mitigate against potential flood risks a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) is proposed. The proposed strategy is proposed to replicate the existing drainage regime as far as possible and, as there is no run-off from the site, to use infiltration methods to discharge all surface water to the ground within the boundary of the site.

10.119 The Environment Agency has welcomed the proposed SUDS strategy to deal with the surface water runoff of the site. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and supporting documentation outlines the proposed drainage strategy by which the surface water runoff from the residential units will be managed by soakaways, and the runoff from larger units such as the commercial buildings and roadways will be put either to piped systems or swales culminating in treatment and infiltration ponds located in the southern dry valley and area adjacent to Well House Lane. The applicant clarifies that the attenuation swales and basins will be wet only on a seasonal basis, and will make a significant contribution to the biodiversity of the site. The Environmental Infrastructure Plan (224/P/1000 rev C) indicates the broad areas of the five green fingers in the north of the site that would be used for SUD attenuation/infiltration lawns in addition to fulfilling other purposes. The dry valley in the south of the site is also proposed as an area for SUDS attenuation. The submitted Design and Access Statement provides a number of examples of sustainable drainage typologies including swales and hard channels, attenuation and infiltration basins, porous paving and parking, green roofs and gardens that could be adopted in the proposed development. A S106 legal agreement would be required to secure the management and maintenance programme for the SUDS. The S106 legal agreement has not been completed to secure the SUDS management and maintenance programme and therefore the development is considered unacceptable in this regard.

e) Whether the proposed development would cause significant harm to the natural or built environment and whether any potentially negative environmental impacts are identified and satisfactorily mitigated;

10.120 In assessing whether the proposed development would cause significant harm to the natural or built environment the following issues shall be considered:

- (i) Landscape and trees
- (ii) Ecology and Green Infrastructure
- (iii) Water quality – pollution and ground water and effect on the River Itchen
- (iv) Flooding
- (v) Air quality

- (vi) Archaeology and cultural heritage
- (vii) Noise and vibration
- (viii) Agricultural Land Quality

(i) The affect of the development on landscape and trees

10.121 The application is supported with a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) contained within chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. The assessment describes the baseline landscape condition of the application site and its visibility within the wider landscape framework and also assesses the anticipated landscape and visual effects that would arise from the development, including the requirements for mitigation, remediation, and for monitoring. The assessment also includes an arboricultural survey of the existing trees within the site.

10.122 The analysis contained with the ES describes the physical and landscape setting of the site. The analysis identifies two distinct landscape units contained within the site:

Landscape unit A – Land between the railway line and Andover Road, to the **south** of the Barton Farm ridge. The defining characteristics of this area include a group of arable fields surrounding Barton Farm, undulating topography with pronounced dry valley; residential setting to west on tree-lined Andover Road and south (Park Road residential area); enclosed by railway line (mainly on embankment) to east and Barton Farm ridge (with part tree belt) to north.

Landscape unit B – Land between the railway line and Andover Road, to the **north** of the Barton farm ridge. The defining characteristics of this area include arable fields occupying extensive north-facing slope from Barton Farm ridge to Well House Lane; short east boundary terminated by the railway line and a mainly residential setting to west of Andover Road.

10.123 The assessment addresses the sensitivity of landscape contained within the site and includes a series of photographs that show the principal public views over the site and from more distant viewpoints. The assessment also identifies the groups of sensitive visual receptors that may potentially be affected by any proposed new development.

10.124 The assessment identifies landscape and visual impacts separately which are broken down into temporary or permanent impacts. The assessment also identifies primary and secondary visual envelopes from which the site may be visible from. The primary visual envelope comprises land that abuts the application site boundary and the maximum extent of the primary visual envelope is 2.5km, measured from the approximate site centre on Barton Farm ridge. The secondary visual envelope mainly involves views to the east and north-east sides of the city involving discrete areas of rising and high ground lying some 2-6km from the site, some of which lie within the South Downs National Park.

10.125 The findings of the LIVA confirm:

- The scheme will generate many landscape and visual impacts, both of a temporary and permanent nature, and the majority of these are adverse in nature. The proposed conversion of Andover Road to form a green corridor is a notable exception generating beneficial impacts for some receptors.
- In the construction phase, some potentially adverse temporary landscape impacts can largely be mitigated through good operational planning of the works to reduce the potential severity of impacts or to eliminate them altogether. However, some

impacts cannot be easily mitigated as they are an inevitable consequence of the development process.

- Some potential adverse permanent landscape impacts (notably damage to or loss of trees, tree belts and significant hedgerows) can be mitigated by design to reduce the potential severity of impacts or to eliminate them altogether. Some impacts, notably the permanent loss of agricultural land, cannot be mitigated.
- Potentially adverse temporary visual impacts in the construction phase will only affect visual receptor groups in the primary visual envelope around the site. While it will not be possible to eliminate these temporary visual impacts, their severity can generally be mitigated through good operational planning of the works.
- Potentially adverse permanent visual impacts will affect visual receptors in both the primary and secondary visual envelopes. The most severe potential impacts will be observed by the several visual receptor groups in the primary visual envelope because the nature of existing views will change very significantly from the existing baseline conditions. The main residential development and the associated elements (local centre, school and CHP unit) will generate the most significant visual impacts affecting the majority of visual receptor groups, whereas visual impacts arising from the new/realigned junctions on Andover Road will generate more localised visual impacts. However, the severity of the majority of identified visual impacts can be mitigated through exemplary design following the principles set out in the masterplan and parameter plans used to undertake this assessment.
- Although there will be potentially adverse permanent visual impacts in the secondary visual envelopes, these will mainly be of slight or moderate significance. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that specific mitigation measures to reduce visual impact would be effective in reducing the visual impact of the development for the majority of visual receptors in the secondary visual envelopes.

10.126 The landscape and tree information has been assessed by the Council's Landscape Officer who is generally satisfied with the findings and conclusions. It is agreed that the masterplan has been developed taking into consideration the landscape sensitivity of the site and surrounding area and the positions of higher density and taller development within the site are considered logical from an urban design perspective. It is agreed that the concentration of denser and taller buildings within the local centre area will have the greatest visual impact on the surrounding area due to the position of these buildings on one of the highest areas of the site. Some aspects of the development may also be seen from longer distant views including from within parts of the South Downs National Park located to the east of the site. It is considered that the masterplan provides sufficient opportunities to protect and strengthen existing characteristic landscape features of the site, such as treed skylines and an integration of the greenspace features either side of the railway line. In addition, through the provision of high quality design and a robust landscape planting scheme (which will be the subject of S106 requirements), the visual impacts of the development on the surrounding area will be mitigated to an acceptable level. A S106 legal agreement has not been completed to secure the landscape planting scheme and therefore the development is considered unacceptable in this regard.

10.127 There are no significant issues in relation to the impact of the development on the existing trees within the site. Taking into account the size of the development, the loss of 9 individual B1 trees (trees that might be included in the higher category, but are down graded because of impaired condition) is a small number of trees to lose. It is also noted that 3 of these trees are classed as over mature and will therefore have a limited life

expectancy. A management plan will be required and approved by the LPA for management of the trees on site which can be secured by condition.

10.128 In terms of future planting, consideration should also be given to the planting of new trees either side of the shelter belt to preserve this line of trees and this can be secure through the provision of a landscaping strategy through the S106 legal agreement. It is advised that street trees species need to be specified to ensure there is sufficient room for them to develop and be agreed by the LPA which can be secured through condition. The detailed highway plans now submitted for the New Andover Road indicate adequate provision in the design of the verges to accommodate medium/large tree species with minimum verge widths of 3metres, though there is no indication of what type of species will be planted within the verges at this stage. It is also considered that large native trees that reflect local character should be planted where space allows them to develop, which can be secured at the reserved matters stage of development.

(ii) *The effect of the development on ecology and the provision of green infrastructure*

10.129 Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement addresses the impact of the development on the ecology of the site. The assessment involved a desktop study to review existing ecological data available for the site and surrounding area, and extensive field surveys of the site and its immediate environs. Ecological surveys were carried out to identify habitats of nature conservation value on the site, and to determine whether there were likely to be any protected or priority species on the site or in the vicinity which might potentially be affected by the proposed development. The assessment also involved consultation with the statutory agencies.

10.130 In terms of designations the site itself is not designated as a Statutory or non statutory Site of Nature Conservation Importance. However the River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are within 2km of the site. The ES concludes that a major negative unmitigated impact is likely to occur to the River Itchen SSSI due to increased disturbance through recreational pressure by the increase in population at Barton Farm, causing habitat degradation. The assessment concludes that the impact can be adequately mitigated through the provision of the land east of the railway line which should be taken out of agricultural use and managed for biodiversity with the additional recreational benefit through providing public access footpaths and an ongoing management strategy.

10.131 The supplementary information submitted provides assurances that the land to the east of the railway line will be provided as mitigation to the scheme and provides greater detail on how the area will be used and managed, with a broad plan of design and management proposed. It is envisaged that this area of land has the capacity to fulfil a number of functions, i.e. the necessary mitigation for impacts from the development site upon habitats and species (replacement or compensatory habitat and wildlife areas), as well as additional recreational provision as an alternative to the use of sensitive designated sites. It is considered that with the land to the east as recreational provision the development will not result in a likely significant effect on the River Itchen (SAC).

10.132 Natural England, the Environment Agency, Hampshire County Council, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and the Council's landscape officer have made comments on the ecological issues in relation to the development and have also commented on the supplementary information. There is agreement that the provision of land to the east of the railway line in the form proposed is acceptable and provides

appropriate mitigation for the harm identified. However further detail is required in order to be fully satisfied that the biodiversity mitigation and gains are fully implemented. It is accepted that these details can be secured through conditions and a S106 Legal Agreement. A S106 legal agreement has not been completed to secure the management of the land to the east of the railway line and therefore the development is considered unacceptable in this regard.

10.133 The supplementary information also provides greater clarity on the measures proposed to enhance the biodiversity of the development site, particularly within the green infrastructure. The Environmental Infrastructure Plan identifies areas of natural green space to be provided within the development site within the green infrastructure which will overall comprise a multi-functional network of green space throughout the development. The following principles of development are proposed for the proposed natural green space within the site:

- Three metre buffer zones of longer grass on the edge of formal playing fields that border natural green spaces to provide additional reptile/invertebrate/bat foraging habitat;
- Buffer strips (approximately 2m) along the edges of the site border hedgerows to maintain their diverse nature;
- Hedgerow and grassland management to maximise biodiversity benefit;
- Natural green space to provide a mosaic of habitats including woodland with suitable long-grass rides, balancing ponds with reed bed, swales and other wet grass habitats;
- Corridors of animal movement are provided around the site (existing ridgeline and dry valley), linked by a series of infiltration areas having a mosaic of short and long grass habitats, running perpendicular to the main corridors;
- Wood piles in appropriate locations created whenever trees are pruned/felled.

The biodiversity features mentioned in the D&A statement, include woodland fringe, calcareous grassland, areas of damp species and willows, seasonal ponds and calcareous grassland, areas of stony meadow species, brown living roofs, and areas of calcareous amenity sward.

10.134 It is anticipated that the proposed measures on the development site itself will result in a net gain for biodiversity within the site. However there is concern from the relevant consultees that the phasing of the implementation of the green infrastructure is not included at this stage and it is important that an agreed timetable of implementation is secured. The Design and Access Statement confirms the need to ensure early maturity of the green infrastructure by completing much of the work up front in order to create a sense of place, to control construction run-off, and so biodiversity can “take hold”. It is therefore considered appropriate that this information be provided through a S106 legal agreement to require the detailed onsite (west of the railway) green infrastructure and ecology plan detailing the implementation (phasing), treatment and protection of the planned green infrastructure and ecological features through construction, and the ongoing (post-construction) protection and holistic management of these areas. A S106 legal agreement has not been completed to secure a programme of implementation and therefore the development is considered unacceptable in this regard.

(iii) Water quality – pollution and ground water and effect on the River Itchen

10.135 Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement assesses the impact of the development on Hydrology and Drainage and includes the impact on water quality. It confirms that the principal receiving watercourse serving the site is the River Itchen, a designated SSSI and SAC. It confirms that at the time of the previous planning application, in January 2004, there were concerns regarding the level of phosphates being discharged into the River Itchen, primarily from the Harestock Wastewater Treatment Works (HWWTW). The treatment works were upgraded in early 2006 to meet a more stringent limit on phosphates in the discharge in addition to tightening the normal sanitary standards. The ES confirms that current consent from the HWWTW complies with the Habitat Regulations.

10.136 Natural England and other bodies initially expressed concerns over the proposed development and its impact on water quality in the River Itchen SAC, due to waste water discharge from the proposed development. At that time the issue of whether the HWWTW would lead to increased sewage discharge, thereby increasing phosphate levels in the river above consented levels, had not been clarified. Following further clarification from the Environment Agency and Southern Water, who have confirmed that adequate treatment capacity will be available to serve the proposed development (all 2,000 residential units), Natural England are now satisfied with the proposed development in respect of this issue. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the water quality of the River Itchen. In these circumstances it is considered that further Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of the proposal in respect of the River Itchen SAC is not required.

(iv) Flooding

10.137 Chapter 15 of the Environment Statement assesses the stormwater drainage implications and provides a Flood Risk Assessment. The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 in which the proposed development is considered appropriate. The ES identifies a dry valley in the southern part of the site falling south west to north east which is classified as Flood Zones 2 and 3. The ES confirms that whilst some “less vulnerable” development (employment, commercial) may be permitted in Flood Zone 2, no development should be allowed in Flood Zone 3. The ES confirms that there no development is proposed within the dry valley area of the site. The northern area of the site falls towards another dry valley falling east to west but this is outside of the application boundary.

10.138 The catchment is all farmland and used for agricultural purposes where rainwater percolates rapidly into the soil and through into the groundwater in the chalk. The southern dry valley has experienced flooding in recent years and the northern dry valley has suffered flooding on a number of occasions in the last decade. The ES confirms that the flooding event that occurred in the southern dry valley during the very wet winter of 2000 was thought to have been caused by overland flow from the Andover Road highway drainage system being dammed by a transverse hedgebank and high groundwater levels. The ES confirms that the proposed masterplan includes the construction of a swale along the base of the valley which will convey all overland flow from the catchment to the lowest point in the valley and ensure that any future ponding will be contained within the floodplain.

10.139 The Environment Agency have raised no objections to the proposed development

on flood risk grounds subject to there being no development within the dry valley. As no development is proposed within the dry valley, the proposed development would not give rise to an adverse impact on flooding in the area.

(v) Air Quality

10.140 Chapter 8 of the ES assesses the impact of the proposed development on local air quality. The ES acknowledges that Winchester City Council has declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the City Centre for the pollutants nitrogen oxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀). The assessment examines the impact during the construction and operational phases looking at levels of pollution caused by increased traffic generation and the proposed energy centre.

10.141 The ES concludes that during the construction phase of development the residual effects on air quality would be minor adverse to insignificant. The ES recommends several mitigation methods that could be implemented to minimise the production of dust and particulate matter.

10.142 In terms of the operational phase the ES results indicate that the proposed development would cause moderate to small increases in NO₂ concentrations and small increase of PM₁₀ concentrations at the assessment points. Some decreases were predicted at a few properties due to the realignment of the Andover Road. In terms of mitigation the ES relies upon the Framework Travel Plan which sets out a package of measures to encourage travel to and within the site by modes other than single occupancy car journeys. Other sustainable travel measures are also referred to in the Transport Assessment including the park and ride "light" provision. The ES anticipates that these measures would reduce the traffic levels from the development and thereby reduce pollution.

10.143 The air quality impacts modelled in the ES have been updated and now include "development with mitigation measures in place". The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has reviewed these figures and, although he acknowledges that the development will result in small increases in both PM₁₀ and NO₂ levels at some of the receptors, he is now satisfied that the development would not have an adverse impact on air quality, provided that the travel plan and park and ride "light" are secured as part of the planning permission. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer therefore withdraws his original objection to the scheme.

(vi) Noise and Vibration

10.144 Chapter 9 of the ES addresses the appropriateness of the site for the proposed uses in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment includes a comparison of the baseline noise and vibration levels with the noise and vibration levels associated with the mainline railway, the realigned Andover Road and Well House Lane and construction activities. The ES confirms that assessments of the likely impacts during the construction and operation of the proposed development have been made and mitigations measures are detailed that will minimise noise and vibration where necessary. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has assessed the proposed development in relation to all noise and vibration issues.

10.145 Construction impact - It is agreed that the noise and vibration associated with the construction of the proposed development can be minimised by the agreement of a Code

of Construction Practice. Such a code should include an assessment based upon BS 5228:2009 from which hours of work should be determined and agreed. It is recommended that this be implemented through an appropriate planning condition.

10.146 Rail and traffic noise impacts on residential development - The site has been identified as falling mainly in NEC category A and B as defined under Annex 1 to Planning Policy Guidance Planning and Noise (PPG24). However areas immediately adjacent to the diverted Andover Road and garden areas adjacent to the railway line have been provisionally identified as potentially falling with Category C. Annex 1 to PPG 24 advises that for Category C “*Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.*”

10.147 The applicant identifies appropriate remediation strategies for these areas to be:

1. Primary leisure areas (rear domestic gardens) – Avoidance of NEC C or D categories by orientation of garden and/or the erection of solid garden fences.
2. For dwellings in NEC C, thermal double glazing and mechanical ventilation to be fitted to habitable rooms.

It is considered necessary to accommodate new residential development within category C zones in order to secure the comprehensive development of the site in an acceptable manner. These remedial measures are considered acceptable and it is recommended a condition be included to assess detailed proposals to precisely identify category C areas and require appropriate remediation strategies. The improvement in noise levels achieved by moving Andover road away from existing properties the Council is also recognised.

10.148 Rail and Traffic noise impacts on proposed school - The proposed assessment methodology and design criteria for the school, using Building Bulletin 93 on acoustic design of schools, is agreed to be an accepted target methodology. It is accepted that a detailed assessment cannot be performed until final design details of the school and surrounding area are available. It is therefore recommended that a condition be included to identify appropriate sound attenuated ventilation measures are implemented if appropriate.

10.149 Noise impact of the Combined Heat and Power Plant - It is accepted that a detailed assessment of noise impacts are inappropriate as detailed plant specification is not currently available. It is therefore recommended that a condition be included to ensure this assessment is performed before such development takes place.

(vii) Archaeology and cultural heritage

10.150 Chapter 12 of the ES examines the impact of the development on archaeological resources. The assessment establishes that the site contains the remains of a late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement. The ES confirms that these remains are considered of local importance and therefore “preservation by record” comprising archaeological excavation, recording and dissemination of the results are appropriate which could be secured through condition.

10.151 The Council’s archaeological officer confirms that the ES adequately assesses

the impact of the proposed development on the known and likely archaeological resources within the application site and proposes an appropriate outline strategy to mitigate this impact; this will comprise preservation by record. Therefore, in accordance with the principles of PPG16 and Policy HE.1 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review, it is considered appropriate to apply a condition securing a programme of archaeological work to any planning consent. In the event of refusing the application it is considered necessary to add a reason for refusal in order that archaeology is considered at appeal.

(viii) Agricultural Land Quality

10.152 The site has been identified as having Grade 2, Grade 3a and Grade 3b agricultural land within its boundaries. The development would result in the loss of this agricultural land. PPS7 recommends that the loss of best and more versatile agricultural land should be taken into consideration alongside other sustainability considerations including accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities etc. when determining planning applications. Consequently, although this proposal would result in the loss of approximately 61 hectares of higher grade agricultural land, the benefits provided by the development of the site in relation to the establishment of a sustainable community are considered to outweigh the loss of agricultural land.

f) Whether the proposed development would provide a satisfactory level of physical, social and transport infrastructure to meet the needs of the development, and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area;

10.153 The infrastructure provision considered necessary to deliver an acceptable development of the Barton Farm site would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement (S106) entered into between the developer, the relevant Council and any other interested party. An agreed S106 legal agreement has not been secured at this stage and therefore the infrastructure deemed necessary to meet the needs of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area cannot be provided. It is therefore considered necessary to provide additional reasons for refusal in relation to the failure to deliver the necessary infrastructure. It is likely that a number of these issues can be resolved through negotiation with the developer before the Public Inquiry in relation to the first application and this is accounted for in the officer's recommendation.

10.154 The necessary infrastructure to be provided includes:

- education;
- affordable housing;
- transport;
- public open space;
- community facilities;
- health and cultural facilities.

Education

10.155 The developer accepts the proposed development will impact on education services and that the scheme requires the provision of a primary school both to meet the needs of school-age children resident at Barton Farm and will help create a sense of community. The developer also accepts that there is no spare capacity available currently within the catchment to take pupils from the development. However, there is

disagreement between the developer and the Hampshire County Council, the local education authority (LEA), both in relation to the size of the primary school needed to cater for pupils arising from the development and in respect of the scale of the financial contributions sought to provide the school and also towards pre-school and secondary school education.

Primary Education

10.156 Using their assessment of the number of primary school age children who would live at Barton Farm the applicant originally proposed to provide a 2 form entry primary school to serve the development. A site of 1.8 hectares was proposed to accommodate the school which would be located to the east of the proposed local centre. The LEA disagrees with the developer's methodology for calculating future pupil numbers and considers that it significantly underestimates the future demand for school places. As a result the LEA considers that the development is likely to generate the need for a larger 3 form entry primary school, based on an assumption that the development will generate 527 pupils of primary school age. The developer recognises that any possibility that there would be insufficient school places within a new school would be a serious concern. and is now willing to reserve a site of sufficient size to accommodate a 3-FE primary school amounting to a site of 2.8 hectares in size should this be required. The masterplan has been amended to reflect the changes in area for the proposed school site. It should be noted that the development of any new school is likely to be phased so that it only grows to maximum capacity if this is necessary. The precise nature and timing of provision will be a matter for the LEA not the developer.

10.157 There is also disagreement between the two parties in relation to the cost of providing the school as it considers the LEA's cost estimates to be excessive. Discussions on this issue are continuing and an update will be provided to the Committee.

10.158 Notwithstanding the conclusions reached in relation to an appropriate financial contribution in the absence of a completed S106 agreement securing the education provision the proposals cannot be said to provide an acceptable level of primary education provision to meet the needs of the development. and the proposal is therefore unacceptable and contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan.

Secondary Education

10.159 The size of the development does not warrant the provision of a new secondary school. A financial contribution has been offered by the applicant to mitigate the impact of the development on existing secondary school resources. Again, there is disagreement between the developer and the LEA about the methodology used to calculate future demand for pupil spaces and no agreement has been reached in relation to the level of financial contribution required. Given the current objection from the LEA it is concluded that the proposals do not provide an acceptable level of secondary education provision to meet the needs of the development and is therefore unacceptable and contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan.

Pre-school facility

10.160 It is proposed to provide a day care nursery for infants, covering an area of 0.15 hectares within the proposed local centre. Whilst the LEA are pleased that the development incorporates a dedicated pre-school facility there is disagreement between the parties in relation to the methodology used to predict future pupil numbers. Given the current objection from the LEA it is concluded that the proposals do not provide an acceptable level of pre-school education provision to meet the needs of the development and is therefore unacceptable and contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan.

Affordable Housing

10.161 The proposed development will provide 40% of the total residential units as affordable housing amounting to a total of 800 residential units. The indicative mix includes 63% social rent, 30% intermediate and 7% intermediate extra care which is considered acceptable. The affordable housing tenure arrangements, standard of the dwellings, the method of allocating the housing and the long term availability of the affordable dwellings are to be determined and set out in the S106 agreement in consultation with the Strategic Housing Manager. However in the absence of a completed S106 agreement securing the affordable housing requirement the proposals fail to deliver the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to policies H5 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Transport

10.162 The physical transport infrastructure and proposed sustainable travel measures would be secured through a S106 legal agreement. As outlined in previous paragraphs the Highways Authority and Highways Agency object to the proposed development and the mitigation measures currently proposed are not considered sufficient to overcome the highway reasons for refusal.

10.163 In the absence of a completed S106 agreement securing the physical transport measures and sustainable transport package the proposals fail to deliver the necessary infrastructure to mitigate the traffic implications of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with the objectives of PPG13 and PPS4 and policies T1, T2 and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East and does not comply with saved policies T1, T2, T3 and T5 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Public Open Space

10.164 Across the MDA there will be a network of open space as outlined in the master plan and associated documents to encourage formal and informal recreation activities. This is in addition to the open space that will be managed for nature conservation and SUDs. In the absence of a completed S106 to secure the provision, management and adoption of open space the proposals fail to deliver the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area and is contrary to policies RT4, DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Community facilities

10.165 As part of the proposed development a community building is proposed to be located within the local centre. The building would be 660 sq.m gross floor area and used for a variety of community based purposes, including indoor sport. A financial contribution is sought in order to fit out the community building to provide a good range of services to local residents.

10.166 The Council considers that community projects during the early occupation of the development provide an excellent opportunity to build strong communities. Funding is therefore sought towards the participation of officers to undertake these projects during the first 3 years of the development. In response the developer considers that there is no case for a contribution on this basis in light of the statutory tests now applying.

10.167 The Council consider a public art scheme which is properly integrated into the development will enhance its design, increasing pride of place among residents and so potentially reducing antisocial behaviour. In response the developer accepts that public art will be incorporated into the development proposals.

10.168 A community development worker is proposed in order to foster community addressing issues arising as the new development establishes itself.

10.169 In the absence of a completed S106 to secure the necessary community infrastructure the development is unacceptable and is contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Health facilities

10.170 It is proposed to provide a medical centre of 660 sq.m gross floor area and this would be located within the local centre. The size, location and function of the health centre has been provisionally agreed by the Primary Care Trust (PCT). In addition the PCT require a financial contribution towards the construction of the health centre in line with the previous agreement sought on the planning application in 2004. However in the absence of a completed S106 to secure the necessary health infrastructure the development is unacceptable and is contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Cultural facilities

10.171 The Council have put forward a case for financial contributions towards the Theatre Royal Winchester and other arts projects so as to provide additional capacity to accommodate the pressure on City Centre resources from the development. In response the developer disagrees with the principle of such contributions as the greater numbers of potential patrons within its catchment area will of itself support the viability of the theatre and other arts activities and therefore there is no case for the suggested contributions.

10.172 The Council considers that the development will increase the demand placed on the library provision at Winchester Discovery Centre, a provision that is already at capacity. Financial contributions are sought to pay for a one off increase in stock, to

provide additional ICT for public use and to increase the number of self service terminals, to provide additional seating and study areas by making better use of existing space within the building. The developer is willing to continue to discuss the request within the context of the S106 obligations.

10.173 Notwithstanding the above, in the absence of a completed S106 to secure the necessary cultural infrastructure the development is unacceptable and is contrary to policies DP9 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.

10.174 Other necessary infrastructure required to secure an acceptable development include through the S106 legal agreement includes:

- Design and specification of the SUD's system including future management
- Strategic landscape planting details and management plan
- Implementation scheme for sustainable energy strategy
- Biodiversity mitigation strategy

CONCLUSION

11.1 On the basis of housing requirements in the South East Plan there is a short-term requirement for housing land which the application could help to meet, and a longer-term need to plan for a major housing allocation, with this identified as the preferred site. It had therefore been considered that these factors amounted to a 'compelling justification' which should result in the applications being considered acceptable in principle, in accordance with Local Plan policy H.2. However, since that original conclusion the Secretary of State for Communities letter (see Appendix 7) has been received and is a material consideration. This allows local planning authorities to reach decisions on housing land supply 'without the framework of regional numbers and plans'.

11.2 There is a clear future need for additional housing in Winchester, but the work that has been done on housing needs and the options for accommodating them has always been within the context of the South East Plan's housing requirements. There has not been a 'regional guidance-free' assessment of housing needs and it is not, therefore, clear how such needs would compare to the South East Plan's requirements. Members may conclude that local housing needs, particularly for affordable housing, warrant approval of the application, but the Secretary of State's letter also enables Members to conclude ('without the framework of regional numbers') that the development is not needed at this stage having regard to the evidence of such need before Members and the clear intention of the Secretary of State to render the overarching requirements of the South East Plan obsolete for the purposes of any assessment of that need. Accordingly, a potential reason for refusal is put forward for consideration, should Members follow this option.

11.3 The outline application is supported with a comprehensive masterplan that is underpinned with a thorough analysis of the morphology of Winchester and its surrounding suburbs. The resulting strategy to develop Barton Farm is based on excellent background analysis and good urban design principles which demonstrate the development would achieve a distinctive, well integrated suburb of Winchester. The access strategy is considered radical, but based on a thorough understanding of the issues and provides an excellent opportunity to create a vibrant and integrated community by re-directing the Andover Road through the development and converting the old road into a green corridor. The submitted details, illustrative material and parameter plans demonstrate that a legible and accessible urban extension can be achieved which

contributes to the need for market and affordable housing. The masterplan provides a robust template for future phases within the development to follow a sensitive and logical pattern of development that responds to the landscape setting of the site and surrounding area. The masterplan also demonstrates that the development will integrate well with neighbouring communities and provides realistic opportunities to use sustainable methods of travel both within the site and to key destinations in the city centre and to neighbouring communities. A realistic and low carbon method of supplying energy to the site is proposed that is based on a district heating system that has the potential to be converted to a renewable energy source in the future.

11.4 Despite providing a comprehensive masterplan that is considered to create a new high quality neighbourhood of Winchester there are a number of outstanding technical details that have been unable to be resolved at this stage. The unresolved matters are mainly confined to transport matters. As a result both HCC Highways and the Highways Agency conclude at this time that the scheme as proposed is acceptable and they therefore have recommended refusal.

11.5 In addition to the above a S106 legal agreement has not been secured at this stage and therefore the infrastructure deemed necessary to mitigate the impact of the development and to ensure it is fully integrated with the surrounding area cannot be secured even where the developer has agreed with the case that it should be provided. It is therefore necessary to provide reasons for refusal in relation to the failure to deliver the necessary infrastructure. It is likely that a number of these issues will be resolved through negotiation with the developer before the Public Inquiry and this is accounted for in the officer's recommendation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation A - 09/02412/OUT

That had an appeal for non-determination not been lodged by Cala Homes (South) Ltd on 19th April 2010 then Winchester City Council would have **REFUSED** Planning Permission for the development of 84 ha at Barton Farm, Winchester for the following reasons:

1. That having regard to its consistent position on the appropriate level of housing numbers for the non PUSH area of Winchester district and the advice that it is able to determine the application without the framework of regional numbers and plans the Council is not satisfied that the local need for housing amounts to the compelling justification needed to justify the release of this reserve site.
2. It has not been demonstrated that the local road network is capable of operating satisfactorily with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the site proposals, particularly along the proposed and existing Andover Road corridor including its junctions with Harestock Road, Well House Lane, Stoney Lane and City Road and also along the existing Stockbridge Road corridor particularly at its junctions with Harestock Road, Stoney Lane and Berewecke Road and on those parts of the network to the east of the site particularly Park Road and its junction with Worthy Lane and at the A33 junction with the B3047. Consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network which is contrary to policies T2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South

East.

3. The junction of Andover Road / Harestock Road / Well House Lane is unsuitable in its present condition to take the type and amount of traffic likely to be generated by the first phase of the proposal. Consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network which is contrary to policies T2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East.
4. The design of the proposed New Andover Road is unsuitable in its present condition to safely and satisfactorily accommodate the type and amount of multi-modal traffic likely to be generated by the proposal and using that route to access the City Centre. Consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network which is contrary to policies T2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East.
5. The proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13 in that it fails to make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance on the private car. The failure to utilise alternative means of transport to the private car would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the objectives of PPG13 and PPS4 and policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East and does not comply with saved policies T1, T3 and T5 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review.
6. It has not been demonstrated that the strategic road network is capable of operating satisfactorily with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the site proposals, particularly in relation to J9 of the M3. Consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network which is contrary to policies T2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East.
7. The development is unacceptable as an appropriate agreement has not been secured for the adequate and timely provision of the necessary social, community, cultural, physical and environmental infrastructure required in association with the development relating to: affordable housing; open space provision; primary education; secondary education; early years education; healthcare; community facilities, cultural facilities, ecological mitigation, sustainable drainage and renewable energy. The development is therefore contrary to policies DP9, RT4, CE.8, CE9, CE11 and MDA.2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review and policy NRM 11 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East.
8. The proposed development is contrary to Policy HE.1 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make satisfactory provision for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording before or during development, on a site which is considered to be of archaeological interest.

2. That delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director (Operations), in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Development Control Committee, to enter into any necessary Section 106 Agreements or Unilateral Undertaking in respect of securing the appropriate social, physical and community infrastructure on the site.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director (Operations), in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Development Control Committee, to negotiate the removal of reasons for refusal from the application if the necessary information is supplied in full by the applicant prior to the Section 78 Inquiry.

Recommendation B – 10/01063/OUT

1. That the Council formally declines to determine the duplicate planning application ref. 10/01063/OUT for the reason that this is an overlapping application as set out in paragraph 70B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1- Summary of consultation responses on original application 09/02412/OUT

Appendix 2 – Summary of consultation responses on the supplementary information

Appendix 3 – Summary of consultation responses on the duplicate application
10/01063/OUT

Appendix 4 – Full Parish Council responses

Appendix 5 – Illustrative Masterplan

Appendix 6 – Land Use Parameters Plan

Appendix 7 – Communities and Local Government letter from the Rt Hon Eric Pickles
MP of 27th May 2010 relating to the abolition of Regional Strategies

Appendix 1- Summary of consultation responses on original application 09/02412/OUT

09/02412/OUT

Barton Farm – Initial Consultation Comments / Observations

1	<p>Patrick Aust Drainage Engineer, Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitted Flood Risk Assessment indicates that the site can be drained of both foul and surface water; please forward to the EA for comment. • The info submitted for the outline application is adequate, however should a full application be received a comprehensive drainage strategy for the entire development should be submitted to and approved by the LPA.
2	<p>Steve Opacic Head of Strategic Planning Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application site is allocated in the Local Plan Review as a 'strategic reserve' site for 2000 houses. There was also reference to land north of Winchester in the South East Plan Panel Report and the Core Strategy's Preferred Option proposed a 'strategic allocation' at Barton Farm for 2000 dwellings. Assessment of alternative sites and of representations made on the Preferred Option has concluded that it will remain necessary to make a strategic allocation in the non-PUSH part of the District and that the application site is the most suitable for this. • Assessment of the housing land supply situation suggests that the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable 5-year land supply, in accordance with PPS3's requirements, and that the situation is likely to deteriorate unless additional land is released. Although the Local Plan's reserve allocation has not been triggered, and the Core Strategy is not yet adopted, the land supply situation is an important material consideration, which PPS3 advises should result in applications being considered favourably. • There is, therefore, a short-term requirement for housing land which the application could help to meet, and a longer-term need to plan for a major housing allocation, with this identified as the preferred site. I consider that these factors amount to a 'compelling justification' which should result in the application being considered acceptable in principle. • In general terms the application appears to meet the requirements of the Local Plan and Core Strategy policies. Some issues would appear to require clarification or further work, but other specialist consultees will advise on whether various matters are adequately addressed. Subject to this being the case and Local Plan/Core Strategy requirements being met, the application should be approved.
3	<p>Chris Walters Crime Prevention Design Advisor Gosport Police Station,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Officer provided detailed comments regarding the following areas: • Road layout within the development

	South Street, Gosport, Hants, PO12 1ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking • Streets, Footpaths, Bus stops and Cycleways • Railway underpass • LEAPS and LAPS • Schools • Park and ride • Retail area • Sports facilities • Allotments • Security for dwellings • Utilities • Cycle stores • Multi agency office
4	Mr Amos Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service, Service Delivery (Community Safety Delivery) Protection Department, Southsea Fire Station, Somers Road, Southsea, Hants, PO5 4LU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided the applicant conforms to section B5 of approved document B, access for fire fighting, the fire and rescue authority will have no objections to the development. • Best practice advice: It is strongly recommended that domestic sprinklers are installed in all new build premises, conforming to BS9251 2005 or equivalent specification.
5	Vicky Aston Planning Manager South East Region Sport England Sport England, 51a Church Street, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8AX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Outdoor Sports Facilities- Quantity:</u> This provision is welcomed by Sport England. • <u>Outdoor Sports Facilities – Quality:</u> a condition is required to ensure that good quality playing surfaces can be developed that would sustain high levels of use • <u>Management and Maintenance of Sports Facilities:</u> Should be secured through a section 106 agreement for at least a 10 year period, • <u>Primary School:</u> the Primary School could offer the potential for providing dual use sports facilities. • <u>Youth Provision:</u> It is noted that children's play areas will be provided within the development (in the form of Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play), but no consideration appears to be given specifically meeting the needs of youths. Such facilities can also have benefits in relation to improving health and reducing crime/anti-social behaviour.
6	Derrick Hudson Countryside Secretary Winchester Ramblers 2 Dover Close Alresford Hants SO24 9PG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the proposals to encourage walking and cycling between the proposed development and Winchester City Centre by downgrading the Andover Road to a pedestrian and cycle route. • We are not convinced that the proposal to re-route the Andover Road will reduce traffic issues for walkers or cyclists. The New Andover Road will remain an arterial route in/out of Winchester; we are concerned that the bridge over the railway will remain a problem for walkers and cyclists. • Winchester Ramblers would like to see improved and new provisions to encourage walking and cycling in the surrounding countryside and by providing safe links with Headbourne Worthy, Abbots Barton and open countryside to the North

		of the Barton Farm.
7	<p>Barry Lockyer Access Development Team Countryside Service Hampshire County Council Room 200 Mottisfont Court High Street, Winchester SO23 8ZF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have no objection, in principle, to the proposed development. • However, we do have on file several submissions for the addition to the definitive map of some, currently unrecorded, rights of way across the site. The paths would need to be accommodated within the development or diverted under s257 of T & CPA.
8	<p>Ian Lawson, School Organisation Officer Children's Services Department, Hampshire County Council, The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can confirm that we will be expecting the developer to provide a site for a primary school, access to additional playing fields for Henry Beaufort School and allocate a site for a pre-school facility, together with financial contributions towards primary and secondary school places. We will let you have details of the expected heads of terms for the Section 106 agreement shortly, and comments on the proposed primary school site. • Further comments received: • We do not accept the calculation of primary, secondary and pre-school places required, as the methodology is considered flawed. Methods are suggested to overcome this and further discussion is encouraged.
9	<p>Mike Slinn Chair WinACC Transport Action Group Winchester Action on Climate Change The Masters' Lodge West Downs Campus University of Winchester Winchester SO22 5HT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Transport Assessment:</u> Detailed comments submitted claiming inaccuracies, omissions and purported misleading information. • <u>Travel Plan:</u> Detailed comments received including the assertion that the stated objectives and targets are inappropriate. Some measures are considered as 'generally sound' and 'good', whilst others are deemed 'inadequate'. • <u>Views on Transport Infrastructure and Services:</u> • The development should be designed to minimise the need to travel by motorised transport and, when travel by motorised transport is necessary, to encourage travel that minimises greenhouse gas emissions • Sadly we see no evidence that the TA starts with this premise. • The respondent makes various detailed suggestions of how to improve the scheme.
10	<p>Mr Jon Maskell Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency Solent & South Downs Office, Colvedene Court, Colden Common, Hampshire, SO21 1WP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We OBJECT to the proposed development as submitted because the mitigation of the risks to nature conservation are inadequate. We therefore recommend that the planning application is refused. • Reason: The mitigation measures submitted with the application are inadequate at present and do not properly address the risks. In particular, the proposals do not provide secure mitigation for the impacts posed to nature conservation. • Further comments received 02/02/10: • Environment Agency Position

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development will only be acceptable if a planning condition is imposed requiring the following drainage details. • Condition: Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. • The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion • Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.
11	<p>Allison Hulbert Natural England Senior Planning Specialist Western Area Government Team South East Region 1 Southampton Road Lyndhurst Hants SO43 7BU</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection: insufficient information submitted to demonstrate whether or not the development would have an adverse effect on European and nationally designated sites of nature conservation importance. Also, further information should be sought on green infrastructure, to ensure that there is adequate provision and management in any development which may be approved. • The development site is visible from parts of the South Downs National Park and the proposed development site forms part of the National Park setting. Natural England would therefore wish to see protection and strengthening of characteristic landscape features • The current submission does not clearly demonstrate a net gain for biodiversity west of the railway line and there is uncertainty in the role of the land east of the railway line in meeting green infrastructure requirements
12	<p>Sarah Warriss Senior Ecologist Hampshire County Council Development & Biodiversity Environment Department The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although a certain level of information has been provided with the application, which only seeks to approve the principle of development and details of access to the site, I would recommend that further information is sought prior to determination in order to clarify various issues and to demonstrate that the ecological impacts of this development are acceptable. • It is imperative that the biodiversity measures including creation and management (and monitoring) of habitats within the development site and within the blue line area are secured through a S106 agreement. <p>Appendium to original response following ecology meeting 23/03/10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Designated sites</u> • There is currently insufficient information to demonstrate to the LPA that the development

		<p>would have no adverse impact on European and nationally designated sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information in the submission has identified that there could be a major negative impact on the River Itchen SSSI. The proposal relies on land to the east as mitigation to prevent impacts on the SSSI (by providing alternative recreational space), but there is currently insufficient information to demonstrate how the land to the east will provide this mitigation, whilst also providing mitigation for the identified on-site ecological impacts (see below). • Concerns raised regarding other SSSIs further afield, and possible increased recreational pressures upon them, also need to be addressed. • <u>Biodiversity</u> • The land to the east is identified as forming the mitigation for various ecological impacts on the development site (to the west of the railway line) itself. As above, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate how the treatment of the land to the east will provide the required mitigation. • <u>Green infrastructure</u> • To demonstrate the net gain, both the mitigation for losses and enhancements need to be clearly demonstrated and in particular the green infrastructure within the site needs to be defined (showing minimum, worst case scenario, minimum buffer widths and biodiversity areas, and highlighting the principles of treatments of those areas). • Areas specifically for biodiversity need to be identified and the green infrastructure plan should show how the existing habitats/features on the site will be buffered, protected and enhanced through development.
13	<p>Sue Coles Winchester Cycle Working Group Secretary Hampshire Cycling 7 Ruffield Close Winchester Hants. SO22 5JL</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been insufficient time to examine all the relevant documents and so the CTC objects to the application on the grounds that the development does not comply with sustainability criteria and will generate an unacceptable level of additional motor vehicle traffic. This will be detrimental to the needs of walkers and cyclists, groups essential to the long-term sustainable development of Winchester
14	<p>Kristina King Development Control Officer Hampshire County Council Environment Department The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire County Council do not object to the proposal 09/02412/OUT for housing development at Barton Farm on a planning basis. • We stress the need to address innovative and successful waste management opportunities. • Landscape: It is believed that there are lost opportunities here and can only ask that details when submitted ensure a high quality of both design and use of appropriate materials is achieved, together with an appropriate range of open spaces capable of supporting long term large growing native forest trees (without conflict

		<p>with adjacent buildings/uses) to reflect the local Winchester suburban context, and to assist absorption of the new development into the landscape over time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to the form of the serpentine road around the Northern and Eastern edge of the site, the initial impression is that the road seems to be curving gratuitously. But I accept that it may be the most appropriate street type in this location, specifically to allow for bus access to the majority of the site and thus encourage public transport use. • The street and block layout as shown is an 'anywhere' development, and more reference to the urban form in the historic core, with its tight urban grain and short straight roads, which are highly permeable, legible and walkable, would possibly have helped to inform this development and made it more rooted to 'place'.
15	<p>Dan Massey, Transport Planner, Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transportation Assessment element of the Environmental Statement falls short of what should be expected for such a prestigious site. The TA is over reliant on the sites proximity to the town centre for its sustainability credentials, with relatively little thought or effort to making the site an exemplar of green travel. • Before approval can be granted for this development I would recommend that the issues raised in this report to be considered and incorporated in a revised Transportation Assessment and Travel Plan. In due course I would expect the developer to enter into appropriate legal agreements to secure the new facilities and infrastructure agreed.
16	<p>Nick Culhane Highways Engineer Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is deemed to be strategic, and as such falls within the responsibility of HCC as Highway Authority to deal with.
17	<p>Francis Porter Development Control Manager Network Operations South East Highways Agency 1B Federated House London Road Dorking RH4 1SZ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until additional information is provided the HA is not able to assess the full impact of the development on the M3/A34 trunk roads. At present, the HA is concerned that the development could have a material impact upon the SRN unless suitable, possibly extensive, mitigation measures are provided and would therefore recommend refusal. • Given that there are existing M3 and A34 SRN capacity issues and that there are no planned improvements to the M3 south of Junction 9 before 2014, and additionally that DaSTS has designated the M3 corridor as one of national strategic importance, it is critical that the proposed development does not have a material

		impact on the SRN near Winchester.
18	Strategic Housing Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While a good mix of affordable housing is proposed it is important that account is taken of demographic projections, including that of an ageing population. It would, therefore, be advantageous to incorporate some bungalows on the site in order to meet the needs of older persons and those with disabilities. The inclusion of extra care accommodation is welcomed. • Community Infrastructure: The approach taken with the masterplan maximises the likelihood of a strong, cohesive and integrated community developing at Barton Farm. In particular, the proposal to reroute Andover Road and place Henry Beaufort School at the heart of North Winchester offers great potential to build strong links between the old and new communities and maximise movement between the two.
19	David Boardman Environment Team Manager Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall we have no grounds for objecting to the proposals in principal. In the event of the Council being minded to grant consent then the following matters should be covered by suitable conditions or legal agreements attached to any consent granted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refuse collection and recycling • Bring Recycling Facilities • Maintenance of communal facilities.
20	Phil Tidridge Environmental Protection Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminated Land report "Preliminary Risk Assessment (Desk Study) has been assessed by the contaminated land officer who accepts the contents of the report and agrees with the recommendations contained within Section 3, subject to suitable conditions to be attached to any permission granted.
21	Chris Gillham Winchester Friends of the Earth Transport Group 16 Upper High Street, Winchester, SO23 8UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lengthy appraisal was received from the respondent with many negative assertions, though no objection is specifically mentioned.
22	Catriona Riddell Director of Planning South East England Partnership Board Berkeley House Cross Lanes Guildford Surrey GU1 1UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council will need to be satisfied that release of this greenfield site is necessary and the most appropriate location to meet housing needs, having considered local and regional housing delivery objectives for the Winchester area, and that its release will not prejudice the emerging Core Strategy DPD. It should also be satisfied that there is a need for the proposed office floorspace and that the site represents an appropriate location. The provision of new infrastructure will need to be closely related to the scale and phasing of development.
23	Tracy Matthews – Historic Environment Officer (Archaeology) Winchester City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application site is archaeologically sensitive. • I advise that Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement adequately assesses the impact of

	<p>City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<p>the proposed development on the known and likely archaeological resources within the application site and proposes an appropriate outline strategy to mitigate this impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, in accordance with the principles of PPG16 and Policy HE.1 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review, I recommend that a condition securing a programme of archaeological work be attached to any planning consent
24	<p>Linda Thomas Landscape Architect Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments of 27.01.2010 • To properly assess the above, additional detailed information on aspects of hard/soft landscape such as proposed use/treatment/extent is required at outline stage. Clarity of design principles/concepts and consistency between documents is also a necessity. I would therefore recommend further information is sought prior to determination in order to clarify various issues/concerns relating to landscape as outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Treatment of Environmental Infrastructure • - Old Andover Road • - Design of green space within the development • - Visual Impact • - Other issues: The Sustainability Statement, flood risk and ecology • Comments of 25.02.2010 • With reference to the previous combined landscape response dated 27.01.2010 and a subsequent meeting with the applicant and consultees on 10.02.2010 to discuss main landscape issues, concerns remain for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the east of the railway has not been included within the red line boundary and is thus not part of the outline application even though it is both contrary to existing Local Plan policy (MDA2) and emerging LDF policy (WT2). Following discussion with applicant and consultees on 10.02.2010, it appears unlikely that the proposal will be amended to include land to the east within the outline proposals as the applicant believes open/green space requirements have already been met within the area of development west of the railway line. • Regarding the area west of the railway, it was reiterated that the application has yet to demonstrate that sufficient space has been allocated within the new development without compromising the multifunctional quality and quantity requirements of existing and proposed green spaces as set out in the Design and Access Statement. • The above concerns reinforce the need to provide clear design principles/concepts at the outset to ensure a robust environmental infrastructure to support the development. Whilst acknowledging that a clear explanation of the main design principles and concepts has been

		<p>set out in the Design and Access Statement, this has yet to carry through to supporting documentation and plans hence consultees requirements for clarification/amendment and additional information before considering their recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The omission of old Andover Road within the phasing and environmental infrastructure framework at outline stage is of particular concern as its role to provide a new 'greenway' as described in the DAS is a main aspiration of the development and should not be seen as an optional extra. • Parameters also need to be established for the green corridors and spaces within the development (to include old Andover Road) to ensure main design principles and concepts are met as set out in the DAS and to avoid any conflict of use and/or compromise of outcome at detailed stage due to lack of space or unsuitable areas allocated that are not fit for purpose. • It is therefore advised that the above concerns need to be properly addressed at outline stage if the design principles/concepts for the development and detailed highway plans are to be considered for approval.
25	<p>Stuart Dunbar Dempsey Open Space Project Officer Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The required quantity of 'outdoor sport' space for 2000 houses is 3.45 Ha. • The quantity proposed is in the region of 4.0Ha. • The Masterplan therefore meets the minimum quantity requirement for public open space. • However, various issues require clarification.
26	<p>Ivan Gurdler Aboricultural Officer Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 individual Trees being removed • 1 x group of trees possible removal (9 x copper beech) • 10 R class trees • 9 B 1 class trees • 2 C 1 class trees • Taking into account the size of the development, the loss of 9 individual B1 trees is a small amount of trees to lose. It is also noted that 3 of these trees are classed as over mature. In accordance with BS 5837 over mature trees have a very limited safe life expectancy. • Consideration should be given to the planting of new trees either side of the shelter belt to preserve this line of trees. I estimate this line of trees to be at least 80 to 120 years old and important landscape feature that is visible from the surrounding country side.
27	<p>Diane Haigh Director of Architecture and Design Review CABE 1 Kemble Street London WC2B 4AN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a fundamental concern for the downgrading of the existing Roman road, Andover Road, to replace it with a road parallel to this as the alternative route into Winchester. Although we found much to admire in the plan as presented, because of this major issue, we are unable to support the planning application in its

		current form.
28	WinACC Built Environment Group West Downs Campus University of Winchester Winchester SO22 5HT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any extension of Winchester will increase the city's carbon footprint, and we register our in principle objection to the proposal. However, the standard of development should be exemplary and the sustainability and renewable energy aspects of the proposals require thorough assessment by a specialist consultant.
29	Littleton & Harestock Parish Council David Elsmore Parish Clerk 7A Bercote Close Littleton Winchester SO22 6PX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection: Any approval of this application is premature particularly with the Inspector's comments on the consultation of the City Council's Local Development Framework. Need for 2000 homes is unproven Scheme lacks imagination for a greenfield development of such a key site at the edge of Winchester Flood risk issue Access to/from a site of this size is inadequate Provision of a green route on the old Andover Road will be ineffective as anyone cycling/walking to town, will use the new or existing road network. Traffic impact on surrounding area has been inadequately analysed/quantified Schools and hospital overstretched
30	South Wonston Parish Council Debbie Found, Clerk PO Box 324 Winchester SO21 3WB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection based on traffic consequences of development.
31	Save Barton Farm Group (SBFG) Chris. Slattery Secretary Ann Gosling Treasurer Gavin Blackman Chairman 46 Halls Farm Close, Winchester, SO22 6RE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection: There is no justification for this development in terms of Housing Land Availability Effect of the proposal on the character and setting of Winchester The highway and transportation implications of the proposal Flood-risk Loss of high quality farmland
32	Winchester City Residents Association Becton Lodge 24 Bereweeke Road Winchester Hants SO22 6AJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection: Winchester City and its Setting – Its Local Distinctiveness Valuable Agricultural Land – A Vital Resource Highways Housing Need Infrastructure
33	Catherine Rankin-Moore Planning Officer Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust Beechcroft House Vicarage Lane Curdrige Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection: insufficient information to enable the Council to determine whether the development will result in any likely significant effects. Accept the principle of the development, though concerned that there is insufficient detail of provision for green infrastructure and management over a suitable time frame. No assessment of the potential for increased

	SO32 2DP	<p>recreational impacts and necessary mitigation relating to the nearby St Catherine's Hill and Crab Wood Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little detail on potential impact on the habitats associated with the River Itchen SSSI. • Inadequate assessment of potential indirect impacts on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
34	<p>Headbourne Worthy PC Mrs H Graham, Clerk Little Holt Wellhouse Lane Headbourne Worthy WINCHESTER SO23 7JY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong Objection: • Road safety • Increased flooding • Loss of strategic gap • Lack of existing facilities and infrastructure • Land to east of railway line • Density and scale
35	<p>Georgiana Robertson Commissioning Manager Extra Care HCC Adult Services The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with local plan policy • Consistent with national, regional and best practice guidance. • Design should reflect standards of Extra Care Housing. • Encourage Extra Care Housing integrated with a core local facility to serve the new development. • Evidence of need for extra care in district
36	<p>Eloise Appleby Head of Economic and Cultural Services Winchester City Council City Offices Colebrook Street WINCHESTER Hants SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Business Issues • Micro Enterprise Zone for Entrepreneurs (MEZE) - the intention is for serviced plots offered freehold for entrepreneurs and innovators. This is a welcome part of the plan, but the freehold should be affordable • Live work - residential properties should be considered as live-work units. • Broadband essential. • Nursery provision - to enable parents to return to work. • Retail provision - Local retail provision is important for the local residential community, but also as an employment base. Focus should be on local retailers selling locally produced goods, rather than a national chain supermarket brand. • Other employment uses are welcome e.g. health centre, nursery, community hall, gym, financial services, restaurant/cafe, offices, public house, energy centre, primary school, S106 funding to the existing secondary school to provide for increased pupil numbers in catchment leading to increased staffing. • Impact on existing town • Traffic issues at Andover Road could affect commuters and restrict visitor movements leading to negative impact on the accessibility of Winchester town. The 200 space park and ride facility is a good start, but a far larger facility will be needed to reduce peak time traffic flows through the centre of the development. • Other comments • Over 4000 new residents, approximately 80% of whom may be seeking employment (based on

		<p>the economically active population of those at working age currently in Winchester), could increase already high out commuting levels unless employment is provided on site or within Winchester town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is a real opportunity to showcase environmentally sustainable technologies, in house design and building, energy creation and smarter working. • b) Sports and Recreation • The 4.9 hectares of space for pitches, to include parking and changing facilities, is considered to be adequate provision, on the understanding that there will be a proposal for additional s • c) Arts and Culture • As with any new community of this kind, cultural activities which can draw people together and help to establish an identity for their neighbourhood. The proposed development at Barton Farm would benefit from developer contributions to support this 'place-making process', building community cohesion and pride of place, making the new neighbourhood attractive and helping to avoid the 'dormitory' experience. • The proposals for bicycle and pedestrian routes through the estate lend themselves particularly to some public art or landscape art interventions which could make this a showcase development for the city, possibly connecting the new residents to the agricultural heritage of the site.
37	<p>Southern Water Network Development Atkins Ltd, Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO23 9EH</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed foul and surface water disposal strategies are acceptable to Southern Water. There is not adequate capacity in the existing foul sewerage network and therefore connection direct to Harestock Wastewater treatment Works is the best solution. • SUDS systems usually have a significant land take and it is not clear how the SUDS facilities can be accommodated within the proposed layout. Before the proposed layout is approved, we advise that the applicant/developer give consideration to ensure that the proposed means of surface water disposal can be accommodated within the proposed layout. • Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. • The Air Quality section of the Environmental Statement makes reference to the close proximity of the Harestock Wastewater Treatment Works. The impact of odour from the Wastewater Treatment Works should be reviewed in order to ensure that proposed properties are protected from potential odour nuisance • Southern Water would therefore request that the layout be reviewed when the updated odour

		<p>contours become available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following initial investigations, there is currently inadequate capacity in the local network to provide a water supply to service the proposed development. Additional off-site mains, or improvements to existing mains, will be required to provide sufficient capacity to service the development. Section 41 of the Water Industry Act 1991 provides a legal mechanism through which the appropriate infrastructure can be requested (by the developer) and provided to supply a specific site. • Southern Water has adequate resources now and in the future through the Water Resource Plan, to ensure levels of service to the development and existing customers.
38	<p>John Hearn Urban Design & Major Projects Officer Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contextual survey and analysis is thorough and comprehensive. It shows a good understanding of Winchester and how its suburbs have developed over time, how they work and connect with one another, with the city centre and with the countryside beyond. • There has been good engagement with a range of stakeholders: at meetings, workshops and a public exhibition. All of this work has informed a series of design principles and it is upon these that the proposed masterplan has been based. • The master plan and the supporting material demonstrate comprehensively what the layout and form of the new suburb will be like and how it will function. • There are some improvements which could be made to the land use parameter plan • It is recommended that the submission and approval of 'design codes' are secured by condition attached to the outline consent. • Subject to the submission of additional information I consider that the masterplan with the supporting information provides an appropriate urban design solution for a new suburb north of Winchester.

Appendix 2 – Summary of consultation responses on the supplementary information

09/02412/OUT

09/02412/OUT

Barton Farm – Consultation Comments / Observations to supplementary Information as of 02/06/10

1	<p>Winchester Ramblers Derrick Hudson Countryside Secretary 2 Dover Close Alresford SO24 9PG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is encouraging to see more detail on proposals to encourage walking and cycling between the development and Winchester City Centre. • However, we are disappointed that the opportunity to improve access to the surrounding countryside has not been taken. • Please re-examine our proposal for an alternative bridge over the railway for walkers and cyclists at the point where the existing right of way meets the railway. • We are concerned that at least one of the three existing pedestrian refuges on Worthy Road is not to become a controlled crossing point. We believe that the new path linking the development with Worthy Road will become a popular route to the recreation facilities along the river walk and Winnall Moors. • We recognise that links to the countryside may be regarded as “off site” but we think that to build on such a large green area to the north of the city without providing footpath access to the countryside is a mistake. We regard safe links to encourage walking in the surrounding countryside as essential.
2	<p>Simon Maggs Housing Strategy and Development Manager Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have no comments from and affordable housing statement. • The community infrastructure paper (page 4, point 4) refers to local people being housed. While it is likely that a proportion of new households will come from the neighbourhood, many will come from the wider Winchester town area, and from the wider district. Furthermore the council operates a joint lettings system with 3 other Hants LAs for social rented housing and a wider system for intermediate affordable housing. So, while priority may be given to certain groups, it should not be taken for granted that residents will be “exclusively” from the local neighbourhood. • I do not agree with the comment at para 2 on page 2 of the community infrastructure paper. It would not be possible to combine the role of an implementation officer and a community development worker. These are two totally different roles, requiring a different skill set. Furthermore, there is no way that one post would have the capacity to carry out the two roles. • The phasing plan highlights a potential problem. The community centre will come as part of phase 4, after some 1,000 dwellings. We need to ensure that interim arrangements are made so that there is somewhere for people to meet during the time

		<p>until the community centre is completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community planning work in Weeke has identified a shortfall in provision for teenagers in that area. The Community Infrastructure Note rightly points out that the development is not obliged to provide facilities to address existing under provision, but intelligent placement of facilities within the new development could partially help address existing problems and at the same time encourage integration of the old and new areas.
3	<p>Ian Lawson, School Organisation Officer Children's Services Department, Hampshire County Council, The Castle, Winchester Hants SO23 8UG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We continue to assert that CALA's methodology significantly underestimates the future demand for school places. Although we are pleased to see that CALA are committed to provide a site suitable for a two form entry primary school, there should be provision to allow the school to be expanded to three form entry if this is justified by the actual numbers arising. The cost of a two form entry school can be a fixed baseline for the Section 106 agreement, but there will need to be a mechanism to calculate a reasonable contribution in the event that the demand rises above two forms of entry. A pro-rata cost per additional dwelling, above a threshold, would ensure that this is in direct relationship with the impact of the development, but we will be happy to consider suggestions for an alternative approach. It is more difficult to provide a scheme and estimate relating to additional secondary school places, until we have agreed the number of additional secondary children that will have to be accommodated. However, we have commissioned a feasibility study for the expansion of Henry Beaufort School, based on the maximum number of additional places required under our usual forecasting methodology. Whilst we are pleased that the development will provide for a pre-school facility, we continue to be concerned that the site allocated is not adequate to meet the anticipated demand. So far as the Children's Centre is concerned, provided that there are suitable community facilities within the development that can be hired for outreach activities from The Lanterns Children's Centre, we can withdraw our request for finance (and additional site) to allow a dedicated facility to be built. We have noted CALA's comments concerning alternative funding for additional school places. Whilst nobody can predict what a future government might provide, there are no indications that there will be significant changes from the current arrangements. We have already investigated the one-off DCSF allocation for "abnormal growth in pupil numbers" but that was targeted at authorities where the actual number of children requiring places was higher than predicted. This is not likely to apply in the case of Barton Farm, bearing in mind that CALA is

		<p>contending that our forecasting methodology overestimates future demand!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will, of course, continue to investigate sources of external funding for suitable projects, but that is not likely to cover the basic provision of additional places for additional children. • The primary school at Barton Farm is only intended to serve that development. On that basis, the suggestion that developers' contributions from sites that would not be served by the primary school could be used towards that school runs counter to the tests in Circular 05/2005. • We see from the phasing plan that the primary school site is in Phase 1. However, it is not clear how access will be provided, bearing in mind that the school will be required well before the 350th occupation.
4	<p>WinACC Built Environment Group West Downs Campus University of Winchester Winchester SO22 5HT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have previously noted that for a site of this significance to be given outline approval there should be a clear commitment to it being an exemplar development • Environmental performance. The argument put forward is disingenuous and attempts to gloss over the fact that it should be an important target for any new development to minimise its carbon footprint, both in construction and use. • It should moreover be borne in mind that zero carbon in domestic use is scheduled to become a building regulations requirement less than halfway through the construction period for this development. • Code for Sustainable Homes: The Code for Sustainable Homes is deliberately structured to be open ended and to allow for the adoption of new technologies as and when they become viable. The applicants' statement appears therefore to have no meaning although it is of concern to note their intention that the minimum level of Code will be achieved. • Combined Heat and Power: we are pleased that CALA acknowledge that the plan to adopt a Gas fired CHP plant will be subject to review as the scheme is developed. • We believe that there should be a clear commitment to the use of renewables for space heating and hot water, consistent with achieving Code 5 for energy. • Building Envelope/Passivhaus standards: • The applicant appears to have confused our recommendation that the scheme should be constructed to Passivhaus standards, with 'passive measures'. • As previously noted, The Passivhaus standard is robust and deliverable and it would be entirely feasible to make compliance with Passivhaus a condition of planning. 'Passive measures' as put forward in this note are vague, unquantified (30% from what?) • Water use: As with the previous statement on the Code, we see sound reasons to require this

		<p>proposal to comply with the Core Strategy's requirement that a minimum of Code 5 for water use should be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion: We do not believe that the additional information provided represents an adequate response to our previous objections. • Unless conditions to any consent are applied that require detailed proposals for new dwellings to comply with Code 5 as a minimum for Energy and Water, and to be constructed to Passivhaus standards, we therefore OBJECT to the application
5	<p>Francis Porter Development Control Manager Network Operations South East Highways Agency 1B Federated House London Road Dorking RH4 1SZ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Barton Farm site is in close proximity to the M3 and the A34/A272 Junction. The M3 and A34 trunk roads are currently experiencing congestion during the peak hours • There are no further planned capacity improvements on this section of the SRN before 2014. Therefore, it is essential that any Strategic Road Network (SRN) impacts associated with the new development are managed down and mitigated. • Whilst some of the minor points raised in our last letter have been addressed, many issues still remain unresolved. • Until the above information is provided the HA is not able to assess the full impact of the development on the M3/A34 trunk roads. • Additionally the HA is concerned that the proposed mitigation measure will not appropriately mitigate the impact of the development in line with Circular 02/2007, and would therefore recommend refusal. • Given that there are existing M3 and A34 SRN capacity issues and that there are no planned improvements to the M3 south of Junction 9 before 2014, and additionally that DaSTS has designated the M3 corridor as one of national strategic importance, it is critical that the proposed development does not have a material impact on the SRN near Winchester.
6	<p>Linda Thomas Landscape Architect Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main concerns regarding design principles and concepts as they affect environmental infrastructure are now considered to have been addressed. Minor concerns remain as outlined below. For this reason, there are no objections to the revised proposals providing main design principles and concepts can be secured through condition and Section 106 Agreement at detailed reserved matters stage, as set out in the updated Design and Access Statement (April 2010); illustrative Masterplan; revised detailed highway plans; parameter plans including land use, developable areas, densities, building heights; Environmental Infrastructure plan.
7	<p>Landscape – Trees Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and Access Statement: • The additional detail now includes 'Old' Andover Road, this is essential to maintain/enhance the tree lined character/ feature of this road.

	Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Highway plans: • There seems to be adequate provision in the design of the verges to accommodate medium/large tree species with minimum verge widths of 3metres, though there is no indication of what type of species will be planted within the verges. • Street trees species need to be specified to ensure there is sufficient room for them to develop and be agreed by the LPA. • Large native trees that reflect local character should be planted where space allows them to develop
8	Catherine Rankin-Moore Planning Officer Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust Beechcroft House Vicarage Lane Curdridge Hampshire SO32 2DP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust does not object to the principle of the application but does have concerns on a number of issues. We believe these issues can be addressed through appropriate planning conditions. • The Trust is pleased that the applicant has considered the concerns of ourselves and other nature conservation bodies and has provided additional information in response to those concerns. A number of issues appear to remain outstanding, but it will be for the Council to consider whether these warrant any further delay to the determination of the application. On the basis of the information now available, the Trust has the following additional comments to make: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 1: Recreation pressure • Issue 2: Damage or displacement of existing biodiversity interests • Issue 3: Waste water treatment works capacity • However, the Trust believes these three issues can be addressed through appropriate conditions and a legal agreement, should the Council be minded to approve the application.
9	Mr Jon Maskell Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency Solent & South Downs Office, Colvedene Court, Colden Common, Hampshire, SO21 1WP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our outstanding Objection with regard to this development is based on the fact that the off-site mitigation / enhancements referred to in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Chapter 10 Ecology; pages 23 & 24) could not be conditioned in the absence of an appropriate legal agreement. We have been assured by the LPA that such an Agreement is under way, although we have not seen evidence of this to date. • In light of the Appeal for non-determination, and as the land referred to in the ES is within the Applicants ownership, it would not seem unreasonable to remove our outstanding Objection and request a Grampian condition to secure the delivery of the off-site mitigation / enhancements.
10	Stuart Dunbar Dempsey Open Space Project Officer Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection. • The supplementary information submitted in April 2010 in support of the outline planning application includes an amended version of the Developable Areas Plan (drawing number PL02 Revision C –

Hants, SO23 9LJ	<p>John Thompson and Partners) and a new Environmental Infrastructure Plan (drawing number 224/P/1000 Rev C – Studio Engleback). These plans illustrate the various types of public open space which are proposed to be provided and are submitted in response to earlier comments from Winchester City Council's Landscape Team in January 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winchester City Council have taken a likely population figure of 4,600 people based on information supplied by the County Council as to likely household size. The applicants however have arrived at a slightly lower figure of 4,520 people, but this does not significantly alter the quantity of public open space required. • Allotments • The submitted response confirms the proposal to include smaller growing areas and these can be identified on the submitted Environmental Infrastructure Plan, however the allotment area, whilst still slightly in excess of the quantum required at 1.00 ha, has been consolidated into one area in the far south east of the site rendering it even less accessible than before. Could there not be a second allotment site to serve the northern half of the site? • Children's play space • Space required 2.26 ha, space provided 2.26 ha. • Informal green space. • Space required 3.62 ha, space provided 6.30 ha. • Natural green space. • Space required 4.52 ha, space provided 5.7 ha. • Parks, sports and recreation grounds. • Space required 6.78 ha of which at least half (3.39 ha) should be for 'outdoor sport'. Space provided 8.5 ha of which 4.5 ha is provided for outdoor sport. • Use of park opposite Henry Beaufort School • The land opposite Henry Beaufort School is identified as a park for public use and will be provided as part of the open space network. It is not classified as outdoor sports space and is not dedicated for use by the school. The Masterplan incorporates this space as a means of satisfying the obligation within the emerging Core Strategy to make provision for the potential relocation or expansion of the school. The precise use of the land in the future would be a matter to be determined by the local authority managing the land the school. • Land to the east of the railway line • The land to the east of the railway line is to be provided by the applicant as supportive space adding to the strategic green infrastructure
--------------------	--

		<p>provided as part of the development, which while not strictly public open space, will provide wider opportunity for recreation and dog walking via the paths that will be created across and around the perimeter of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This outline application now comfortably meets the council's minimum on site public open space quantity standards and with the exception of a question about the accessibility of the allotment provision I have no further policy objections at this stage.
11	<p>Sarah Wariss Senior Ecologist Development & Biodiversity HCC The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additional information goes some way to addressing the concerns and issues that have previously been raised on ecological matters. In particular we are pleased that that the land to the east is now being included in the proposals in more detail, with a broad plan of design and management having been provided. However there are some remaining issues that WCC will need to be satisfied with. Should consent be granted it is imperative that various measures are secured through appropriate agreements and conditions.
12	<p>Allison Hulbert Natural England Senior Planning Specialist Western Area Government Team South East Region 1 Southampton Road Lyndhurst Hants SO43 7BU</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Natural England's previous letter, we expressed concerns relating to the potential impacts on water quality in the River Itchen SAC, due to waste water discharge from the proposed development. Based on this additional information, Natural England is able to withdraw its previous objection on this point. Additional information has been supplied, discussing the recreational impacts on the River Itchen SSSI from dog walkers, The inclusion of the area of enhanced access land to the east of the railway is welcome, as it would potentially have an important role both as an alternative to recreation on other established green spaces, including designated sites, and as wildlife habitat, including provision for some species currently found on land to the west of the railway line. However, we consider that before the Council could rely on the land fulfilling these functions over the long-term, a legal agreement detailing ownership and management for the land is required. Therefore, subject to the inclusion of conditions and a section 106 agreement to secure the ownership and management of the land to the east of the railway line, Natural England does not object to the proposed development. Natural England would expect to be consulted on the suitability of any resulting legal agreement.
13	<p>Patrick Aust Drainage Engineer, Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foul water will gravitate to four pumping stations from where it will be pumped to Southern Waters Harestock STW. The applicant must liaise with Southern Water so that a Section 104 Agreement (Water Industry Act 1991) is in place for the adoption of the pumping stations and on site

	Hants, SO23 9LJ	<p>sewers prior to the commencement of any development. It will not be acceptable for any part of the sewage infrastructure to be privately maintained with the exception of individual connections to dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storm water to go to SuDS features, the full details of which will be agreed on receipt of full application. • A flood risk assessment has been carried out and this indicates that the site can be drained of storm water in a sustainable way and in compliance with PPS 25.
14	<p>Steve Jenkins Team Leader - Highways Development Planning Hampshire County Council Environment Department Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this stage there are a number of issues which I have concerns over. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Food store trip generation • - Extent of assessment and unknown impact on the Stockbridge Road corridor & routes to Kings Worthy / A33 • - Re-routing of Andover Road – Unknown delays into City Centre and the proposed layout / safety / operation and delivery of the proposed route • - The proposed junctions of 1. Andover Road / Harestock Road, 2. New Andover Road / Well House Lane, 3. New Andover Road / Stoney Lane, 4. Andover Road / City Road / Sussex Street / Stockbridge Road (Detailed comments to follow). • - Phasing of development, particularly access via the existing Harestock Road / Wellhouse Lane staggered cross roads for upto 300 dwellings. • - Inadequacy of pedestrian and cycle routes to the west • - The unsuitability of the proposed Well House Lane Rail Arch works • - The inadequacy of the travel plan • - The inadequacy of the passenger transport contribution • Recommendation: • Unfortunately I have no alternative but to recommend that the application is refused for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13 in that it fails to make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance on the private car. The failure to utilise alternative means of transport to the private car would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the objectives of PPG13 and PPS4 and policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East and does not comply with saved policies T1, T3 and T5 of the Winchester District Local Plan • It has not been demonstrated that the local road network is capable of operating satisfactorily with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the site proposals, particularly along the proposed and

		<p>existing Andover Road corridor including its junctions with Harestock Road, Well House Lane, Stoney Lane and City Road and also along the existing Stockbridge Road corridor particularly at its junctions with Harestock Road, Stoney Lane and Berewecke Road and on those parts of the network to the east of the site particularly Park Road and its junction with Worthy Lane and at the A33 junction with the B3047 consequently the development proposals will have a significant impact to the detriment of the highway network contrary to policies T2 of the Winchester District Local Plan and CC7 of the South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction of Andover Road / Harestock Road / Well House Lane is unsuitable in its present condition to take the type and amount of traffic likely to be generated by the first phase of the proposal. • The design of the proposed New Andover Road is unsuitable in its present condition to safely and satisfactorily accommodate the type and amount of multi modal traffic likely to be generated by the proposal and using that route to access the City Centre. • The above reasons for refusal could be overcome should the applicant submit further transport assessment information and enter a Section 106 Agreement with the County Council to secure off site highway works and the payment of financial contributions in line with an agreed mitigation package.
15	<p>John Hearn Urban Design & Major Projects Officer Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional drawings submitted give more information on the public realm. More sections plans and perspectives are included of both Andover Road and the main street through the site. They show that an attractive environment will be created. • The Land Use Parameters Plan has been amended so that it corresponds with the masterplan. Importantly the plan now shows the positions of the linear landscape features that will extend south into the development from the landscaped northern edge and other informal green spaces have been extended which is an improvement. • There are some minor drafting errors on the revised Land Use Parameters Plan and on a drawing in the master plan. Some of the key development frontages have been omitted and also some of the key buildings. The applicant's agent has confirmed that amended drawings will be submitted and I am therefore satisfied with the supplementary information.
16	<p>Southern Water Network Development Atkins Ltd,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments in our original response dated 13/03/2010 for the application no. 09/02412/OUT remain unchanged and valid for the amended

	Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO23 9EH	details.
17	Phil Tidridge Environmental Protection Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information clarifies that the “with development” scenario presented in Chapter 8 to the environmental statement was “without mitigation” measures in place. Modelling has now been submitted for “with mitigation” in place. I am satisfied that the traffic flow inputs used in producing this additional modelling are based on reasonable assumptions. The air quality section of the Non-Technical Summary of the Environmental Statement still states “that the Travel Plan will mitigate the increases in No2 and PM10 concentrations predicated in the assessment.” This is not the case as it has now been shown that the development could potentially result in small increases in both PM10 and NO2 levels at some of the modelled receptors. However the size of the increases is not unreasonable when set against the size of the development and the mitigation measures proposed. I am therefore of the view that providing the travel plan and park and ride “light” are pursued through planning conditions/agreements then there is no longer any reason to refuse this application on air quality
18	Rachel Walmsley Design Review Advisor CABE 1 Kemble Street London WC2B 4AN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The masterplan has been underpinned by detailed background work and studies of the history of the growth of Winchester and form and character of existing landscape. However, we continue to have a fundamental concern for downgrading the existing Roman road and replacing it with an alternative route into Winchester due to traffic issues and capacity problems beyond the immediate boundaries. A strategic approach to traffic management is required to solve these transport issues. It is not clear how the development compliments / enhances the number and distribution of existing services and facilities in the local area. We remain unconvinced that the idea to create a local centre around an exiting school will help create the active hub that is intended. In light of our concern regarding the Roman road, we are unable to support this application in its current form.
19	Costin Matei Primary Care Projects Facilitator NHS Hampshire Omega House 112 Southampton Road Eastleigh Hampshire SO50 5PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHS Hampshire would like to submit its comment with regard to primary care facilities in the Barton Farm area. We understand that a Section 106 agreement is currently being drafted based on previous proposals. NHS Hampshire continues to agree with the initial offer made by the developer: 0.15 hectare (clean land) and access road with transfer of ownership to the PCT plus £880k capital contribution. Within the S106 there was agreed a minimum build of 600sqm but no maximum and NHS Hampshire would make decisions as to the

		<p>size and utilisation of such a building based on local need. The PCT would require an assessment to describe the impact of the development's population on the health services available at present in the local area. Provision does need to be made for health care delivery, however, as the delivery manner is changing at a fast pace the new site may have generic use including many health facilities but not necessarily a GP service. Also the planning application does mention the removal of the Andover Road 'barrier' which may facilitate the use of the new GP facilities at Friarsgate Surgery in Weeke (waitrose development).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As a result of the above the PCT would like to engage with the developer in further detailed negotiations should outline permission be granted to develop further plans for service delivery for this population.

Appendix 3 – Summary of consultation responses on the duplicate application
10/01063/OUT

10/01063/OUT

Barton Farm – Initial Consultation Comments / Observations as of 02/06/10

1	<p>Helen Parvin Historic Environment Officer Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no objections raised from Conservation (Historic Environment) on the proposed development as the impact on the built historic environment will be minimal. It is important for boundary and footpath planting to be retained and commendable that the proposed scheme intends to preserve it. • Please see comments from Archaeology (Historic Environment).
2	<p>Simon Maggs Housing Strategy and Development Manager Winchester City Council City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hants, SO23 9LJ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand that this latest application is identical to the appealed application. Consequently I have nothing to add to previous comments
3	<p>Sarah Warriss Hampshire County Council Senior Ecologist Development & Biodiversity Environment Department The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for consulting us on the new, duplicate Barton Farm application. Unless you would like any specific further comments from us, we would ask that you please apply our response to the previous application (with amendments) to this new application
4	<p>David Brock Team Leader English Heritage South East Region Eastgate Court 195-205 High Street Guildford Surrey GU1 3UH</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not consider that it is necessary for this application to be notified to English heritage under the relevant statutory provisions
5	<p>Barry Lockyer Access Development Team Countryside Service Hampshire County Council Room 200 Mottisfont Court High Street, Winchester SO23 8ZF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for sending us the above consultation, a duplicate of updated application 09/02412/OUT. • Our response is the same as for that earlier application, and I reproduce it below • We have no objection, in principle, to the proposed development. • However, we do have on file several submissions for the addition to the definitive map of some, currently unrecorded, rights of way across the site. I and my colleague, Sylvia Seeliger, who deals with such map related issues, met with Mike Emmett of Cala Homes recently and made him aware of these claims for footpaths across the site. We also advised that the paths would need to

		accommodated within the development or diverted under s257 of T & CPA
6	Allison Hulbert Natural England Senior Planning Specialist Western Area Government Team South East Region 1 Southampton Road Lyndhurst Hants SO43 7BU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I note that this is a duplicate application of the updated application 09/02412/OUT. I therefore confirm that Natural England's comments are as set out in our previous response dated 4 May 2010.
7	Mark Turner Commercial Director Stagecoach South Bus Station Southgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 8DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We, in principle would support the application in that it would strengthen the customer base and add to an already prosperous city. We welcome the suggestion of a dedicated bus to serve the site and the developer recognises the need for it to be funded for a number of years in order for it to become sustainable.
8	Derrick Hudson Countryside Secretary Winchester Ramblers 2 Dover Close Alresford Hants SO24 9PG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winchester Ramblers submitted comments on both the original application and the additional information provided by the developer in April 2010. At a meeting earlier this week, it was decided to make no further comment on the proposed development
9	Vicky Aston Planning Manager South East Region Sport England Sport England, 51a Church Street, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8AX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I confirm that we are happy to rely on our representations dated 18th December 2009 in response to your consultation on application 09/02412/OUT.
10	Catriona Riddell Director of Planning South East England Partnership Board Berkeley House Cross Lanes Guildford Surrey GU1 1UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your consultation on the above planning application being a duplicate of Application 09/02412/OUT, which we commented on in January this year. However, we have no record of being consulted on the supplementary information in April. Provided that this supplementary information raises no new strategic issues, I can confirm that our comments on the original application can be used in relation to this duplicate application
11	Southern Gas Networks 95 Kilbirnie Street Glasgow G5 8JD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You will note the presence of our Low/medium/ Intermediate Pressure gas main in the proximity to your site. No mechanical excavations are to take place above or within 0.5m of the Low pressure and medium pressure system and 3 metres of the intermediate pressure system.
12	Chris Walters Crime Prevention Design Advisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Officer provided detailed comments regarding the following areas: Road layout within the development

	Gosport Police Station, South Street, Gosport, Hants, PO12 1ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking • Streets, Footpaths, Bus stops and Cycleways • Railway underpass • LEAPS and LAPS • Schools • Park and ride • Retail area • Sports facilities • Allotments • Security for dwellings • Utilities • Cycle stores • Multi agency office
13	Basingstoke & Deane BC Civic Offices London Road Basingstoke Hants RG21 4AH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matter has been considered and OBJECTION is raised for the following reason: • The proposals are premature to the proper consideration of the wider strategic impacts of development as part of Winchester's LDF. • More specifically, the impacts of all new development and its location needs to be assessed 'in the round' in relation to both the strategic road and rail networks having sought the views of both the Highways Agency and Network Rail. • This will allow proper consideration to be given to the potential increase in cross boundary journey to work movements and any potential implications for existing infrastructure, such as jct 6 of the M3 at Basingstoke, having taken into account the long term background growth projections on the strategic transport network
14	City of Winchester Trust 32 Upper Brook St, Winchester SO23 8DG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust continues to STRONGLY OBJECT to this application as being premature and detrimental to the character of Winchester for the reasons given in their comments dated 17 January 2010 on the previous application.
15	Kristina King Development Control Officer Hampshire County Council Environment Department The Castle, Winchester Hampshire SO23 8UD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County Council as a local planning authority has no objection to the outline proposal, but wishes to make a few comments relating to different aspects which need to be considered before a decision is made. • Waste planning • Landscape • Archaeology

Appendix 4 – Full Parish Council responses

Appendix 5 – Illustrative Masterplan

Set out on a separate, colour, sheet

Appendix 6 – Land Use Parameters Plan

Set out on a separate, colour, sheet

Appendix 7 – Communities and Local Government letter from the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP of 27th May 2010 relating to the abolition of Regional Strategies