

### **Consultation comments on Policy CC3 – land at Main Road**

- Support - 7
- Neither support of object - 9
- Object - 14

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

<b>Comments which neither support nor object to Policy CC3 – land at Main Road</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8R7-Z Colden Common Parish Council	<p>Land at Main Road CC04 (WCC have labelled this site as CC04 on the front page, but as CC3 on the reverse)</p> <p>Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve street lighting with lights a minimum of 200m apart: NE4: T1</li> <li>• Need for a pedestrian crossing: D5: T1: T4</li> <li>• Improvements to ROW13 D1: D5: T1: T4</li> <li>• Request bus shelters on the east and west of Main Road D4: D5: T1: T4</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that the site was incorrectly labelled in parts of the Reg 18 Plan and the correct reference is CC3.</p> <p>Criteria iii) iv) and v) as proposed to be amended (see HCC response below) require that proposals provide safe access to Main Road, provide or contribute to crossing points as appropriate and contribute to other improvements as necessary in the area.</p> <p>Further detailed consideration of details relating to access provision, specific highways improvements and landscaping and planting schemes will form part of the</p>

		<p>design process when developing detailed proposals for the site.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8Z7-8 South Downs National Park Authority</p>	<p>In terms of the proposed allocations, the following allocations will need to be amended to reference Policy NE8 (South Downs National Park) and set out that the proposed development sites and/or neighbourhood plan (NP) designated areas will be within the setting of the SDNP. As such, any development will need to be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the SDNP. The above relates to the following: Policies BW3 (Tollgate Sawmill), CC2 (Colden Common Farm), CC3 (Land at Main Road), D1 (Denmead NP Designated Area), KW2 (Land adjoining the Cart &amp; Horses PH), NA3 (New Alresford NP Designated Area), OT01 (Land east of Main Road), W5 (Bushfield Camp), W6 (Winnall), W10 (Former Riverside Leisure Centre), WK1 (Winchester Road and Mill Lane), and WK2 (The Glebe).</p>	<p>It is important that the Local Plan is read as whole and in this respect, it is not considered necessary to refer each specific policy to NE8.</p> <p>The allocation already refers to the protection of views to the SDNP, however it is acknowledged that the policy should also refer to minimising any harm to the setting of the national park.</p> <p>An amendment is proposed to the policy to reflect this.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> Amend Criteria viii) of CC3 as follows – viii. Provide landscape buffers to protect the amenities of existing properties to the south of the site and <b>any minimise any harm to wider views and the setting of the SDNP</b></p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BQ-A Historic Environment <a href="#">Link here</a></p>	<p>Para 14.60 - comment We suggest minor wording changes to acknowledge the importance of significance, rather than more generically respect the buildings.</p> <p>There are three listed buildings opposite the site. Part of their character is the rural undeveloped nature of their setting and the</p>	<p>The comments of Historic England have been discussed further with officers. A detailed Historic Environment Impact Assessment has now been conducted for this site by WCC Historic Environment</p>

	<p>development will need to be sensitive to their character and minimise harm to their setting respect these buildings.</p> <p>Para 14.78 - comment The supporting text would benefit from minor amendment to clarify what is being sought from this development</p>	<p>Officers, in liaison with officers from HCC Environment Team and Historic England.</p> <p>This Assessment concluded that development proposed could take place on this site subject to careful consideration of the setting of the historic buildings as part of the design process of masterplanning for the site.</p> <p>Criteria ix) requires proposals to preserve the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: No Change</b></p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86Z-7</p>	<p>GP Surgeries Colden Common Twyford Surgery Stokewood Surgery (Main and Branch) NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB - Primary Care Response The GP surgeries that serve these potential sites are currently over subscribed by 1,957 patients of October 2022. Stokewood surgery is undersized for the current population and is urgently seeking new premises to grow with population increases already approved in the area. One of its branch surgeries is due to close in 2024 and urgent temporary accommodation has been sought for the practice to mitigate this reduction in estate. The additional dwellings from the local plan will add a further 523 patients and in order to mitigate this the NHS will be seeking financial contributions to increase the primary care space by a further 42 m2 Stokewood Surgery are being supported by the ICB to find an urgent temporary solution to a rapidly expanding patient population, and to work in parallel on a long term solution to potentially expand the current practice to grow with the local population, or to find new</p>	<p>This representation is identical to that submitted under CC1 and a response has been provided there.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: No Change</b></p>

	<p>premises for the surgery.          Twyford and Stokewood surgeries are part of the Winchester Rural South Primary Care Network. Significant development is being experienced across the Network's geography (which includes Twyford, Stokewood, Bishops Waltham and Wickham surgeries). The SHELAA sites propose up to 31,000 additional homes across this geography; the local infrastructure and workforce cannot cope with such a sizeable additional population without significant developer investment into primary care infrastructure.          The two surgeries and PCN have been clear with the ICB that it does not feel able to absorb any further increases in population due to agreed development without significant further investment in primary care infrastructure.          Winchester City Council – Local Plan Policies          Due to the additional healthcare activities that will derive from the Local Plan we believe that there should be references to healthcare in policy CC1/4 to inform potential developers of the requirement for these impacts to be mitigated.</p>	
--	--	--

<b>Comments which object to Policy CC3 – land at Main Road</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
ANON-KSAR-NK2C-Y Southern Water <a href="#">Link here</a>	This site is within Southern Water's statutory water and wastewater service area. We note that there is a policy requirement for 'connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network'. Since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we have adjusted our approach in line with the new requirements, therefore the wording of this requirement is no longer effective. Moreover, our	Points noted. This has now been picked up in the changes to the wording of criterion in Policy CC3.  <b>Recommended response: No Change</b>

	<p>assessment of this site reveals that there is presently adequate capacity within the wastewater network for this development, therefore this policy criterion may be deleted.</p> <p>Our assessment also revealed that site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source is maintained and inform Southern Water of the outcome of this consultation.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>Accordingly, we propose the following amendments to Policy CC3:</p> <p>Delete; 'Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.'</p> <p>Add; 'Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected'</p>	
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BE-X</p> <p>Environment Agency <a href="#">Link here</a></p>	<p>Based on the information currently available, the site raises some environmental concerns that need to be addressed. Further work will be needed to show how these issues can be satisfactorily addressed to ensure no environmental impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPZ</li> <li>• principal aquifer</li> </ul> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>The entire development area is within a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) there may be some constraints on activities, designs and construction works (i.e. fuel storage or drainage options) associated with this development.</p>	<p>A Stage 2 SFRA and a site sequential and exception test has been undertaken in consultation with the EA which is available on the website. Additional supporting text has been included in the Reg 19 LP on Source Protection Zone 1.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> Incorporate additional text at paragraph 14.61 – see changes at the supporting text and policy.</p>

ANON-KSAR-NK1D-Y	Colden Common is already significantly under-served by retail services and employment. This allocation should not be made without provision for and encouragement of commercial space.	<p>The provision of commercial, retail or social space is not generally sought in relation to housing allocations of the scale proposed at Colden Common. Should proposals to develop commercial space come forward - including retail and employment – these would be considered in accordance with the general policies of the plan as appropriate. including the Spatial Strategy (SP2), the policies in the Economy Chapter and other relevant factors including the site’s location in relation to the settlement boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK25-H	<p>I have no problem with this development as long as the infrastucture is sorted, the drainage system in the area is already under immense pressure and the drain on Kiln Lane near Brambridge Garden Centre is overflowing on a regular basis and flooding into the river. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>One Local shop is not sufficient and the bus service is really poor</p>	<p>Southern Water have outlined their intention to undertake improvements to drainage in the area, as discussed more under responses in relation to CC1.</p> <p>Comments regarding the retail provision and the bus service are noted, but are outside of the control of the local plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK2P-C	I would just like to share my concerns about the proposed building of 35 dwellings on the land on Main Road Colden Common (CC04). I believe that we should be trying to preserve the rural character of the village at all costs, as there will be no going back. We should be conserving local views, and development here would ruin the visual impact when entering the village from the north. We should be using	The city council needs to meet the housing requirements that have been set by government. This was considered to be the most suitable site to be able to accommodate housing. The points regarding the local views are issues that

	<p>brownfield sites and in-filling before we destroy the patchwork of our British green fields forever. We also need to maintain and protect settlement gaps.</p> <p>This field is opposite 3 listed buildings and the proposed development would harm their setting without question. We should be protecting their uniqueness. The traffic on this road is already very heavy, making it almost impossible at peak times for the residents to get out onto the road. Traffic speeds along this road, making it unsafe for young families to walk along the pavement to school.</p>	<p>will be dealt with as part of the Design Process.</p> <p>A Strategic Transport Assessment, which has been undertaken in consultation with HCC Highways and National Highways and this has assessed the impact and the mitigation that is needed to deliver the site allocations in the LP. This is available on the LP website.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKFE-N	<p>The policies do not adequately address critical issues surrounding the success of this site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flooding - the site is elevated, and with building occurring on this elevated site, the water will run down onto the road, and there is a real risk of flooding on the road or housing opposite. Flooding in this area is at critical point with the protected river Itchen.</li> <li>2. Boundary settlement and Village Design Statement - the green areas on the approach to the village are to be protected, as to make the distinction between Colden Common and Twyford. Expanding the housing line, goes against an identified need.</li> <li>3. Protection of environment - the field on this site is home to bluebells, we also have sites of slowworms in our house opposite. Are these not protected? Living opposite the site, we also have the pleasure of seeing bats in flight, the sounds of owls hooting and sites of buzzards flying overhead. Imagine what building on this field will do to the natural habitat.</li> <li>4. Local amenities - Colden Common has already housed a large housing allocation, stretching our amenities and infrastructure network. The Main Road is at a standstill for traffic, the local shop</li> </ol>	<p>Points note.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flooding – A stage 2 SFRA and a site sequential and exceptions assessment has been undertaken in consultation with the EA – this is available on the LP website</li> <li>2. Boundary settlement &amp; VDS – the city council needs to meet the housing requirements that have been set by government. This was considered to be the most suitable site to be able to accommodate the housing.</li> <li>3. Environment – wildlife &amp; habitat – developers are now required to provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain</li> <li>4. Local amenities – see point 2 above.</li> </ol>

	<p>cannot keep up demand. I personally worked hard to get the Primary School PAN amended in 2014 as the Council had not increased the allocation in line with new housing that had been built. Forgive me for not having faith that our infrastructure will not be improved to meet increasing housing demands.</p> <p>Moreover, the public transport network is lacking and does not provide options in order to attract more people to use public transport and enable for them to get to where they need to be.</p> <p>5. Brown fill vs Green Field sites - this is a plea, to not take anymore of our wonderful green areas away from us, and fill them with unsympathetic buildings. Where we can, we need to be using existing brown fill sites, of which there appear to be a number surround Colden Common. Some as SHLAAs that have not been selected as part of this process. Why?</p> <p>6. Having housing built on this elevated ground will create an unappealing and quite new identity to the approach to the village. Moreover, being a house on lower ground, facing the site, I am very concerned as to the loss of privacy and natural outlook with the development.</p> <p>I do appreciate that housing has to be provided for for a growing population, but Colden Common really has provided substantial numbers of new housing over the last few years, and with the allocation from the last Local Plan. Please can you give us a break to just enjoy living where we live.</p>	<p>5. Brownfield &amp; why some Shelaa sites not selected? – a comprehensive assessment has been undertaken of alternative sites to meet the government’s housing target – this is available on the LP website. There is not enough brownfield land in the district to meet the governments housing requirement so greenfield land will be required.</p> <p>6. Elevated site, privacy concerns – the site is elevated but this is a issue that can be addressed through the design process.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F	<p>In paragraph 14.56, the correct term is ‘bridleway’ not ‘footpath’ as the public right of way in question, which actually runs through the field to the north of the Recreation Ground, is Colden Common bridleway 13, as recorded on the Definitive Map.</p> <p>The Colden Common Village Design Statement (March 2022), under Planning Guidance, states that, “Existing paths and bridleways should be protected and maintained, and new development should link to, and extend, footpaths and bridleways wherever possible.”</p>	<p>An amendment is proposed to the text to correct the reference to this route to that of a Public Right of Way (PROW)</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> Amend text of paragraph 14.56 as follows Opposite the site a <del>footpath</del> PROW runs alongside..</p>



	<p>Map C2 incorrectly shows the status of the public right of way with 'views' as a footpath rather than a bridleway. The map key has a label 'Bridle Path' with a red dashed line but most of the red dashed line on the map has been overprinted with a solid blue line denoting a footpath. Therefore in paragraph 14.56, replace 'footpath' with 'bridleway'.</p>	
<p>ANON- KSAR-N8XQ- Z</p>	<p>Relative to the Village boundary settlement and design statement;</p> <p>a) This area is a green area on the approach to the village that maintains the rural aspect and approach to the village and the distinction between Colden Common and Twyford. This expansion of the village settlement boundary goes against identified need and surely with the likelihood of increase need for schooling development should be considered on areas that are available nearer the heart of the village (school and local amenities).</p> <p>b) This area has been used for agricultural purposes (sheep and hay) in previous years and it is believed houses slowworms and a diverse ecosystem of bats, owls and buzzards which relies on this strategic natural habitat.</p> <p>c) Development here will hugely impact on current traffic flows which are frequently already at a standstill at peak times and may even be dangerous to an increase in associated foot traffic.</p> <p>d) The local amenities and school which are arguably at the centre of the village are a significant walk from this site alongside a busy main road and the amenities and infrastructure struggles to cope with existing needs as it is.</p> <p>e) Flooding impact on existing properties which include listed buildings could be caused by development of this elevated site opposite existing housing.</p> <p>f) The existing electricity supply to this end of the village barely copes as it is when there are significant weather extremes that have historically cause power cuts, and neither is the current broadband services particularly reliable such that additional loading at this site</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>a) The city council needs to meet the housing requirements that have been set by government. This was considered to be the most suitable site to be able to accommodate housing.</p> <p>b) Developers are now required to provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain</p> <p>c) A Strategic Transport Assessment, which has been undertaken in consultation with HCC Highways and National Highways and this has assessed the impact and the mitigation that is needed to deliver the site allocations in the LP. This is available on the LP website.</p> <p>d) These are issues that will be dealt with as part of the Design Process – this was considered to be the most suitable site for development when it was considered against alternatives.</p>

	<p>could further impact existing supplies.</p> <p>g) Why is another greenfield site being targeted when there are existing brownfield site that should be used for redevelopment first?</p>	<p>e) A Stage 2 SFRA and a site sequential and exception test has been undertaken in consultation with the EA. This is available on the LP website.</p> <p>f) As part of the development of the LP, Officers have had numerous discussions with SSEN regarding the delivery of the electricity network and they have used this information to plan further upgrades to the electricity network.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N89A-H</p>	<p>In the last 2 years this site was put forward for development and refused on appeal. The issues that were raised and considered at that time are still true.</p> <p>Many of the negative points regarding this location have been noted in the current plan, but I don't agree that the mitigating proposals fully resolve the issues, that the development of this site would raise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it would affect the open views of the SDNP that is valued by the community as noted in the VDS</li> <li>- it required the extension of the development boundary of the Village towards Twyford, when there are alternative sites within the current boundary</li> <li>- the development would clearly affect the rural setting of the 3 adjacent listed buildings to the west of Main Road and No27 (also listed?) to the North of the site. All the Listed Buildings are currently officially sited in the countryside.</li> <li>- It is further away from the school and majority of public services.</li> </ul>	<p>The city council needs to meet the housing requirements that have been set by government. This was considered to be the most suitable site to be able to accommodate the housing.</p> <p>The design, layout and views into and out of the site can be addressed through the design process. A Strategic Transport Assessment, which has been undertaken in consultation with HCC Highways and National Highways and this has assessed the impact and the mitigation that is needed to deliver the site allocations in the LP. This is available on the LP website.</p>

	<p>Also on the opposite side of the very busy Main Road, that would need to be crossed to access any of those facilities - many other potential development sites are far better positioned and safer for young and older residents.</p> <p>- Adding traffic volume to the busiest road in Colden Common (Main Road), is surely something that should be avoided, Main Road will remain a through road for vehicles (including many lorries) avoiding the motorway on route to/from Portsmouth and the South coast.</p> <p>I have noted in the Public Consultation section the flaws in the site selection process, where it appears that this site was chosen because there less properties in it's vicinity rather than a choice that would be most beneficial to the future residents of Colden Common.</p>	<p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N8WS-1</p>	<p>I do not support the policy for this site for the following reasons;</p> <p>1) The Council has stated that in their planning policy that brownfield sites should used as preference, however this is a green field site and thus should not be accepted as brownfield sites within the area could fulfil the housing allocation required. The site is surrounded by ancient native trees many with TPOs, and is the habitat for many types of native wildlife. Slow worms and voles are regularly seen in neighbouring gardens and red kites are often seen hunting in the fields, along with deer and other native species. Development of this site would have a real risk of potentially destroying the habitat for these species. Development would also block the view of the existing ancient trees that can be seen on entrance to the village and ruin the rural aesthetic of the entrance to the village. Proposed hedges and trees at the front of this site will not allow for the open view to the native trees at the back of the site. If the site is developed it should be insisted that the species used in the buffering/hedging should be in keeping with the existing native hedging.</p> <p>2) Road issues - air pollution and safety - once again the sites proposed are along the Main Rd which has already been</p>	<p>Points noted. The city council needs to meet the housing requirements that have been set by government. This was considered to be the most suitable site to be able to accommodate the housing. Whilst the city council has prioritised the use of previously developed land (pdl) – there is not enough pdl to meet the government’s housing requirement. A Strategic Transport Assessment, which has been undertaken in consultation with HCC Highways and National Highways and this has assessed the impact and the mitigation that is needed to deliver the site allocations in the LP. This is available on the LP website. A Stage 2 SFRA and a site sequential and exception test has been undertaken in consultation with the EA. This is available on the LP website.</p>

<p>substantially effected by the new developments along the road not only within the village but also in neighbouring Fair Oak, Horton Heath and Botley. Whilst this policy discusses road improvements these do not go far enough. The road is used as a preferred route for many drivers rather than using the motorway, as there are no permanent speed restrictions on the road to deter them. Although the speed should be 30mph through the village, the majority of vehicles do not stick to this speed limit and the road is very dangerous for the residents of the road. My children have to cross at the controlled crossing near New Rd to access their school bus but vehicles are often going too fast to stop and my 12 year old daughter has been nearly blown off her feet by speedy HGVs. The houses along the road shake due to the speed of HGVS and I am often unable to access my own driveway safely as traffic speeds do not allow for safe access, meaning we must park across the road in the recreation car park. We are unable to open windows in the summer due to the extensive traffic fumes and noise of speeding traffic. Adding more development to this road will only exacerbate this issue and is not in line with WCCs Environmental policy. Adding more crossings and widening pavements will not necessarily solve the problems. Permanent speed restrictions that cover the length of the road should be considered to try to deter drivers using this as rat run alternative to the motorway. Public transport to and from Winchester should be improved (the current bus service is not regular enough so not convenient ,so many use cars instead) and a safe separate cycle route away from the road (i.e. not a cycle lane on the road due to volume of traffic) should be developed.</p> <p>3) Flooding - this site is elevated from the road. Water runs from the site and the surrounding fields onto the road and down towards the south and east of the village. At times of high rain fall the road becomes a river as existing drainage along the road cannot cope, and the gardens of neighbouring properties during the winter months</p>	<p>Infrastructure issues are addressed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – this work has not identified any infrastructure that would preclude development on this site. As part of the work on the LP, extensive discussions have been undertaken with the HIOW ICB and this information has been included in the Infrastructure Delivery. Additional text has been included encouraging early engagement with the HIOW ICB. Extensive discussions have also taken place with Southern Water, HCC Education and SSEN – all of this information is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The design, site layout, views into and out of the site and the number of car parking spaces will be addressed through the Design Process.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
--	--

are often waterlogged. Adding a significant amount of hardstanding, road/driveways/foundations etc. will only increase this problem and must be addressed to prevent more damage to neighbouring properties and increased danger on the road.

4) Infrastructure - the current village infrastructure cannot cope with this increased demand for housing, and development of this site would put further strain on existing services.

Retail - We have one small food shop approx 10-15 min walk from this site, that has staffing issues and is often closed, meaning villagers need to travel by vehicle to neighbouring areas for supplies.

NHS services - The GP surgery in Colden Common only does a limited type of appointment with most appointments needing a vehicle journey to Twyford Surgery. It can already be difficult to get appointments when required. There is no NHS dental service in the village.

Schooling - There is no senior school in the village which is in the catchment of the over subscribed Kings School in Winchester, again which requires transport to get too.

Public transport - public transport for the village is not adequate, so many use their own vehicles as the public transport is not regular enough so is not convenient. If public transport was improved it would be used more.

For years the village has had regular power cuts, as the existing infrastructure cannot cope with demand and needs to be upgraded. With a potential of 38 new homes with likely 70 + more cars on this site alone, the existing electrical infrastructure would not be sufficient to support the required EV and modern housing electrical requirements.

There has been numerous watermain breakages in the last year along Main Road and also in neighbouring Church Lane, as again the existing infrastructure has not been properly maintained and cannot cope with the demand. Local residents including elderly and those

	<p>with additional needs have been left without water for days on end and a number of properties were damaged due to the flooding. As mentioned above, the sewers in this part of the village cannot cope with the rainfall and Main Road is often flooded during significant rainfall as a result.</p> <p>Network communications - mobile phone coverage is poor in this area of the village (despite network maps saying differently) and broadband speeds are not adequate, especially considering the increased demand for working from home.</p> <p>Significant investment in improvements to infrastructure is needed to allow for any further development within the village. Any funds from developers to improve infrastructure must be used for this means and not used elsewhere. Preferably any improvements to infrastructure should be carried out BEFORE any development to ensure this will be fulfilled and not done retrospectively.</p> <p>5) Character and design- the properties along this section of the road and this entrance to the village are varied in character, age and size. A group of generic designed housing would ruin the character of the area. If the site is to be developed WCC should take the opportunity to push for, and only accept, innovative and varied design, to stay in keeping with the varied housing styles in this part of the road.</p> <p>On street parking is already a big issue in the village especially when the recreation ground is holding football matches and there are often disputes due to inconsiderate parking. The design must allow for adequate parking plus visitor parking (2+ spaces per residence) not the bare minimum that is required by planning guidelines, as there is little to no alternative parking availability.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZX-9	CC04 Land North East of Main Road Unwelcome and unnecessary development of this raised, highly visible, wildlife meadow site at the entrance to the village, and some	Points noted. These are all matters that can be addressed through the Design process. Extensive discussions have also taken place with Southern Water,

	<p>distance from village amenities, would cause a major change to the rural ambiance of this part of the parish and destroy wildlife habitat and hunting ground. Access would require major roadwork improvements to make safe that would result in the urbanisation of a very rural part of the B3354 Main Road. Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to Main Road</li> <li>b) Provide a safe Main Road crossing to ROW 13 D5(g)</li> <li>c) Improve access and surface of ROW13 to provide suitable pedestrian / cycle/ mobility access at both Main Road and Lower Moors Road. D5(F):NE4</li> <li>d) Provide a safe and wide roadside pavement both sides of the Main Road from the site to Spring Lane.</li> <li>e) Provide sufficient improved capacity in the sewerage and water supply along Main Road from the site to Spring Lane to avoid disasters to neighbouring properties and local infrastructure and environment.</li> <li>f) Provide adequate, deep drainage along the boundary (including access) with Main Road to prevent run off from this high land flooding the road and much lower established properties opposite the site.</li> <li>g) Retain, protect and enhance all current boundary hedging and native trees and add sufficient high native landscaping to fully screen new development to preserve and enhance the rural aspect of the Main B3354 Road at the Northern entrance to the village. NE9: NE14.</li> <li>h) Fully protect all overhanging boundary tree lines and all wild English bluebells currently established at the Northern edge of the site.</li> <li>i) Provide Bus stops and bus shelters on Main Road close to the East and West boundary of the site.</li> </ul>	<p>HCC Education and SSEN – all of this information is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. HCC have provided comments on the wording of the policy and matters regarding access, pedestrian accessibility will all be addressed through the Design Process.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No Change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N862-Y	Unwelcome and unnecessary development of this raised, highly visible, wildlife meadow site at the entrance to the village, and some distance from village amenities, would cause a major change to the	See response above.

	<p>rural ambiance of this part of the parish and destroy wildlife habitat and hunting ground. Access would require major roadwork improvements to make safe that would result in the urbanisation of a very rural part of the B3354 Main Road. Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to Main Road</li> <li>b) Provide a safe Main Road crossing to ROW 13 D5(g)</li> <li>c) Improve access and surface of ROW13 to provide suitable pedestrian / cycle/ mobility access at both Main Road and Lower Moors Road. D5(F):NE4</li> <li>d) Provide a safe and wide roadside pavement both sides of the Main Road from the site to Spring Lane.</li> <li>e) Provide sufficient improved capacity in the sewerage and water supply along Main Road from the site to Spring Lane to avoid disasters to neighbouring properties and local infrastructure and environment.</li> <li>f) Provide adequate, deep drainage along the boundary (including access) with Main Road to prevent run off from this high land flooding the road and much lower established properties opposite the site. Page 4 of 4</li> <li>g) Retain, protect and enhance all current boundary hedging and native trees and add sufficient high native landscaping to fully screen new development to preserve and enhance the rural aspect of the Main B3354 Road at the Northern entrance to the village. NE9: NE14.</li> <li>h) Fully protect all overhanging boundary tree lines and all wild English bluebells currently established at the Northern edge of the site.</li> <li>i) Provide Bus stops and bus shelters on Main Road close to the East and West boundary of the site.</li> </ul>	
BHLF-KSAR-N86N-U	The policy is supported in principle. Bargate Homes has control of this site and continues to be committed to delivering a high quality residential scheme. Please refer to our separate representation on	Comments noted. Comments regarding the phasing policy are addressed in the



	<p>this site including a vision for its development. That demonstrates that the site comfortably has capacity for the policy requirement of "about 35 dwellings".</p> <p>Objection to the arbitrary phasing for this site to post 2030. In the context of the "critical need" for affordable housing, including in the market towns and rural areas, to hold back sites that can deliver affordable homes is counterproductive and unjustified. The site is identified as being appropriate for development now so should not be held back by policy. Please also refer to our comments on the housing strategy under Homes for All.</p>	<p>general response on housing phasing and supply H2.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
--	--	---

<b>Comments which didn't answer Policy CC3 – land at Main Road</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)</p>	<p>Policy CC3 Land at Main Road – 35 dwellings The County Council expect a sustainable travel accessibility assessment to be undertaken and contribution towards the provision of the mitigation and improvements recommended in the assessment. The County Council request that the following additions and amendments to Policy CC3 text: Access Clause v. Provide pedestrian/cycle crossing provision across Main Road, in accordance with the recommendations of the sustainable travel accessibility assessment and where possible contribute to the development and delivery of the emerging Winchester District LCWIP</p>	<p>Policy T1 (as proposed to be amended) requires applications that increase travel to be supported by a transport assessment. It also references the emerging LCWIP in the supporting text.</p> <p>It is accepted the LCWIP is still being developed and following liaison with HCC Transport and Active Travel England, it is considered useful to add reference to supporting the development of sustainable travel options and highway safety to CC3 and the supporting text.</p>

	<p>network. Contribute to other necessary highway and road safety improvements in the area improvements to the nearest bus stops (both directions) including the provision of shelters and wand seating if deemed appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Recommended Response:</b>  Add additional wording at end of paragraph 14.61 as follows –  ‘Other measures that support the development and use of sustainable travel options, such as active travel and public transport, or contribute to highway safety may be sought following discussions with the local highway authority, where justified as a result of the proposed development.’</p> <p>Amend criteria v of CC3 as follows;  ‘Contribute to other necessary highway <del>and road safety</del> improvements in the area, <b>that encourage and support sustainable travel opportunities or improve road safety</b>’</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8TZ-5</p>	<p>In paragraph 14.56, the correct term is ‘bridleway’ not ‘footpath’ as the public right of way in question, which actually runs through the field to the north of the Recreation Ground, is Colden Common bridleway 13, as recorded on the Definitive Map.  The Colden Common Village Design Statement (March 2022), under Planning Guidance, states that, “Existing paths and bridleways should be protected and maintained, and new development should link to, and extend, footpaths and bridleways wherever possible.”  Map C2 incorrectly shows the status of the public right of way with ‘views’ as a footpath rather than a bridleway. The map key has a label ‘Bridle Path’ with a red dashed line but most of the red dashed line on the map has been overprinted with a solid blue line denoting a</p>	<p>This comment is addressed above and an amendment proposed to the text.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b>  No further change required</p>

	footpath. Therefore, in paragraph 14.56, replace 'footpath' with 'bridleway'.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8TV-1	<p>The 48 members of Colden Common WI have considered at length the proposed requirement for a further 100 homes on countryside adjoining our Village settlement and are deeply concerned that such a proposal is unsustainable and would result in a severe reduction in the well-being and standard of living of our current rural community. It would result in significant damage, and loss of environment, to the highly important surrounding countryside of our rural village. We believe sustainable development in our village has reached saturation point.</p> <p>Furthermore, we believe additional development would reduce the ability to fight climate change and increase the carbon footprint of our village at a time when we, and very many residents are working towards a net zero target.</p> <p>It would also greatly increase the density of housing within our rural habitat.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to any further widening of the Village settlement boundary to accommodate new housing within our Parish countryside.</p> <p>The sites put forward by the Parish Council were a last resort, considered to be the least damaging and least objectionable to the parish, should Winchester City continue with their proposal for such an unsustainable quota.</p> <p>For the following sound reasons members of Colden Common Womens' Institute strongly object to ALL potential development sites on countryside outside the current village settlement:</p> <p>1. Village Design Statement Many residents helped establish a Village design statement that</p>	<p>This representation has been considered under CC2 and a response provided there.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No change</p>

clearly categorises where future development could happen and the places that must be protected from future development. The design statement is adopted by Colden Common Parish Council and Winchester City Council as an aid that must surely be respected by Winchester City Council planning department and potential developers.

## 2. Environment

Our parish is blessed with beautiful rural surrounds, abundant in both flora and fauna.

a) It is essential that wildlife and their natural habitat are protected from pollution and hard development.

b) Easy access to our beautiful local countryside views and nearby rural paths, help us to all find peace, to stay healthy and to wind down from the cares and worries of modern life. It is important that the roadside views from our village are not forever lost to development, and that the well-used rural footpaths that crisscross the countryside surrounding our village never lose that wonderful ability to give a sense of wellbeing to all ages of folk who use them.

c) It is important that village development remains hidden from view and does not compromise our important surrounds and green roadside views.

d) Our Womens Institute are deeply concerned for the future of our children and grand children. We take Climate change very seriously and are all aiming towards a net zero lifestyle. It is essential that new development does not add pollution to local roads, waterways, soil, and fresh air. There is no point in having a home to live in if the planet is no longer habitable.

## 3. Traffic

Massive 21c development of countryside to the South and East of our parish has resulted in an enormous increase in traffic trundling through the narrow, rural, 'B' roads that serve our village. Whether

travelling at high speed or in blocked rush hour traffic jams they create a great deal of noise and air pollution, make roadside homes shake and cause scary, dangerous drag when large lorries / tractors pass pedestrians and cyclists on the narrow roads and pathways.

#### 4. Public Transport

An inadequate, very limited, expensive and unreliable bus service, as well as a lack of shelters from adverse weather conditions, makes use of private vehicles essential to get to and from places of work outside of the parish; to do supermarket shopping; attend doctors' surgery appointments; or to make hospital visits.

#### 5. Services

Essential services are creaking at the seams and are unable to absorb 100 new homes.

a)Surgery. The Doctors Surgery is a tiny offshoot of the main surgery in Twyford and, with recent development, is no longer easy to get an appointment in the village.

b)Electricity. Spasmodic power cuts and extremely poor mobile phone and internet connections make working from home very difficult.

c)Drinking Water. Regular burst water pipes on the old pipeline system cause localised flooding and lengthy periods of loss of water to homes.

d)Drains. The village is built on a deep, sloping bed of clay that means muddy rainwater often tends to run rather than soak away naturally. Old storm drains become easily blocked and cannot take ordinary rainfalls, let alone the climate change storms we now encounter. With extra housing and more hard standing from recent new development and garden infills, rain water regularly overflows into sewage drains and we see terrible polluted discharge into Church Pond running into the Church Lane and Valley Close garden stream that runs directly down into the Itchen Valley.

<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8RV-Y</p>	<p>Unwelcome and unnecessary development of this raised, highly visible, wildlife meadow site at the entrance to the village, and some distance from village amenities, would cause a major change to the rural ambiance of this part of the parish and destroy wildlife habitat and hunting ground. Access would require major roadwork improvements to make safe that would result in the urbanisation of a very rural part of the B3354 Main Road. Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to Main Road</li> <li>b) Provide a safe Main Road crossing to ROW 13 D5(g)</li> <li>c) Improve access and surface of ROW13 to provide suitable pedestrian / cycle/ mobility access at both Main Road and Lower Moors Road. D5(F):NE4</li> <li>d) Provide a safe and wide roadside pavement both sides of the Main Road from the site to Spring Lane.</li> <li>e) Provide sufficient improved capacity in the sewerage and water supply along Main Road from the site to Spring Lane to avoid disasters to neighbouring properties and local infrastructure and environment.</li> <li>f) Provide adequate, deep drainage along the boundary (including access) with Main Road to prevent run off from this high land flooding the road and much lower established properties opposite the site.</li> <li>g) Retain, protect and enhance all current boundary hedging and native trees and add sufficient high native landscaping to fully screen new development to preserve and enhance the rural aspect of the Main B3354 Road at the Northern entrance to the village. NE9: NE14.</li> <li>h) Fully protect all overhanging boundary tree lines and all wild English bluebells currently established at the Northern edge of the site.</li> <li>i) Provide Bus stops and bus shelters on Main Road close to the East and West boundary of the site.</li> </ul>	
-------------------------	--	--

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	None.	
Comments from HRA	None.	

Amendments to CC3 Text –

14.56

Opposite the site a ~~footpath~~ PROW runs alongside..

14.61

~~Access~~

Add additional wording at end of paragraph 14.61 as follows –

**Other measures that support the development and use of sustainable travel options, such as active travel and public transport, or contribute to highway safety may be sought following discussions with the local highway authority, where justified as a result of the proposed development.**

Add new paragraph 14.62 as follows –

**As the site is located on a principal aquifer, and within a groundwater Source Protection Zone any proposed development will need to protect the groundwater quality and avoid any contamination to this aquifer. There may be some constraints on activities, design and construction works association with the Source Protection Zone and developers should liaise with the Environment Agency in respect of this.**

Amendments to CC3

Land at Main Road, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the about 35 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific requirements:

Nature & Phasing of Development

- i. The development is phased for the latter part of the Local Plan period and permission for housing development will not be granted before 2030;
- ii. Provide an overall site plan indicating the general layout of development, open space, landscaping and access points that minimises wider landscape impacts on the setting of Colden Common and impacts on the setting of ~~views to the SDNP~~ **and views to it**. Development should be sited away from the site frontage, behind landscape buffers. Any applications for all or part of the site should demonstrate how the proposal will accord with these principles and achieve the form of development intended by this allocation as a whole;

#### Access

- iii. Provide a safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to Main Road;
- iv. Provide or contribute to the provision of crossing points to Main Road as appropriate;
- v. Contribute to other necessary highway ~~and road safety~~ improvements in the area **that encourage and support sustainable travel opportunities or improve road safety**

#### Environmental

- vi. Provide landscaping to create a new settlement edge to the north of the site which retains a gap to Twyford village.
- vii. Retain and reinforce important trees and hedgerows within and around the edges of the site;
- viii. Provide landscape buffers to protect the amenities of existing properties to the south of the site and ~~any~~ **minimise any harm to wider views and the setting of the to SDNP**;
- ix. Preserve the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings;
- x. Provide on-site communal open space (Informal Green Space / Natural Green Space) in accordance with policy NE3 towards eastern top of the site;

#### Other Infrastructure

- xi. ~~Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider;~~ **Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.**
- xii. Identify and contribute to infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.



# CC04: Land at Main Road, Colden Common

Proposed use: Residential use



<b>IIA Objective</b>	<b>Score</b>
IIA1: climate change mitigation	Minor negative (-)
IIA2: travel and air quality	Minor negative (-)
IIA4: health and wellbeing	Minor positive (+)
IIA7: services and facilities	Minor negative (-)
IIA8: economy	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA9: biodiversity and geodiversity	Significant negative (--)
IIA10: landscape	Minor negative uncertain (-?)
IIA11: historic environment	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA12: natural resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA13: water resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA14: flood risk	Negligible (0)

**IIA objective 1: To minimise the District's contribution to climate change through a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources and facilitate the aim of carbon neutrality by 2031**

**Overall effect: Minor negative (-)**

Score by criteria: 1a: Minor positive (+); 1b: Minor positive (+); 1c: Major negative (--); 1d: Major negative (--); 1e: Major negative (--); 1f: Major negative (--); 1g: Major positive (++); 1h: Major positive (++); 1i: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 401-800m of a primary school. It is not within 2,000m of a secondary school. It is not within 1,200m of a town centre. It is not within 800m of a district or local centre. It is not within 2,000m of a railway station. It is within 300m of a bus stop. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open country or registered common land. The majority of it is within an area where average commuting distance is in 61-80% range for the plan area.

**IIA objective 2: To reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the District and improve air quality**

**Overall effect: Minor negative (-)**

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

**IIA objective 4: To improve public health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities in the District**

**Overall effect: Minor positive (+)**

Score by criteria: 4a: Negligible (0); 4b: Negligible (0); 4c: Negligible (0); 4d: Negligible (0); 4e: Minor positive (+); 4f: Major positive (++); 4g: Major positive (++)

Justification: The site is not within 500m of an AQMA. The majority of it is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are below 50 dB and the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are below 55 dB. The site does not lie within a noise contour associated with Southampton Airport. It is not within 400m of a wastewater treatment works or within 250m of a waste management facility. The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open country or registered common land. It is within 200m of a public right of way or cycle path.

**IIA objective 7: To ensure essential services and**

facilities and jobs in the District are accessible

**Overall effect: Minor negative (-)**

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 8: To support the sustainable growth of the District's economy

**Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)**

Justification: The site is not in existing employment use.

IIA objective 9: To support the District's biodiversity and geodiversity

**Overall effect: Significant negative (--)**

Score by criteria: 9a: Minor negative (-); 9b: Minor negative (-); 9c: Minor negative (-); 9d: Negligible (0); 9e: Negligible (0)

Justification: The site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for 'residential' or 'all planning applications'. It is within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland. It is within 200m of a priority habitat. It is not within 100m of a water course. The site does not intersect with a county or local geological site.

IIA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

**Overall effect: Minor negative uncertain (-?)**

Justification: The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity

IIA objective 11: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment including its setting.

**Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)**

Justification: The site is rated 'green' for risk of effects on heritage assets.

IIA objective 12: To support the efficient use of the District's resources, including land and minerals

**Overall effect: Significant negative (--)**

Score by criteria: 12a: Major negative (--); 12b: Minor negative (-); 12c: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The majority of the site contains greenfield land. A significant proportion of the site (>=25%) is on Grade 3 agricultural land or less than

25% of the site is on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. A significant proportion of the site ( $\geq 25\%$ ) is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

### **IIA objective 13: To protect the quality and quantity of the District's water resource**

#### **Overall effect: Significant negative (--)**

Justification: The site falls within a Source Protection Zone 1.

### **IIA objective 14: To manage and reduce flood risk from all sources**

#### **Overall effect: Negligible (0)**

Score by criteria: 14a: Negligible (0); 14b: Negligible (0)

Justification: Less than 25% of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3. Less than 25% of the site has a 1 in 100 year or 1 in 30 year risk of surface water flooding.