

## Appendix 1 – Comments and responses

### 1. General

#### **J Strubbe**

An overall plan for the centre of the city should be resolved before irretrievable and irreversible involvement with and by developers

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

The concept is excellent. Concerned that if it is allowed to become a developer led project, the architecture will not be given the priority it deserves and an opportunity to achieve something really special commensurate with the site will be lost. It is an ironic fact that many of the poorest developments in the city over the last 50 years were sponsored by the local authority.

#### **A Rutter**

Considers this to be a good brief in many ways incorporating many sound and interesting ideas aimed at getting a high class result in an area which does not help the town at present.

#### **Winchester City Centre Partnership**

View the proposed development as a positive and crucial element of the future economy in Winchester.

#### **City of Winchester Trust**

Congratulates the Council on the straightforward nature of the Brief and the process of public consultation since its publication.

#### **M Oaten MP**

Vision must blend respect for the historic heritage with our strong community and culture and the aspirations of local residents. At the same time it must be outward looking

#### **Response**

The overwhelming public reaction to the draft brief is to welcome its publication and content.

The wider physical and economic context of the town centre is acknowledged in the Draft Planning Brief. The economic context is addressed in detail the *Winchester Retail Study* (2003), carried out by consultants commissioned by the City Council, and part-sponsored by the City of Winchester Trust. The *Local Plan Review, Revised Deposit* (May 2003) in particular *Chapter 11* provides a planning policy context to guide development in the town centre generally.

#### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

### 2. Transport

#### **Winchester City Residents Association**

There has been no 'origin and destination' survey of Winchester traffic carried out for at least 15 years. In the absence of such a survey, any traffic strategy must be seen as being built on nebulous foundations.

#### **Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service**

Any traffic management schemes for the redevelopment area should take into account the close location of the fire station and the effect on emergency vehicles responding to calls in other parts of the Winchester area.

**Hampshire County Council**

The proposed development presents not only a major opportunity to improve transport facilities in the immediate area but also to contribute to improvements across the city in terms of transport networks and services. The Consultation Draft generally satisfies the requirements of the highway authority in that the Local Plan considerations have been dealt with in a manner that is fully consistent with the integrated transport strategy for Winchester. The involvement of the County Council as the proposals have emerged has been particularly helpful in ensuring that the brief is consistent with the highway authority's objectives.

**Response**

Traditional Origin and destination surveys are no longer considered particularly helpful by transport planners for measuring and predicting traffic patterns or growth, the delays caused by stopping vehicles, caused many people to divert their journey and therefore present a misleading representation of actual travel patterns. Information is now gathered using different survey techniques.

The traffic impacts of the development have been considered by the County Council as Highway Authority. The City Council's Transport Planner has also been consulted on the proposals. Both Authorities are satisfied that the development as proposed can be satisfactorily accommodated, provided appropriate traffic management measures are incorporated in the scheme. These will be addressed as the design work progresses.

All traffic management measures will take into account access for emergency vehicles to the development and the surrounding area. Pedestrian priority areas will be designed to accommodate emergency and other vehicles. The use of the circulatory system in the town centre by emergency vehicles should not be compromised by the development.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

**Para 2.9.2** Add a reference to emergency vehicles access in the scope of the Traffic Assessment required as part of the planning application.

**2.1 Car Parking****Eagleprint Ltd**

Endorse the relocation of long stay parking to park and ride sites in order to maximise the number of customer spaces

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Question whether the removal of long stay parking to the park and ride sites will have any significant long term impact on traffic flows without other measures to being traffic constraint.

**Eagleprint Ltd**

Do not consider that it would be appropriate to reduce car parking numbers when additional floorspace is being proposed.

**City of Winchester Trust**

Supports the policy of reducing the number of private parking spaces but wonders how soon pooling car resources would provide an answer

**J Strubbe**

Parking for visiting shoppers, if not attractive and convenient will drive them to Southampton or Portsmouth. The existing underground car park is ideal particularly in poor weather and can be extend north-east whilst providing open space above for extended weekly farmers markets etc.

**Hampshire County Council**

Parking provision as proposed conforms with the Winchester Movement and Access Plan's approach to discourage long-stay parking in the central area while retaining short-stay spaces for business, shoppers and leisure use.

**Response**

The research carried out by the County Council in developing its Park and Ride policy for Winchester indicates that its expansion will make a significant difference to the peak hours traffic flows in the town centre. This will only be achieved if an equivalent number of long stay spaces are removed from the town centre. This will allow the opportunity to secure a better balance between long stay and short stay public parking spaces in the town centre. This will be taken up in a review of the Council's parking policy to be carried out later this year.

The demand for parking to support the commercial and social activities of the town centre has to be balanced against its environmental impact. The Draft Planning Brief suggests a level of short stay parking equivalent to what would be available within the site now if the Friarsgate multi-storey car park had been refurbished. This refurbishment would reduce the number of spaces to around 250. Provision for 300-350 spaces would also replace the Marks and Spencer shoppers car park spaces which will be lost, and the small number of spaces lost in other town centre car parks to accommodate pay on foot equipment.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

**2.2 Bus****2.2.1 Location of Bus Station****Tenants of Godson/Lawn House**

Proposed relocation of the bus station is directly opposite sheltered housing for the elderly. Some of the residents suffer from chest complaints which will certainly not be improved by the extra pollution created by buses starting and stopping. Suggest relocating the proposed bus station to the Cattle Market Area instead

**Hampshire County Council**

The development of a new bus station is of major significance and it is reassuring to note that the planning brief endorses the need for a high quality facility. Technical studies relating to changed bus movements have indicated that measures can be provided to alleviate the impact of the development on the local highway network.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

The need for a modern bus station with high quality facilities is unquestionable.

**City of Winchester Trust**

Still have serious reservations about the siting of the Bus Station in the central area

**North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

It is debatable whether the bus station should be located at this site. There is concern as to how the road system will cope with an increase in the number of cars that will be generated into the centre of the city. Keeping the bus station in the centre rather than linking it to rail or an accessible place away from the centre will accentuate the bottleneck.

**J Bird**

Has consideration been given to the placing of the bus station near the train station and thus creating a 'travel centre'. If such a 'travel centre' incorporated facilities for meals (and ready access to Shopmobility/Dial-A-Ride) and were well designed it would encourage people to lessen the use of cars in our City.

### **Response**

The location of the bus station was addressed in the original development study (Llewelyn-Davies 1997) when the County Council and bus companies were consulted. Alternative locations were considered in the early stages of the study, including the railway station. The expert view was that the bus station should be located in the town centre because that is the origin or destination of most people travelling, or wishing to travel, by bus.

The pollution generated by a bus station depends to a large extent on the way it is managed. If bus engines are turned off during the period of standing there should be no more pollution than at present. The layout of the new bus station will keep manoeuvring to a minimum. The number of bus movements at the eastern end of Friarsgate will increase as a result with the eastbound bus lane, but there will be a reduction in car traffic once the Park and Ride facilities are extended. New bus engines are being introduced with lower emissions, and over time the pollution of the town centre by traffic should be reduced.

The Draft Planning Brief refers to the accommodation of Shopmobility and Dial a Ride as part of the new bus station (*para 2.7.7*)

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

### **2.2.2 Contra flow**

#### **Tenants of Godson/Lawn House**

The siting of a bus lane would mean buses crossing two lanes of incoming traffic to exit the bus station and then travel in the opposite direction to oncoming traffic. This seems a ridiculous idea and positively dangerous.

#### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Concerns about the impact of the bus contra-flow on traffic. In particular, whether this would increase traffic hold ups at peak periods causing gridlock and add to the already excessive levels of pollution in the City Centre.

### **Response**

The impact of the proposed contraflow arrangement has been tested using the County Council's recently completed computer traffic model of the town centre. County Council Highway Engineers have confirmed that they are satisfied the arrangement could operate satisfactorily, with no significant detrimental impact on traffic flows.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

### **2.2.3 Location of Bus Stops**

#### **WSP Development Ltd**

Attached drawing of suggested bus stops.

#### **W.A. & P. Vandersteen**

Essential that there is a bus stop between the proposed bus station and Jewry Street. Upper Brook Street seems the most suitable locations especially if the doctor's surgeries are to be located in that area.

#### **Winchester City Residents Association**

The location of the bus stops to replace those at M&S and Sainsburys must meet the needs of the frail and elderly.

### **Response**

The Draft Planning Brief requires the provision of bus stops in Upper Brook Street, because of the distance between the new bus station and the next stops in Jewry Street. Although these will not be as convenient as the existing stops outside Marks and Spencer, the new bus station will be a much more attractive point to embark than the existing station, and will be better connected to the extended shopping area.

WSP are the Consulting engineers who designed the new bus arrangements. The plans highlight some minor errors in Figure 2 of the Draft Planning Brief.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Re-draw *Figure 2* to conform with the plans submitted by WSP.

## **2.2.4 Other**

### **M Oaten MP**

Quick loading of buses can be achieved by selling all tickets beforehand so everybody just walks on without having to fiddle with change.

### **C J Webb**

Many elderly and frail people use these popular bus stops outside Sainsbury's and M&S. This gives the buses a traffic advantage and priority and enabled them to stop and get away without hinder. If the Council really is committed to increasing bus travel it must give the buses a competitive edge over cars. Very much in favour of the Council running the bus station and perhaps the tourist office as well as the parking office could be located within the bus station.

### **M Charrett**

The bus station should be managed by the Council and not by the bus company. Built-in guarantees must be provided to ensure that it remains as a bus station

The present electronic information system at the bus station is inoperative. At an early stage in the construction of a new bus station, a clear, efficient information system needs to be built in and the management of it passed to the County Council as part of the Romance project.

### **Tenants of Godson/Lawn House**

It is not necessary to have a Bus Station in the town centre providing there is an information point re bus times etc and plenty of bus stops.

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Is central government finance available for the capital works associated with the new bus station having regard to the fact that improving the quality of public transport provision is a key element in the government's transport strategy.

### **W.A. & P. Vandersteen**

Need to make sure that disabled people can reach the buildings as well as access them. Perhaps when the extension of Park and Ride takes place more use could be made of it to enable people to get to various locations around the city.

### **A Rutter**

Not convinced that the provision for taxis within the bus station will work. Not all bus requirements are the same. It is important to provide facilities for elderly or handicapped people to be brought to the station by car and doesn't see how this could conceivably be achieved.

**J Bird**

Supports provision of meeting the needs of the Shopmobility/Dial-A-Ride scheme.

**City of Winchester Trust**

Would like to see stronger control for the parking of tourist coaches so that the Broadway may be used only briefly for set-down and pick-up.

**Winchester Area Tourist Guides Association**

Are facilities being planned for the dropping off and picking up of passengers from visiting coaches coming into Winchester? Feels that it is essential for Tourism in Winchester to have this facility.

**Response**

The construction and operation of the new bus station could be enhanced by a number of other initiatives. Some of these are already planned; others could be considered. As a partner in the ROMANSE real time bus information, and the EU-funded MIRACLES project, promoting less environmentally damaging travel in Winchester, the County Council will be an important partner in maximising the benefits and utility of public transport serving Winchester town centre.

The provision of facilities for people with disabilities, for picking up and setting down, and for taxis is required by *para 2.7.7* and *2.7.10* of the Draft Planning Brief. These may not all be within the bus station itself, but must be immediately adjacent. The way in which these are achieved will be a subject of negotiation with the developer.

The removal of service buses from the Broadway will allow the opportunity to review the way in which the Broadway is used. This includes the way tourist buses use it to set down and pick up tour passengers. This will be the subject of a further study, but may not form part of the Broadway/Friarsgate development.

The Council would prefer to take responsibility for the management of the bus station, subject to appropriate financial arrangements, and this will also be the subject of future negotiations. This is addressed in *para 27.8* of the Draft Planning Brief.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **2.3 Pedestrian**

**Hampshire County Council**

The creation of new, high quality pedestrian routes is welcomed. Attractive, permeable routes are an important aspect of the city's activities and an emphasis on walking in the context of the development is welcomed.

**M Charrett**

The development offers considerable opportunities for pedestrian enhancement of the lower end of the City with buses re-routed along Friarsgate. This would enable effective measures to be taken to prevent unauthorised vehicular access

**Eagleprint Ltd**

Objects to the relocation of the current pedestrian crossing at Friarsgate as shown in *Figure 2*. This current crossing provides an important pedestrian linkage to The Brooks. If a new crossing is to be provided, this should be in addition to the existing location.

**Tenants of Godson/Lawn House**

There have been a lot of accidents at the crossroads of Friarsgate, Lower Brook Street and Tanner Street. Moving the present pedestrian crossing closer to this junction will make it more dangerous.

**A Rutter**

Doesn't believe that sufficient thought has been given to the pedestrian links between Winnal and the town centre.

**CTC**

Substantial research has shown that there are no real factors that justify the exclusion of cyclists from pedestrian areas and indicate that cycling can be more widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians. The brief should therefore state that, in general for this redevelopment, pedestrianised areas are to be open to cyclists and that any proposed exceptions must be individually justified.

**Response**

It is not intended to remove the existing crossing at Middle Brook Street. The relocated crossing already exists in a nearby location in Friarsgate. The provision of light controls at the Tanner St junction should make traffic movements safer.

The removal of buses from the lower High Street area will allow a review of traffic restrictions in this area. This will take into account the level of abuse of the current arrangements by private motorists.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Modify *Figure 2* to make the proposed arrangements for pedestrian crossings in Friarsgate clearer.

The pedestrian/cyclist point is addressed below

## **2.4 Cycling**

**Hampshire County Council**

It would be appropriate to ensure that cycling routes are considered more fully and that the opportunity to add significantly to the local cycle network is not overlooked. Greater emphasis should be placed on the provision of the cycle network and access to and through the development site.

**CTC**

Important that the redevelopment be directed towards reducing motor traffic by making cycling more attractive

Note that buses, taxis and pedestrians are mentioned fairly intensively in the brief, but there is comparatively little mention of cycling. Believe that the brief's treatment of cycling needs to be substantially amplified and strengthened.

It may be helpful to identify 'gateways' (suggested gateways attached) on or near the edges of the redevelopment area, through which most of the cycling traffic passes and seems likely to pass in future. The routes (suggested routes attached) between these gateways which exist already must be preserved and enhanced, and new routes should be created, for cyclists to use without dismounting.

Various detailed comments including the provision for cyclists at the Bus Station, general cycle storage requirements and a general comments about providing for cyclists as well as pedestrians.

**M Oaten MP**

A city hire-a-bike scheme would allow you to hire a bike at any major transport node in the centre and in nearby residential areas and drop it off at any other

**Response**

The development, and the town centre, as a whole should be accessible to cyclists, and should provide facilities to encourage cycling as a means of travelling to and from the town centre. The pedestrian priority areas of the new development are likely be as busy as the High Street at peak times, and cycling will have to be restricted in the interests of safety. Outside peak times, and in areas of lower activity, cycling should be encouraged.

The development should include facilities for cycle parking and storage (see *para 2.5.3* in relation to residential development), and identify links to cycle routes to and through the town centre.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Incorporate provision for cyclists and cycles in *para 2.9*, and ensure that this is addressed in the Transport Assessment (*para 2.9.2*).

## **2.5 Vehicles**

**J Strubbe**

Vehicular access and access to east and west is required for all, not only buses. Two-way can be provided from Upper Brook Street to Eastgate Street and would at the same time stop through traffic from both Middle and Lower Brook Streets, returning some safety and peace to this residential area. (map attached)

**Response**

Earlier work on the Draft Planning Brief has explored the possibility of providing two-way movement of other vehicles at the eastern end of Friarsgate, as it could improve egress from the car parks and reduce traffic on the circulatory system. Until the full impact of the expansion of Park and Ride is known it would not be appropriate to take this step, but the potential will be kept under review.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **3 Waterways**

**Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trusts**

Strongly support paragraph 1.4.2 which states that 'the culverted brooks' should be opened up where possible and the quality of the environment along the banks improved..' Happy to provide advice on this matter at the appropriate time

Welcome the recognition of the importance of close consultation with the Environment Agency in section 2.11 (Flood Risk)

**Environment Agency**

The Agency strongly welcomes the proposals to de-culvert stretches of the brooks that run through Winchester, and welcomes the inclusion of flood risk in the text of the brief. It should be noted that in pre-Victorian times, Middle and Lower Brook Streets were watercourses, and any culverts under the roads may pre-date much of the sewer network in the vicinity.



It is therefore recommended that further investigation of this is undertaken, and care is taken when construction activities occur in and over any structures found.

For soakaways to work, there must be an unsaturated zone within the aquifer. At this location, there is very little depth to the aquifer, and the area in general has experienced problems associated with high ground water levels. If a developer proposes to use soakaways to dispose of surface water, soakaway tests will be required to prove that they would be an effective method of drainage, and alternative surface water drainage may need to be considered.

The Agency does not permit direct discharge into the groundwater as this contravenes the Agency's Policy and Practice for the Protection of Groundwater, and therefore deep bored soakaways are not a preferred method of drainage. There are both foul sewers and surface water sewers in the area, however, permission will need to be sought from Southern Water if the intention is to use them. It may be necessary for pipework to be constructed in such a manner so as to allow the sewerage systems to function even in periods of high groundwater.

It is therefore recommended that the Development Brief encourage the formulation of a drainage strategy as part of the proposals.

#### **Southern Water**

The redevelopment will need to take into account the existing utility apparatus in the area. *Map of Southern Water's pipes enclosed.*

As soon as a developer is involved, contact must be made with Southern Water to see how alterations to water mains and sewers can be accomplished without adversely affecting existing customers

Object to 3.12.2 where it is inferred that all surface water will be by SUDS (continuance of Local Plan objections on this matter)

#### **Donald Insall Associates**

The freshwater brooks that are currently hidden and piped away could be a focal and attractive feature of the development

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

The 'public realm' whilst revealing waterways should also include a modern water feature.

#### **M Charrett**

It is essential that natural water features are provided in the re-development i.e. exposure of rivers and not artificial water features such as fountains.

#### **A Rutter**

Doesn't believe that peoples desire to 'open up' the brook streams is a realisable option, as the water is too low in respect of development and would tend to end up as a deposit for rubbish. There is however one exception to this with the opening up of the brook running behind the Almshouses which would make a very worthwhile space.

#### **City of Winchester Trust**

Welcomes the intention to make use of the existing water courses wherever possible. The presence of open brooks is as important as the street pattern to the historic character of the area; moreover it would be of great visual and aural benefit to the development. They do recognise that the opening up of the western branch may not be possible. If this is the case consideration should be given to drawing off a further branch to a position and in a manner that can more readily be accommodated.

#### **J Strubbe**

Should make the most of the River Itchen with diversions to avoid old culverts along Busket Lane, Broadway and Abbey Gardens. The main diversion could incorporate fountains with a mural on the side of No.166, then via a fountain sculpture linking old and new Broadway.

**M Oaten MP**

Opening up the culverted brooks and the River Itchen would be highly desirable.

**Cllr J Porter**

Keen to use the course of the river to bring water to this development.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Strongly recommend that the highlighting of water as a natural resource should be an element included in the Brief.

**Response**

The support for the Draft Planning Brief's suggestions regarding the culverted brooks is encouraging, particularly the comments of the Environment Agency and Southern Water.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Amend *para 3.12.2* to require a Drainage Strategy for the development.

## 4 During Construction

**Southern Water**

A piecemeal redevelopment could cause greater disruption of service provision

**R Ackland**

There is likely to be substantial noise, dust and disruption to residents of the area. Wants to know how the Council proposes to minimise the impact of the demolition and re-construction work.

The rear entrance and car parking space for his property is on the edge of the site with access for parking from Busket Lane. Would like assurances that access to their property and parking space would not be compromised during the redevelopment.

**Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service**

Fire Service Access to existing premises will need to be considered and should not be compromised during the construction phase. The means of escape from existing premises adjoining the site should not be compromised during construction nor the passage of emergency vehicles responding to calls in other parts of the Winchester area.

**Environment Agency**

It should be noted that in pre-Victorian times, Middle and Lower Brook Streets were watercourses, and any culverts under the roads may pre-date much of the sewer network in the vicinity. It is therefore recommended that care is taken when construction activities occur in and over any structures found.

The site lies on the Middle Chalk Formation which is classified as a major aquifer. This groundwater resource will therefore need to be protected from pollution during demolition, construction and any subsequent use of the site. The method of site construction and operation for any development will need to be considered carefully in order to prevent pollution of underlying groundwater. Although this is most appropriately dealt with through conditions on any subsequent planning application, it may be of value for the Development Brief to mention this issue.

It is likely that groundwaters would be encountered during the construction phases, particularly when creating the foundations. It should be noted that pumping water away from the site (de-watering) to facilitate works may require an authorisation from the Agency.

If de-watering is required at any point within the proposed works a full assessment of the possible impacts should be made. The Environment Agency should be notified prior to the start of dewatering as a conservation notice may need to be issued by the Agency if it is deemed necessary to ensure that water levels in the vicinity are not lowered in such a way as to cause detriment to other sources.

**Eagleprint Ltd**

It is essential that the number of available car parking spaces is maintained during the course of development.

**M Oaten MP**

Trade in the Middle Brook Street market is likely to be disrupted by redevelopment. There is a need for a continuity strategy to sustain these businesses during redevelopment.

With the closure of a large number of Post Office branches throughout Winchester it is essential that the centre Post Office counters are retained during any redevelopment. If this is not possible, alternative provision needs to be secured in the nearby area. The same access issues apply to other key services such as Moss Pharmacy on Silver Hill.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Would add the need to maintain existing essential facilities such as central Medical Centre.

**Response**

*Para 2.0.1* of the Draft Planning Brief makes it clear the Council will require comprehensive rather than piecemeal development of the site covered by the Brief, and a master plan for the development.

The development site is at the heart of a busy town centre with a tight street network and high levels of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Some disruption is inevitable, but the phasing of construction work must be planned to minimise the impact of construction operations. This is made clear in *Section 3.8*.

The Environmental Assessment which will be required as part of the formal planning application will have to measure the impact of construction as well as operation, and recommend appropriate mitigation measures.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Make a specific reference to minimising construction impacts, ensuring the continued operation of surrounding businesses, and access for emergency vehicles in *Section 3.8*.

## **5 Facilities**

### **5.1 Medical Centres**

**Tenants of Godson/Lawn House**

Want Friarsgate medical centre retained

**P Neyrond**

Objects to the possible relocation of the medical centre on the old cattle market site if it could not be in the development. The medical centre is in a good location.

**Tenants of Godson/Lawn House, C J Webb**

Wants the medical centres left in their present position as they are within easy reach.  
Alternative locations unacceptable

**City of Winchester Trust**

Essential that the medical centres have easy access by public transport, and that they should be reasonably close to short-stay parking for those bringing patients in need of assistance.

**M Oaten MP**

Friarsgate Health Practise provides an invaluable and accessible service and needs to be retained within or close to the new development.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Health facilities should be located in the development site in close proximity to the bus station. The facilities should have 'drop down' points nearby for people lacking personal mobility.

**S Smith**

Should definitely include a medical centre preferably one with air conditioning.

**Response**

Discussions have been held with the health practices and the Primary Care Trust during the preparation of the Draft Planning Brief. Their relocation will help to achieve the best possible layout for the new development. The Council has an agreement in principle with Friarsgate Health Practice have to allow them to relocate to the Cattlemarket to serve better their catchment area. The Council and the health practices are however all keen to ensure that the facilities remain in the town centre if possible. The Council will work with all parties to identify an appropriate relocation site or sites in the immediate area.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Delete reference to the Cattlemarket relocation and emphasise the preference for retention of the health practices in the town centre, in *para 2.13.1*.

## **5.2 Post Office**

**A Rutter**

Believes that the siting of the Post Office (a key generator of foot traffic) needs to be given more prominence

**C J Webb**

What happens? Could the King Edward VIII unique letter box at Morn Hill Sub Post Office be relocated in the new development?

**City of Winchester Trust**

Reference to the importance of the Post Office should be further emphasised following the closures of other sub Post Offices in Winchester. Accessibility from public transport and short-term parking has now become a matter of vital importance.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Support inclusion of a new Post Office in the development site.

**Response**

The Post Office Counters facility is an important contributor to the range of facilities in the town centre, and the Council is keen for it to be retained. The new development will provide a significant increase in retail floorspace, and *para 2.14.2* states that the Council expects it to accommodate Post Office Counters. If this were to prove impractical, or an alternative and better location were identified, the Council will be prepared to work with the developers and Post office Counters to secure the best possible location for the facility in the town centre.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Amend *para 2.14.2* to allow for the relocation of Post Office Counters to an alternative site in the town centre if this can be shown to be the better location.

## **5.3 Market**

### **Eagleprint Ltd**

Endorse the comment that whilst Silver Hill should be designed to cater for the potential expansion of the Street Market/Farmers Market, this should be achieved without compromising service access or commercial viability.

### **A Rutter**

To say that there is “little demand to expand the market” may be true as it is at present, but given a different location and layout, the result may be different (Salisbury has a better shaped market)

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Welcomes the retention of a street market. In favour of the enlargement of the area designated for market use, including the provision for the monthly Farmers Market.

### **M Oaten MP**

Existing markets in Winchester provide a great alternative. Redevelopment of the city centre should actively encourage this enterprise. The Council needs to be more relaxed about market holders and should encourage a wider range

### **M Oaten MP**

Consideration should be given for a more formal and accessible location for the farmers market.

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Providing for the potential expansion of the street market and farmers market is to be welcomed. Would like to see a covered market or Market Hall which could be the scene of lively activity whatever the weather.

## **Response**

The street market in Middle Brook street is an important additional facility for the town centre. There is no great demand for extra pitches in the weekday market at present, but the provision of additional public space which could be used for such purposes would enable the town to respond if there proves to be demand either for a larger weekday market, or for specialist weekend markets like the Farmers market.

The design of public spaces will have to maintain access to, and visibility of, adjacent shops should they be used by market stalls.

A purpose-built indoor market is unlikely to be viable, given the high value of the site, and the other public facilities that it will have to support. The ground floor of the Woolstaplers Hall could however be used for such a purpose.

The accommodation of street markets is addressed in *para 3.3.3*.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to street markets in the *Section 2.3, Retail Context*. Add a reference to the possible future use of the Woolstaplers Hall in *para 2.12.1*.

## **5.4 Leisure**

### **Winchester Family Church**

The brief does not appear to have taken into account the use to which the Middle Brook Centre is currently put or of the potential of the building in the future with regard to the leisure provision. Hopes that the leisure needs study will give some attention to the facilities of the Middle Brook Centre

### **Cllr J Porter**

The opportunity to flood and freeze a square for a winter outdoor ice-rink would be popular with locals and tourists alike. This was also a constantly recurring theme in requests for activities in Winchester at the Youth Forum recently.

### **Response**

The Middle Brook Centre lies outside the area covered by the Draft Planning Brief, but is an important town centre facility. The new development will not compromise its activities, and the Council is not aware of any proposals to change or expand the range of activities it accommodates.

The possible use of parts of the new spaces created as an ice rink would provide a popular winter facility. It could however restrict access to public spaces and may be difficult or expensive to manage. This could be discussed with the developers as an opportunity, rather than a requirement.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to winter activities, such as a skating rink, in *para 2.16.4.or 3.3.3*

## **5.5 Evening Economy**

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Would have reservations on the development of further night clubs in the City Centre in the light of the proposed relaxation of the licensing hours.

### **M Oaten MP**

Supports the provision of a nightclub. There is no reason why this cannot also be a mixed use venue. Would welcome a stronger lead and encouragement for innovation on this issue in the development brief.

There is a need for alternative non-alcoholic venues such as cafes, coffee shops and small restaurants open late. This would cater better for families and young people and provide a counterbalance to the large number of pubs that currently dominate the city centre.

There is a gap in the market for family friendly restaurants with facilities for children such as designated play areas or entertainment. Encouraging these sorts of alternative, family orientated services would help to bring more and more varied groups of people into the city centre.

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Would welcome an expansion of evening facilities and a new hotel in the city centre, provided the latter does not unduly reduce the available area for housing.

### **R Ackland**

Currently anti-social behaviour and gathering of large drunken groups is a problem in the Broadway Friarsgate area, but is limited to the front of R Ackland's property and is bordering tolerable for a town centre location. Although additional social venues could significantly enhance the area, I would like to know how the Council proposed to minimise anti-social behaviour particularly at closing time and on the proposed green areas.

This is of particular concern since the new development offers potential for late night disruption both at the front and rear of the property.

### **Response**

The Draft Planning Brief requires a mix of uses, including cafes, restaurants and bars see *paras 3.3.3 and 3.4.1*.

The provision of a nightclub in Winchester has supporters and opponents. The Draft Planning Brief acknowledges that the site would be an appropriate location for such a use, provided it can be incorporated, built and managed in a way that does not compromise the amenities of other occupiers of the development or the surrounding area (see *para 2.4.2*).

The inclusion of a hotel in the development would be a valuable additional asset for the town centre, but it would inevitably reduce the site's residential capacity. (see *para 2.4.3*) Housing is the Council's higher priority at present, but this would be a matter for negotiation with the developer.

For a town of its size, Winchester is quite well-served by family restaurants, and the development is likely to provide more. An alcohol-free venue was trialled a few years ago in the town centre (the North Pole in Parchment Street). The venture failed, partly because the alcohol-free nights were a financial drain, and it would be difficult to make such a facility a requirement of the Brief.

The Council's CCTV system in the town centre is an effective deterrent to anti-social activity, and a useful tool in apprehending those responsible when it occurs. The Draft Planning Brief requires the developer to extend CCTV coverage into the scheme (see *para 2.15.3*). The Council wishes the new development to have the feel of a traditional street, with 24 hour access.

Creating new public spaces may bring with it problems of anti-social activity at night, but the Council feels that this is an issue to be managed, through careful design and supervision, rather than to be avoided by closing off areas out of hours.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **5.6 Young People facilities**

### **A Rutter**

At the town centre forum for young people a good case was made for better central facilities for young people. Previous attempts to do this have floundered because the facilities have been split up in separate buildings when they need to be together to feed off each other.

### **E Turvey, L Waite, S Smith & unknown**

An outdoor ice-rink would make lots of money. Also would like a bowling alley, clothes shops, fast food places, cyber café ( to meet friends) etc

### **M Oaten MP**

A secure facility for parents shopping or visiting the city centre to drop their children off would make the city more accessible

### **Response**

A recent study of community facilities in the town centre ( suggested that there was no shortage of facilities for young people. When asked, young people (such as the three quoted above) tend to ask for more shops, cafes, and places to hang out. These are all required by the Draft Planning Brief. Purpose built facilities are difficult to fund and tend not to be popular, The aim should be to make sure that the cafes and bars are operated with the needs of all ages taken into account, and encouraged to provide a range of entertainment – live music in cafes for example. This is a licensing matter rather than a planning matter.

The idea of a skating rink is acknowledged in Section 5.4 above. A bowling alley would be an appropriate use in this location, but requires a large space which is unlikely to be economic in this prime location.

A shoppers' creche might be an attraction, but the demand for, and thus viability of, such a facility is unknown. Such a facility would not be contrary to the Draft Planning Brief, but it would be unreasonable to insist on the provision of a commercial facility.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **5.7 Other**

### **M Charrett**

If profitable refreshment facilities cannot be provided exclusively for bus users, these should be situated on the High Street side of the bus station so that a service is provided which both bus passengers and shoppers can support.

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Recommend that the Brief should include some reference to accommodation space for non-specialist community use

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Recommend that consideration be given to having a small museum dedicated to the findings arising from the archaeological explorations of the site.

### **Response**

The Draft Planning Brief expects catering facilities to be incorporated within the development. These will be convenient to the new bus station.

Non-specialist community uses are adequately provided for by the Guildhall and other community halls in the town centre, including the churches.

A facility interpreting the history of the site, the surrounding area, or the town centre as a whole would be an attractive addition to the development, and to the town centre. A permanent home is also required for the model of the town built by Roger Brown.

The Woolstaplers Hall might be an appropriate location for such a combined interpretation attraction, combined with market, café or other commercial activity.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to the potential use of part of the Woolstaplers Hall for archaeological interpretation and display of the town model, at *para 2.12.1*.



## 6 Economy

### 6.1 General

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

Brief talks about the relocation of the present health and business uses but does not indicate which businesses uses these refer to and where they might be relocated, whether within the new site or elsewhere in the city.

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

The brief says that the development will be a boost to the local economy and create jobs. It does not, however, state what type of jobs are envisaged and how they will suit local needs.

#### **Response**

The precise businesses and uses to be relocated will depend on the nature and extent of the final development, on which the Draft Planning Brief is flexible, subject to it being part of a comprehensive scheme. The Brief's expectation is that relocated uses will be accommodated either on site or in the immediate vicinity.

The commercial component of the development will be primarily retail, and the jobs created therefore in that sector. As a high-wage area, jobs in this traditionally low-waged sector are not in high demand in Winchester, but this does not mean that they should be discouraged. The increase in the economy activity of the town centre is unquestionable, and other retail sector businesses will benefit from the increased draw and activity.

The economic justification of the development lies in meeting the town's future retail needs, arresting the leakage of trade to other centres, and protecting the vitality and viability of businesses and the centre as a whole.

#### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

### 6.2 Office uses

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

The brief does not state whether the office space proposed will match the existing office accommodation. Office suites of up to 300 m2 are what are generally demanded for the type of business that operate from the City. Hopefully, if this type of space is provided, it will encourage more people who live in the City to work in the City.

#### **Response**

The Draft Planning Brief states that this is not a preferred location for office-based businesses in Winchester. This is consistent with the general planning policies of the Local Plan Review. *Para 2.6.2* refers to the office-based activity on the site at present, and not the office floorspace. The latter is substantial, as there are two floors of vacant office space on the upper floors of the Kings Walk block. The Brief does not propose that these be replaced

The dynamics of employment in Winchester are complex. Substantially more people commute in to Winchester than commute out. Providing more employment in the town centre is more likely to attract more commuters, given the cost of housing in Winchester, and therefore more traffic. The Council's policies direct substantial new employment development to the south of the District where it can help address the higher levels of unemployment in South Hampshire.

The Review Local Plan acknowledges however the need for local businesses to adapt and expand, and restraint policies have now been relaxed. An office component of up to 200 square metres would be acceptable (see *para 2.6.2*).

Incorporating office use would reduce the residential capacity of the site which is the Council's higher priority.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **6.3 Retail**

### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

Thought must be given to the effects on other parts of the city, in particular the retail businesses in the upper part of the town, to maintain the viability and vitality in this part of the city.

### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

*Related to the Winchester Retail Study*

It is noted that of the people in the study area, only 50% of the expenditure is spent locally and that the development may only claw back 5%, which does not seem to be a great deal. To make this development viable, we need to see people working in the area as well as living so that full use is made of the shop, restaurant, market and other facilities. It will be interesting to learn as to how many people work in the area now, in other words what are the number and type jobs which will be created in this area. No study seems to have been done on this particular aspect

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Wishes to emphasise the folly of attempting to compete in retail or leisure terms with Southampton or Basingstoke. Also uneasy about the shift in the centre of gravity of the shopping area; would rather see an extension of the present pedestrian shopping area into the Friarsgate development.

### **M Oaten MP**

Redevelopment will shift the centre of gravity of Winchester to the east, away from Jewry Street and the area at the top end of the High Street. The Brief needs to recognise these knock-on effects including steps taken to help these areas

There is a need for a mix of small and large shops and businesses in the new city centre as well as a spatial mix.

### **City of Winchester Trust**

*Related to the Winchester Retail Study*

Concerned with the floorspace requirement for 'comparison goods' of up to 8500 m2. Concerned that assumptions about the increase in population and an increase in the market share secured by the City Centre is unrealistic. Also concerned about the impact the size of a store 2000m2 would have on the city centre.

## **Response**

The Council commissioned specialist consultants to advise on current and future retail demand (*Winchester Retail Study 2003*). People working in the town, and visitors, are a component of retail the catchment, but this is dominated by the spending power of those living within easy travelling time. The claw back of trade from other centres is modest, but sufficient to indicate that the development can be viable.

Winchester lies within the catchment areas of Basingstoke, Southampton, Hedge End, and other retail centres so it has to compete with these centres for business. Winchester's shopping centre has a unique historic environment of great character, by which it attracts some trade from away from its less fortunate larger neighbours. The aim of the Draft Planning Brief is to secure a development which adds to the competitiveness of Winchester in the range of shopping it provides, while enhancing its character and distinctiveness.

The development will shift the centre of gravity of the shopping centre eastwards. This will have a short term impact on the town centre as a whole. The increase in economic activity should however provide a boost to businesses and result in a short recovery period.

The shift will be achieved by an eastward extension of the pedestrian priority area of the town centre. It will include small and large units. There are other stores in the town centre of 2000 square metres. There is no reason why this site cannot accommodate such a store..

#### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **6.4 Tourism**

### **M Oaten MP**

Recognition of tourism in the redevelopment should help to underline the need for a sensitive development in keeping with the city's historic roots.

### **Response**

The Draft Planning Brief emphasises the importance of the town's history to its physical character, and the importance of protecting it.

#### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **7 Buildings**

### **7.1 Antique Market**

#### **A R Hunter-Craig**

Concerned about the future fate of the Antiques Market. Development should reflect the character of the old City and buildings and not simply an extension of the unfortunate Brooks Centre. Surely any original old building in the area of the proposed development site should therefore be retained and form the basis for the remainder of the development.

#### **C J Webb**

Objects to the loss of the King's Walk Antique Market. As an example of a small works/store it should be retained. Winchester needs a 'start up' area for small businesses who will be unable to afford high rents. Would like to see a proper Market Hall

#### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

Considers that the loss of the antique market would be unfortunate and that the developer should be required to provide some sort of indoor market, which will benefit the local residents and also prove to be an attraction for visitors, as is the market in Durham and other similar cities.

**M Charrett**

Every effort should be made to retain the Kings Walk Antique Market.

**City of Winchester Trust**

Strongly disagree that the Antiques Market is an unimportant building (in relation to Woolstaplers). It has equal interest, much of it in a remarkably well-preserved condition. Suspect that it has been 'downgraded' and summarily written off because it is in an inconvenient position and not because of its importance.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Retention of the Antique Market should be regarded as a matter of key importance since it is part of the old Brooks residential area and a historic feature of Winchester. It could also be used as a 'start up' area for small businesses and thus serve a recognised need.

**Response**

The "Antique Market" building was retained as a feature when the Kings Walk development was carried out in the 1970s. It is a former warehouse and has never been part of a residential area.

The development study carried out in 1997 considered ways of retaining it, but came to the conclusion that its location seriously compromises the successful comprehensive development of the site as a whole. Although not a remarkable building, and younger than the Woolstaplers Hall, the Draft Planning Brief would not recommend its removal if it were in a more convenient position. Given the potential to replace a generally unattractive area with a development of which the town can be proud, the Council considers the loss of a single building to be a reasonable sacrifice.

Prime town centre sites are not the best locations for start-up businesses or covered markets, as they tend to command high rents. The low rents of the Antiques Market reflect the short tenure under which the businesses operate. Such businesses may find it difficult to remain viable if a market rent on a long term basis in competition with the established businesses that would be attracted to such a location.

Some cities have inherited covered markets or similar historic buildings which may be suitable for such uses, but their capital cost has long since been recovered. The cost of developing something similar today would be very expensive. The Woolstaplers Hall is the best opportunity for accommodating such uses.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

**7.2 Woolstaplers Hall****A Rutter**

The Woolstaplers building could possibly be a key building – it is central but on back land. The single clear floorspaces could be compromised by additional inappropriate access points. Could we try to get control of the building to influence what goes in it? The building needs different uses on different floors.

**City of Winchester Trust**

There is much to be said for the Woolstaplers Hall becoming a site for entertainment, accommodation for the arts, or other community activities.

**Response**

The Draft Planning Brief acknowledges the potential of the Woolstaplers Hall, both as a local landmark and as an interesting space. It may be possible to combine arts and entertainment with the other uses already identified

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to arts and entertainment to the uses suggested above for the Woolstaplers Hall in *para 2.12.1*.

## **7.3 Multi-storey car park**

**City of Winchester Trust**

Feels that the present car park building is wholly inappropriate to the character and quality of the centre of Winchester and should not be retained. It is hard to envisage how the development can achieve the design standards set by the Brief with this ugly and alien element.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

The building is intrusive and ugly and, in accepting that the same number parking spaces should be retained in the development site to ensure the viability of the scheme, it is hoped that a new structure might be incorporated which is of lesser height and of significantly less monolithic appearance.

**M Charrett**

The Friarsgate multi-storey car park is very out of character and should be demolished.

**Response**

The Council's plans for refurbishing the car park have been held pending the resolution of the Park and Ride expansion. Although sound, the building is not attractive, and does not meet the modern standards. Complete demolition would require the relocation of the Parking Office, CCTV suite, and Iceland, but would release a large footprint for active ground level uses.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Revise para 2.8.2 to express the Council's preference to see the existing car park replaced by covered parking to current standards, provided the number of spaces does not significantly exceed the number of spaces that the refurbished car park would have provided, and subject to an appraisal of the financial implications.

## **7.4 Other buildings**

**J Strubbe**

The buildings each side of the present bus station entrance should go.

**Response**

There is no reason why these buildings should be demolished, but the Council would not object to them being incorporated in the redevelopment, see *para 3.1.9*.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## 8 Urban Design

### **R Ackland**

The rear of R Ackland's property will look out onto the new development, which included an open public area. This will compromise the existing privacy and security enjoyed by my property. Would like to know what measures will be taken to ensure that the impact on the existing privacy will be minimised, and how security will be maintained in light of the increased throughput of people past the rear of the property.

### **Eagleprint Ltd**

The Brief should clarify the responsibility of the creation of the urban square.

### **Response**

Public spaces will be provided by the developer as part of the development. Their maintenance will be the subject of future agreement (see *para 2.16.5*). It is likely that they will remain private, but with unrestricted public access at all times, rather than becoming adopted highway. This will be a matter for negotiation between the City Council, the Developer and the County Council as Highway Authority.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Insert a reference to protecting the privacy and amenity of properties around the site, both during construction and on completion, in *Section 3.9 Layout and Built Form*.

## **8.1 Views**

### **C J Webb**

Would like to see rooftop cafes/restaurants. The unique view of the cathedral roof towering over the roofscape has been lost from ground level with the building of The Brooks. This view could be recreated within this development but from a higher level.

### **A Rutter**

The top floor of the Woolstaplers building could have phenomenal views of Winchester and the cathedral and could be redesigned to exploit this.

Brief doesn't mention Joyce Gardens, St John Street which is a fabulous spot to direct people too. Shouldn't forget the distinct views from Park Avenue/Middle Brook Street which is the one place you can be on the axis of the cathedral.

With traffic out of Silver Hill behind M&S and Middle Brook Street between M&S & Sainsburys there should be space for more trees!

### **Donald Insall Associates**

The major views looking outwards are stunning and need to be enhanced and relished

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Importance of views looking through and out of the development is essential to good design. Would also include views looking in and emphasise the importance of the roofscape from high points such as St Giles Hill

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Do not understand how the proposal to widen Middle Brook Street would improve the view of the Cathedral

Strongly in favour of the creation of a formal avenue of trees along Friarsgate. Also consider further planting on Middle Brook Street and other areas. Would also like the Master Planner to consider how the absence of built frontages along Friarsgate could be ameliorated.

### **Response**

The Draft planning Brief draws attention to the importance of views to, from and across the site in *Section 3.2.*. Providing public access to activities on the upper floors would take advantage of these views. The design of the public realm will include planting, but it should not compromise the character of the spaces or mask the key views. Additional planting in Friarsgate is recommended in *para 3.2.3*

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add planting to the components of the public realm required by *para 3.3.1*.

## **8.2 Layout**

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Hopes to see a seamless transition from what one would deem the 'Old City' to the new development.

### **M Oaten MP**

Emphasises that respect for the historic character of the area, the Saxon/medieval street pattern and other architectural features must be kept at the heart of any redevelopment.

### **CTC**

Support the concept of redeveloping the area as a set of open streets rather than as an enclosed shopping mall. Agree that 'permeability' is essential

The present layout of the area includes several obstacles to cycling to and through the city centre and the opportunity to remove these must be seized wherever possible

### **J Strubbe**

The Guildhall clock tower could create a centre line focal point for a new patterned paced pedestrian 'Broadway' into the development area, leaving the existing 'way' for tourist buses and taxis.

### **Environment Agency**

Whilst the Agency recognises that much work has already been done by the Flood Steering Group, it will be important for the proposal layout to be informed by a Flood Risk Assessment appropriate to the development, and these should evolve in tandem.

### **St John's Winchester Charity**

The almshouses on the eastern boundary of the site have enjoyed rights of light across the opposite side of the river for over 150 years. They wish to ensure that any redevelopment of the site maintains these rights of light. Although this seems to have been reflected in the brief, a lot will depend upon the height of the buildings which should not over dominate the view looking west from the almshouses

### **Response**

The issue of flood risk is addressed in *Section 2.11*.

The layout suggested by *Figure 3* aims to reflect the historic grid pattern of the rest of the town centre, and maximise permeability. The new space opposite the current bus station exit is intended to make the most of the view of the Guildhall

The design and layout of the public realm should minimise clutter in the interests of visual harmony and safety.

*Para 3.5.1* requires building heights to be sympathetic to adjacent development.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to the St John's Almshouses in *para 3.5.2*

Add the requirement for a Flood Risk assessment to *para 3.12.2*

## **8.3 Public Realm**

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Appreciate that public open space as indicated in Fig. 3 are diagrammatic and need not be circular, but suggest that enlarged open spaces are not characteristic of Winchester, and that the Master Planner should be encouraged to include public open spaces in whatever manner they feel appropriate.

### **Winchester City Residents Association**

Supports the requirement to produce a public realm plan.

### **J Strubbe**

New residential properties require private outdoor space for most new properties. This could be provided in the form of generous balconies and roof space and in turn provide informal surveillance of attractively landscaped public spaces below and by being encouraged to overlook them from a safe vantage point above.

### **M Oaten MP**

Existing layout of the area is people unfriendly – this needs to be opened up with strong, well designed public spaces.

### **Winchester Family Church**

Believes that there would be a great opportunity to create a significant public space in front of the Middle Brook Centre that relates closely to the market area of Middle Brook Street. It would form an integral part of the network of public spaces that are being created in the historic city centre and also recognises that the Middle Brook centre is an important community building in this part of the city.

### **Response**

The layout in *Figure 3* is indicative, and the Council will work with the Developer's master planner to design a combination of streets and spaces that is most appropriate to the location.

The Brief does not address the potential for further development to the north of Friarsgate, although this remains a future opportunity (see *para 2.0.2*).

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **8.4 Other**

### **Winchester Family Church**

At paragraph 3.13 the Brief mentions the importance of the Middle Brook Street route. We endorse that view and believe that the Middle Brook Centre is an architecturally significant building on the corner of Friarsgate and Middle Brook Street, which provides a key focal point in this area.

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Believes that the principle of a pentice should be strongly encouraged by the Brief.



Stresses the importance of public art. Emphasises the importance of including a number of artists, specific funding, its continuing provision after the completion of development and the incorporation of the objectives of the Arts Strategy 2001-2004. Suggests that many of these ambitions could be met in the re-use of the Woolstaplers Hall.

**M Oaten MP**

Providing some covered or sheltered shopping area would encourage people to go out even during bad weather. This might be something that could help out Jewry Street and the Top of the High Street.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Suggests consideration of a glassed roof arcade over a section of street or pedestrian area.

Emphasises the importance of having a number of locally based architects taking part in the scheme.

**Response**

The Brief points to the Pentice as an opportunity to provide shelter for shoppers in a manner consistent with the character of the wider area ( see *para 3.3.7*). Glazed arcades are not so consistent.

The Middle Brook Centre is a former cinema of no great architectural merit. It is however a substantial building accommodating important activities and should be considered in any future development study of the area to the north of Friarsgate.

Both the Council and the developer agree that involving more than one architect in the scheme will help promote a diversity of styles in the development. *Para 3.13.1* refers.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to preferring more than one architect to *para 3.13.1*.

## **9 Access**

### **9.1 Goods Delivery**

**Donald Insall Associates**

Traffic will mean not only customers in cars but supplies and services for the additional shopping too. Perhaps there is a case for out-of-hours deliveries (like the City of Chester)

**M Oaten MP**

Deliveries for mail order and internet goods should be delivered to the local pub or shop for collection by the user. Locals will then use the local services and can receive goods outside of working hours.

One of the main obstructions to further pedestrianisation of the city centre is the need to keep access for deliveries to shops and businesses. Creation of delivery drop off points at strategic locations could structure access to the city centre so that there was minimum disturbance to pedestrian areas and nearby traffic flows.

**City of Winchester Trust**

Consideration should be given to whether goods deliveries to closely adjoining shops outside the development might also be serviced from this development where it would provide serious traffic problems or improve the pedestrian environment.

**J Strubbe**

Goods delivery should be via the central goods area roundabout (see map) and not to St George's Street, thus providing more bus stop space.

**Response**

Providing service access in a tightly developed town centre is always difficult. Shared service access for larger stores as shown in Tanners Street in *Figure 3* will help.. Elsewhere , where smaller units have to be serviced via pedestrian priority areas, delivery time restrictions, respected and enforced, will minimise conflict with shoppers and other vehicles.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **9.2 Other**

**R Ackland**

The rear entrance and car parking space for his property is on the edge of the site with access for parking from Busket Lane. Would like assurances that access to their property and parking space would not be compromised following the redevelopment.

**Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service**

The proposed redevelopment could have a significant effect on the fire service with regard to access.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

The need is recognised to include measures for people with disabilities and limited mobility. This should include drop off points for those with severely limited mobility.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Intention of the owners of the Brooks Shopping Centre to improve public access is long overdue. Would wish to see access related more closely to both street level and the streetscape

**Eagleprint Ltd**

Supports the recognition of the importance of the customer entrances into The Brooks Centre from Middle Brook Street. The entrance to the new shopping centre should be located opposite the existing entrance to The Brooks at Silver Hill/Middle Brook Street in order to maximise pedestrian flows. Wants to be consulted on more detailed plans to ensure that the key entrance at Middle Brook Street/Silver Hill will not be adversely affected.

**Response**

The Brief as amended will require the development to respect the need of adjacent occupiers during construction and on completion. The new development will have to comply with the latest standards for meeting the needs of people with disabilities.

The new development will not be a shopping centre, but a shopping street running along, and extending, Silver Hill.

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

# 10 Proposed areas to include within the Brief

## 10.1 The Broadway

### **A Rutter**

Believes that the eastern part of the Broadway is a good arrival point for visitors in coaches. Visually it is exciting and very easy to orientate oneself. Without service buses going through it, facilities for dropping people off and picking them up would improve & retaining limited vehicle movement helps to give the necessary 'buzz' of life that the town needs.

Area of the Broadway outside the Guildhall would make a very fine pedestrian space which could be considered as a location for the main market.

### **City of Winchester Trust**

The Broadway would be an ideal site for a larger market, would like this to be investigated as a supplementary element of the Brief.

### **M Oaten MP**

The relocation of the bus station could provide the opportunity to partly or wholly pedestrianise the Broadway. Turning this area back into a public pedestrian space could bring the King Alfred statue back into the city, creating a plaza-like area and reinvigorate the Guildhall and other businesses at that end of Winchester.

### **R Ackland**

Believes that the brief did not address the renovation of the rear aspects of existing Broadway properties. Although they are not strictly part of the proposed redevelopment area, they will be clearly visible from the new development and are in a poor state with numerous unsightly additions. Suggests that the Council co-ordinates with the freeholders to renovate the rear of these properties to the standard of their frontages

### **M Charrett**

Ideally, the Broadway as well as the Cossack Lane car park should be very much an integral part of the Friarsgate development.

## **Response**

The Council has thought carefully about the scope of the Draft Planning Brief. There are areas beyond the boundary identified in the Brief that merit improvement or redevelopment. To introduce too many changes at the same time however, would not only be difficult to manage, but could generate too much disruption for the town centre.

The removal of buses from the Broadway will be an opportunity to re-plan the area. Vehicle access will have to be retained to the south side of the High Street, but substantial improvements for pedestrians, and possible tourist coaches could be introduced. The space may also be made more suitable for events.

The County Council as Highway Authority and the City Council are discussing the possible repaving of the High Street and Broadway as part of the Local Transport Plan, and will be preparing a feasibility study in the coming year. The implementation of this work will be co-ordinated as closely as possible with the redevelopment of the Broadway Friarsgate site.

The new development will in most areas back onto existing development, and will screen most areas not intended for public view.

## **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **10.2 Other areas**

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Recommend that an outer, hatched line be drawn on figure 1 to encompass the following non-development areas for consideration:

- 1) Cossack Lane Car Park
- 2) Broadway in general, and in particular its frontage from Busket Lane to Middle Brook Street
- 3) Full length of St George's Street

### **A Rutter**

The Council owns amenity land adjacent to the site that at present is never used, although theoretically amenity land for the city's flats. Suggest that part of this could be opened up to Friarsgate and equipped with seats and some play sculpture so that parents with children would have a place where the children could safely play.

### **J Strubbe**

Area covered should extend north in order to resolve current traffic problems and not wait until it is too late to do so

### **Eagleprint Ltd**

Considers that The Brooks Shopping Centre is appropriately excluded from the defined boundary of the Planning Brief. Essential that the design of the new scheme will maximise linkages between the two locations.

### **Response**

The Cossack Lane car park has been identified in other Council studies, (notably the *Urban Capacity Study 2001*) as a possible redevelopment site. To incorporate this in the current development would introduce more issues to be resolved and could delay its implementation. The Council may tackle this area once the future of the Broadway Friarsgate has been resolved.

The design and layout of the eastern end of the development must take the presence of The Brooks shopping centre into account, and create a space of high quality between them, see *para 3.1.4*.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## **11 Housing**

### **C J Webb**

Prefer to see housing integrated over the whole area to avoid creating what appears to be a ghetto at one end.

### **Environment Agency**

Attention should be paid to *Figure 3* of the Brief, which currently indicates residential development on the lowest part of the Brief area. In this respect, the Planning Brief should not be adopted as supplementary planning guidance until after a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, informed by floodplain modelling currently underway, is performed. Whilst it is recommended that residential uses be located on higher ground, it must be remembered that if residential development is to occur on the lower area, it should not only avoid being at risk of flooding itself, but also have a safe means of access to higher ground in times of flood

**City of Winchester Trust**

The requirement for affordable housing is fully supported

**M Oaten MP**

Small housing units proposed for the city centre should be affordable and be made available for key public sector workers.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

The inclusion of a significant residential component is fundamental to the Scheme to bring a sense of permanence of human living to an area which is forbidding in its sterility.

**Response**

Residential development will occupy the upper floors across the whole site. Dwellings will be mainly small units, and at least 35% will be affordable, in line with the Council's wider Planning policies, see *Section 2.5 Residential Context*

The need for a flood risk assessment is acknowledged in the Brief .

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

None

## 12 Mix of uses

**Winchester Family Church**

Concerned about the mixed-use proposals for the Cossack Lane car park and the indication that there might be no car parking at all. Would welcome the opportunity to discuss the nature and scale of the mixed-use development, particularly in relation to the proposals for the Middle Brook Street area.

**Winchester City Residents Association**

Reservations about the balance and mix of the development. Would wish to see a greater residential element. Should also make more provision for small shops and offices with no one major monolithic store.

**Response**

There are no proposals for Cossack Lane car park in the Draft Planning Brief. Any future study of the development potential of this site would be conducted with full public consultation

The residential capacity of the site will be maximised. The capacity identified in the Brief is indicative, and the Council will discuss the best way of maximising the potential with the developers and their master planners (see *para 3.6.4*).

The town centre is short of medium to large footprint modern retail floorspace, and this will predominate in the new development. There is also likely to be at least one large store of around 2000 square metres. The Council will expect a range of unit sizes however, and will expect the design of the development to minimise the visual impact of the larger format units. (see *para 3.5.4*)

**Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to the need for a range of sizes of retail units in *Section 3.4 A mix of uses*.

## 13 General Comments

### **C J Webb**

Hopes that a model of the development will be made with eye level viewing as well as helicopter views

### **W.A. & P. Vandersteen**

The meeting was quite well attended, but where were all the young people who will be the main beneficiaries of such development?

### **City of Winchester Trust**

Wishes to make sure that the Draft Master Plan will be available for public examination and comment before it is approved by the City Council.

### **Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service**

As part of the building regulation consultation they look forward to receiving proposed details of the final scheme, including any proposal to use an engineered solution and the provision of water supplies for fire fighting.

### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

A development of this nature will naturally cause considerable disruption and therefore we feel that a proper timescale should be set out by the City Council with a clear statement as to how the development will be phased.

### **A Rutter**

Believes the Guildhall to be Grade II\* not just Grade II. St Johns are Alms houses not arms houses.

Why doesn't the brief mention the Council's signs and shop fronts policy? It is an important and well identified document.

### **English Heritage**

Would like to see the brief cross-referenced with the Winchester Conservation Area Project in order to better inform the development proposals.

### **City of Winchester Trust**

The list of relevant studies should include the *Winchester City and its Setting Study*, the *Conservation Area Strategy*, the *Winchester District Arts Strategy*, the *Signs and Shop-fronts policy* and *the relevant housing strategies*.

Welcomes all efforts to perpetuate the mediaeval street pattern, and the intention to make a full archaeological evaluation and recording of the site.

Management of the spaces in the public realm should be under the control of the local authority and not an outside body which would not be directly accountable to the people of Winchester.

### **North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**

What contributions will be required from the developer to enhance the public realm and infrastructure.

### **M Charrett**

The development, when completed, must be effectively managed so that it remains high quality and litter/graffiti free

### **M Oaten MP**

Use of solar panels and other forms of green energy to supply some of the needs of business and residential properties would be highly desirable.

Use of signed historic trails around and radiating out from the new centre would be one way of embedding the new and the old and boosting trade and tourism to nearby area.

Extending CCTV throughout the new development and surrounding play areas would be desirable.

### **Environment Agency**

The Environment Agency supports and favours the use of water efficient and water conservation measures as part of the completed development.

The Consultation draft does identify sites which may be potentially contaminated, such as the bus garage, where there also appears to be a storage tank. Further investigation would be required to determine that there is no contamination and that the land is fit for its proposed use. It is recommended that research is carried out to determine if site investigations have already been carried out for previous developments.

### **Cllr J Porter**

Keen to see a green and clean environment in the area with bins that take litter in a smart way.

### **Response**

Detailed design and phasing of this complex development will be the subject of detailed discussions, and member level scrutiny of the emerging scheme will be conducted in public. There will be formal public consultation when the developers submit their planning application and Environmental Statement, which among other things will have to address site contamination and its mitigation. A variety of visual tools will be used by the architects to ensure their plans are understandable by all.

The Council received comments from some young people following a display of the Brief at a SNAPS disco at the river Park Leisure Centre during the consultation period. The results of previous studies of young people's needs have been taken into account.

*Para 5.3.8* requires the developer to make appropriate contributions to the improvement of the public realm around the site, as well as providing public spaces within it. The management of public spaces will be the subject of further discussions. Whoever retains control, it is essential that they are open at all times to the public, well maintained and safe.

The potential for generating photo-voltaic power is covered in *para 3.12.2*

Street furniture should be carefully designed to be useful, as well as attractive.

### **Proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief**

Add a reference to the resolution of a management regime for public spaces in *para 3.5.8*

Add a reference to the design of street furniture in *para 3.3.1*.

Add the following policy documents to the list in *para 2.2.1*:

Winchester City and its Setting

Winchester Conservation Area Strategy

Winchester District Arts Strategy

Signs and Shop-fronts policy

Achieving a better mix in new housing developments