

# Winchester District Local Plan Review

## Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

Summary of Representation.  
*Change sought*

Recommended Response to Representation  
*Recommended Change*

---

#### MOD 15.1 Appendix 3

#### Recommended Response to Representation

##### Representations:

- **Objections:**

##### **J Hayter (138/12)**

Object to the omission of amendments to Appendix 3, the Sustainability Appraisal, to reflect the modifications proposed to the Plan

*Change sought* – update Appendix 3 to reflect changes to the Plan.

The respondent suggests that the Plan's Sustainability Appraisal should be appropriately revised, to reflect proposed modifications to the content of the Plan.

It is accepted that relevant updating of the Appraisal should be carried out as part of the updating to be undertaken on adoption of the Plan. As this will not involve changes to the Plan's policies or text, such changes can be made without the need for further Proposed Modifications.

##### **Recommended Change:**

***Update the Plan's Sustainability Appraisal, as necessary, to reflect changes resulting from agreed modifications to the content of the Plan.***

---

#### MOD 15.2 Appendix 4

#### Recommended Response to Representation

##### Representations:

- **Support:**

##### **Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (2475)**

Support inclusion of a map showing nature conservation sites of all designations

- **Objections:**

##### **M Charrett (1370/1)**

Support inclusion of a map showing nature conservation sites of all designations, but it should be extended to include the small but important open spaces formerly protected by Policy EN.2 of the adopted Plan. The areas of Weeke Pond and the small open space in Stockers Avenue should be protected by the inclusion of specific designations. Weeke Pond may be protected by Policy DP.5. The

The support is welcomed.

While offering support regarding the inclusion of a map showing nature conservation sites of all designations, the Respondent suggests the additional designation of two further sites, at Weeke Pond and Stockers Avenue.

The two sites referred to, the small pond and its planted margins beside the Stockbridge Road at Weeke and the grassed open area, at the junction of Stockers Avenue and Wesley Close, are not of sufficient interest to justify a specific SINC, or other nature conservation designation.

Furthermore, the small size and roadside location of both these sites limits the extent to which they could be regarded as being of practical open space or recreational value. Nevertheless, both are of considerable importance in townscape terms and represent distinctive features which are worthy of retention and proper care.

The important contribution to local character, made by small areas of this kind, is recognised through Policy DP.5, which makes appropriate provision for their retention and enhancement, where possible. It is, therefore, considered unnecessary to make further changes to the Plan.

# Winchester District Local Plan Review

## Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

**Summary of Representation.**  
**Change sought**

**Recommended Response to Representation**  
**Recommended Change**

---

Council has pledged support for improving environmental features.

**Recommended Change: None**

*Change sought – include specific designations for the areas referred to.*

---

**MOD 15.10**  
**Inset Map 8: Denmead**

**Recommended Response to Representation**

The support is welcomed.

**Representations:**

- **Support:**

**Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd**  
**(397/12)**

---

**MOD 15.14**  
**Inset Map 20: New Alresford**

**Recommended Response to Representation**

**Representations:**

- **Objections:**

**Bewley Homes Plc (227/1)**

Support District's aspiration to accommodate open space and recreation needs, but object to extension of the RT.4 allocation, as it has no reasonable prospect of being brought forward, and therefore compulsory purchase procedures would need to be used. The extended allocation is not certain to provide the required open space and playing fields. The alternative proposal put forward by the landowners would be deliverable immediately and provide more land at a nominal cost. Despite the Inspector's comments on the alternative land, the provision of playing fields is feasible on that land. The weight attached to the Inspector's comments on floodlighting should be limited, as the issue could be resolved at the detailed stage, and it applies

The respondent suggests that the Revised Deposit Plan's designated westward extension to the Arlebury Park Recreation Ground, which the Inspector has accepted as being justified in terms of local and community need, should instead be reallocated to the north, in order to facilitate possible future development negotiations relating to the area that includes Arlebury Park.

In repeating this suggestion, outlined at the Inquiry, the respondent also indicates that the alternative site would be considerably larger than the proposed designation, would be capable of accommodating a full-size rugby pitch and could be 'delivered' without undue delay.

The negotiations referred to would, therefore, be aimed at achieving a form of comprehensive development proposal which would include some element of housing but, as part of such a proposal, might also result in an enhanced area of additional land being assigned to recreational use, without incurring significant public cost.

The Inspector has recognised that the respondent and landowner 'would oppose the acquisition of the designated [extension] land for recreational use and the question of compulsory acquisition would therefore need to be considered'.

Furthermore, the Inspector acknowledges that '...they would like to explore in the future the possibility of achieving a

# Winchester District Local Plan Review

## Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

#### Summary of Representation.

##### *Change sought*

equally to the extended allocation.  
The Town Council wishes to pursue the proposed RT.4 allocation.

**Change sought** – replace RT.4 designation at New Alresford with the alternative land area proposed

#### **L Cook (1048/1)**

There is an anomaly between the proposed modified text and Inset Map 20. The text on page 38 refers to the deletion of the designation between New Farm Road and Bridge Road, and this should be amended to reflect the proposed change to the Inset Map, which extends between Bridge Road and the settlement boundary.  
**(1048/1)**

**Change sought** – amendment of text referring to the deletion of the designation on page 38 of the Proposed Modifications

#### Recommended Response to Representation

##### *Recommended Change*

comprehensive proposal including some housing development...’ However, in relation to evidence submitted to the Inquiry, the Inspector highlights the lack of any details of such a proposal.

Consequently, the Inspector confines his overall consideration, and recommendation, to the principal issue of whether the Revised Deposit Plan’s RT.4 allocation is appropriate. Having noted matters relating to implementation, comparison of site topography, the impact of projected floodlighting and plans to enlarge the present sports pavilion, the Inspector states that ‘whilst my preference is therefore to retain the present allocated site, it is of insufficient size to accommodate a rugby pitch’.

As a result, the Inspector concludes that he is not persuaded that the alternative allocation proposed by the objector ‘should be pursued’ and recommends, therefore, that the allocated RT.4 site should be enlarged by approximately 50% northwards, partly in order to meet this additional sports pitch requirement. The Inspector’s recommendation, which took into account the respondent’s objection, has been accepted.

It is accepted that there is a discrepancy between the wording on page 38 of the Proposed Modifications (January 2006) document, and both the detailed schedule of changes on page 115 (MOD 15.14) and accompanying extracts from Inset Map 20, on page 126.

The first of these references forms part of the introductory summary which correctly lists the Inspector’s formal recommendations. However, in this particular recommendation, the Inspector does not make specific reference to the smaller area also subject to an RT.1 designation in the Revised Deposit Plan, but which is separated from the main designated area of the former railway line, to the east, by the road bridge which carries New Farm Road over its cutting.

To accept the Inspector’s recommendation exactly as set out and, therefore, to retain an RT.1 designation over this small area to the west of New Farm Road would not appear to conform to the Inspector’s overall intentions and would, in any event, leave an effectively enclosed fragment of RT.1 land with limited amenity value and no public access. It is not, therefore, considered necessary or appropriate to make any further amendment to the Map 10 change (to Inset Map 20:

## Winchester District Local Plan Review

### Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

#### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

Summary of Representation.  
*Change sought*

Recommended Response to Representation  
*Recommended Change*

---

New Alresford), which correctly shows the intended change.

**Recommended Change:**

**None.**

---

#### **MOD 15.15**

##### **Inset Map 34: Sparsholt**

**Representations:**

- **Objections:**

#### **S Osmond (2424/1)**

Although the site of Church Farm Buildings may be included within the extended settlement boundary, no development should be permitted there until the buildings cease to be used for agricultural purposes. They are currently in use and form a valuable part of the farming business. The Inspector included an error of fact in paragraph 6.48.13 of his Report, which has already been drawn to your and the landowner's agent's attention, as the farm buildings are not redundant.

*Change sought – amend wording to reflect comments*

#### **Recommended Response to Representation**

In recommending a modification to the Sparsholt settlement boundary, to include existing residential development at Bostock Close and adjacent land and farm buildings at Church Farm, the Inspector recognises that such a change in planning status from 'countryside', to designation as part of the settlement's built-up area, would make it possible for limited appropriate development to take place within the extended boundary.

It is accepted that the Inspector may not have appreciated the fact that the farm buildings in question are not redundant. Nevertheless, the Inspector appears to have based his reasoning, in making this particular recommendation, on material factors other than the current agricultural use of these buildings.

In addition, no phasing or timetable has been indicated, for any possible future development within this area. Therefore, should any future decision be made to seek planning permission, for any particular scheme, the timing of that is likely to rest chiefly on commercial decisions which are beyond the land-use remit of the Local Plan. Therefore, as the site in question is not a specific allocation of the Plan, it would not be appropriate for the Local Plan to comment on whether or not it should be developed.

**Recommended Change:**

**None.**

---

#### **MOD 15.22**

##### **Inset Map 45: Winchester**

**Representations:**

- **Support**

**Mr & Mrs Fraser (836/2), A Sutton  
(1388/1)**

#### **Recommended Response to Representation**

The support is welcomed.

# Winchester District Local Plan Review

## Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

#### Summary of Representation.

##### *Change sought*

#### Recommended Response to Representation

##### *Recommended Change*

---

Support the deletion of the RT.1 designation from land at St John's Croft, and the deletion of the RT.4 designation from the land between Harestock Road, Kennel Lane and Littleton Road.

- **Objections:**

#### **K O Story (882/1)**

Object to the identification of land at Worthy Road / Francis Gardens because there has been insufficient consultation with local people and its development would result in unacceptable increases in traffic. It would also contravene policies safeguarding the landscape setting of the City and extend the City boundary into the countryside in a location that would increase flood risk in the historic core. It would also destroy important farmland.

*Change sought – delete Local Reserve Site at Worthy Road / Francis Gardens*

#### **K O Story (882/2)**

Object to the identification of land at Pitt Manor as a Local Reserve Site because there has been insufficient consultation with local people and its development would result in unacceptable increases in traffic. It would result in more air pollution and breach PPG 3 guidelines by spoiling the character of the neighbourhood.

*Change sought – delete Local Reserve Site at Pitt Manor.*

#### **S Duck (2500/9), S Duck (2501/9)**

Pitt Manor should not be identified as a Local Reserve Site, as its development would exacerbate the congestion in Romsey Road, and impact on the surrounding rural roads. The site is identified as important in

The main response, relating to the introduction of Local Reserve Sites and their position within the Local Plan's housing strategy, is dealt with under Proposed Modifications 2.4 and 2.5, in Chapter 2: Strategy.

Detailed responses, in regard to the identification of specific Local Reserve Sites at Pitt Manor, Winchester and Worthy Road/ Francis Gardens, Winchester are given under Proposed Modifications 6.11- 6.15, in Chapter 6: Housing. Respondents should, therefore, refer to those sections for a full response to the issues raised.

***Recommended Change:***

**None.**

# Winchester District Local Plan Review

## Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

### Chapter 15: APPENDICES, GLOSSARY & MAPS

**Summary of Representation.**  
***Change sought***

**Recommended Response to Representation**  
***Recommended Change***

---

"Winchester City and its Setting" and development would change its character. It would intrude into the countryside and there is no justification in housing or employment needs. In accordance with the sequential approach, it should not be developed.

***Change sought*** – delete Local Reserve Site at Pitt Manor.