

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought

Recommended Response to Representation
Recommended Change

Abbey Mill, Bishop's Waltham MOD 13.3

Recommended Response to Representation

Representations:

- **Objections:**

James Duke & Sons Holdings Ltd **(866/1)**

The sub-heading should be changed to "Mixed Residential and Employment Uses" rather than "Mixed Uses" as it more accurately reflects the nature of the proposed uses for the site.

Change sought – modify wording as requested.

The sub-heading "Mixed Use" has been used for consistency with other similar allocations in the Local Plan Review (e.g. at Durley, Sutton Scotney and Waltham Chase). The policy and explanatory text following this sub-heading (including the other wording change that forms part of MOD 13.3) make clear that a mix of residential and employment uses are proposed and it is not, therefore, necessary to amend the sub-heading as suggested.

Recommended Change:

None.

MOD 13.4

Recommended Response to Representation

Representations:

- **Objections:**

J Hayter (138/13), Bishop's **Waltham Society (2355/1)**

Support that there should be no reference to extant planning permission but consider revised Policy / text only in part reflects appeal inspector's decision [wording amendments suggested to criteria (i), (iii), and (iv)]. Criterion (iii) should require the open water course to be restored **(138/13), (2355/1)**.

Changes sought – modification to wording of criteria (i), (iii) and (iv).

James Duke & Sons Holdings Ltd **(866/2)**

It is unlikely that it will be desirable to retain all existing planting. Criterion (iii) should therefore be amended to read "retention of appropriate planting".

Respondents 138 and 2355 make a number of detailed suggestions for changes to Policy S.4 (Proposed Modification 13.4). They suggest further detail is needed as it is no longer intended to update the Development Brief for the area. The suggested changes are discussed below.

Criterion (i) – Respondents 138 and 2355 suggest replacing the wording "*are integrated well with adjoining housing*" with "*pay due regard to the impact on neighbouring residential uses, particularly from noise*". The reference to being 'integrated well with adjoining housing' is intended to cover the use, design and impact of the new employment uses, including the effects of noise. It is expected that any planning applications would be for the whole site and would address both the employment and housing uses at the same time, and therefore the relationship between them. It is considered that the general reference to being well integrated, along with the requirements of other policies of the Plan (e.g. E.1, DP.13 and DP.14), are adequate to avoid harmful impacts.

Planning applications which did not cover the whole site and which sought to deal with each use in isolation would be unlikely to satisfy the 'integration' requirement and could, therefore, be refused.

Criterion (iii) – Respondents 138 and 2355 suggest replacing

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation. *Change sought*

Recommended Response to Representation *Recommended Change*

Change sought – *modify wording as requested.*

the criterion with wording which includes reference to indigenous planting, opening up of the watercourse as open space and establishing car parking areas with landscaped surfaces and planting. The existing criterion already requires 'substantial new planting' and this wording is consistent with other development allocations in the Local Plan. There is no need to include detailed requirements in each Policy on the type of landscaping as this would be too detailed for a Local Plan and guidance is available elsewhere on this (e.g. 'Winchester District Landscape Assessment' and 'Native Tree and Shrub Species Guidance Note').

With regard to the objection by respondent 866, the main purpose of the criterion is to secure the establishment of 'a substantial landscape framework'. The criterion is not intended to suggest that every piece of existing planting should be retained, although the importance and location of the existing trees around the site would suggest that most should be retained. Some of the existing planting will also be within the Conservation Area and be important in wider views. It is, therefore concluded that it would be appropriate generally to retain existing planting, unless it were shown that it did not make a contribution to the proposed 'substantial landscape framework'.

Respondents 138 and 2355 suggest that the Policy should require an open watercourse to be created, as in the scheme approved on appeal. They suggest this would help with addressing requirements on flood alleviation, that the route of the culvert could not be built on anyway, that there is a need for appropriate hard and soft landscaping within the site and that the approved scheme demonstrates it is achievable. It is claimed that to make provision for an alternative outlet from South Pond across Abbey Field would be harmful and unnecessary.

It is accepted that the opening up of the watercourse is likely to have various benefits and help address issues such as flood alleviation, hence the Plan's encouragement for it. However, the fact that an open water course was previously proposed and may have various benefits is not, in itself, sufficient reason to make it an absolute requirement of the scheme, or to dictate the route of such a watercourse. Whether a route through the Abbey Mill site itself or through Abbey field is most appropriate, and whether it should be open for all or part of its length, can only be properly assessed in the context of a development proposal. This will allow the proposed uses and layout of buildings and open areas to also be taken into account, along with the impact of introducing

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought

Recommended Response to Representation
Recommended Change

such a watercourse. The provision of an open watercourse on a particular route is not such a fundamental aspect of the development of the site as to justify the prescriptive approach suggested by the respondents, and it is proposed that the Plan should continue to require its provision 'if possible'.

Criterion (iv) – Respondents 138 and 2355 suggest that the requirement for 'careful design and landscaping' is unclear and should be replaced by a requirement for 'high quality' design, 'particularly in the roof lines, material used, detailing and landscaping'. However, the word 'careful' was used in the context of taking care to ensure that development does not intrude into views. As such, it is just as clear as 'high quality' and the impact of roof lines, materials, etc clearly should and would be taken into account in assessing whether development is intrusive. Accordingly, it is not considered that the suggested wording is an improvement on the existing, and this criterion (along with iii, discussed above) has not been materially changed by the Proposed Modifications anyway.

It is concluded that the suggested changes to the wording of the criteria of Policy S.4, so as to add additional detail, are either too prescriptive to be justified or would offer no significant improvement over the existing wording. Therefore, it is recommended that no further changes be proposed.

Recommended Change:

None.

MOD 13.5
Paragraph 13.11

Representations:

- **Objections:**

James Duke & Sons Holdings Ltd
(866/3)

The reference to the site being in a very sensitive location and requiring a very careful design adds little to the substance and should be deleted.

Change sought – *modify wording as suggested*

Recommended Response to Representation

The wording to which this objection relates has not been modified by the Proposed Modifications. It is, therefore, not necessary to consider this objection further. It is evident, however, that the location of the site in relation to the Conservation Area and Scheduled Ancient Monuments does make this a sensitive location which requires careful design, and various Inspectors have commented on this. Indeed, the objector's suggested revision of MOD 13.10 (Policy S.5) promotes similar wording.

Recommended Change:

None.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought

Recommended Response to Representation
Recommended Change

MOD 13.7

New paragraph following existing paragraph 13.12

Representations:

- **Objections:**

J Hayter (138/14)

The text should be amended to include a requirement to address noise reduction measures, a requirement to restore the open water course and a requirement for landscaping to include provision of seating alongside the watercourse and mixed height planting around the parking areas. There should be a requirement to use local materials as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment.

Changes sought – modification to wording of MOD13.7.

James Duke & Sons Holdings Ltd (866/4)

Support reference to the possibility of the restoration of the watercourse as the full implications are not known. The text should clarify this.

Change sought – modify wording as suggested

Recommended Response to Representation

The changes sought by respondent 138 reflect those also sought in relation to the wording of Policy S.4 (see MOD 13.4 above). Although the suggested changes are to the explanatory text rather than the Policy itself, they are still considered too detailed and/or prescriptive for inclusion. They also seem to assume that the watercourse will be a permanent water feature, whereas in practice it is likely to be 'ephemeral' and dry for substantial parts of the year. The Local Plan does not include the level of detail suggested here in relation to other development allocations and would not be justified in doing so for this site.

Respondent 866's general support is welcomed, but it is not clear how the text could be meaningfully clarified to refer to implications which are as yet unknown. It is considered that the wording of the Proposed Modification provides the right balance by giving clear encouragement to the restoration of an open watercourse, but avoiding being over-prescriptive about its nature or route so as to allow factors which may currently not be foreseen to be taken into account at the design stage.

Recommended Change:

None.

MOD 13.8

Paragraph 13.13

Representations:

- **Objections:**

J Hayter (138/15)

The first sentence duplicates MOD 13.7 and the second sentence is now in modified criterion (iv). The paragraph should be replaced by:

Recommended Response to Representation

The alleged duplication that is referred to would only take place if the respondent's recommended changes to Policy S.4 and its explanatory text were accepted. It is proposed not to make these changes and the text in paragraph 13.13 is, therefore, a worthwhile amplification of the Policy. The respondent's proposed wording is considered too detailed in certain respects (e.g. detailed requirements for insulation) and deals with matters that are covered in other Policies of the Plan (as cross referenced in the respondent's suggested wording). Therefore it is considered inappropriate or unnecessary to propose further Proposed Modifications on

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation.

Change sought

Recommended Response to Representation

Recommended Change

“The design will be required to reduce to acceptable levels the noise impact on the new dwellings with modern insulation forming part of the scheme and nearby older ones with less insulation. This must be considered in the overall layout of roads, buildings and car parks and also take account of over looking and light pollution. Conditions may be imposed requiring a noise reduction scheme and restrictions on working hours. More details on these requirements are given in the Design and Employment chapters.”

Changes sought – modification to wording of MOD 13.8.

these matters.

Recommended Change:

None.

MOD 13.10

Policy S.5

Representations:

- **Objections:**

James Duke & Sons Holdings Ltd (866/5)

All references to preferred locations of car parks / open space should be deleted as they would be matters for detailed consideration at the planning application stage (amended wording suggested).

Change sought – modify wording as suggested

Recommended Response to Representation

The wording to which this objection relates has not been modified by the Proposed Modifications. It is, therefore, not necessary to consider this objection further.

Recommended Change:

None.

MOD 13.31

Paragraph 13.71

Representations:

- **Support:**

Hampshire County Council

Recommended Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Recommended Change:

None.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications

Chapter 13: SETTLEMENTS

Summary of Representation.
Change sought

Recommended Response to Representation
Recommended Change

(Estates) (1434/3)

Support the Modification to paragraph
13.71 (MOD 13.31).