Summary

1. **Objections** are made by Welbeck Strategic Land LLP to Policies CC1 and CC2. The housing allocation at Sandyfields, Main Road, Colden Common (Policy CC1) (known as Site 275) and Clayfield Park (Policy CC2) (including sites 888 and 889). Welbeck contend that *Local Plan Part 2* should be amended by:
   
   - The Sandyfields site (Policy CC1) should be deleted or materially reduced in capacity.
   - The Clayfield Park allocation (specifically site 888) (Policy CC2) should be deleted.
   - Land to the east of Highbridge Road should be included as a housing allocation for up-to 70 dwellings, together with open space, because this is the most appropriate strategy for growth at Colden Common. A policy for the omission site at Highbridge Road is suggested at the end of this representation and a parameters plan identifying the suggested allocation is provided.

2. Previous representations were made to the draft *Local Plan Part 2* document which included reference to a smaller housing development (up to 70 dwellings) on land to the east of Highbridge Road (known as site 1874 in the *Winchester Local Plan Part 2 Sustainability Appraisal Report* and the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015*). It was identified that the assessment undertaken in the *Sustainability Appraisal Report* and the wider evidence base did not reflect the smaller proposal (which has been the subject of an outline planning applications for up to 70 dwellings (Refs 14/01404/OUT and 15/02043/OUT)). However, although there are some comments in the various background documents to consideration of this smaller omission site this does not appear to have been fully carried though into the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015*.

3. Welbeck is concerned that the *Sustainability Appraisal Report* and *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015* have been drafted in a form which are intended to justify the allocations at Sandyfields (Policy CC1) and Clayfield Park (Policy CC2) housing
allocations rather than be objective assessments. The confusion about the appraisal process is not assisted by the separate assessments and interpretations contained in the report to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 19 September 2015 (the Cabinet report).

4. Specific comments are made in this representation but, as an example, although the ‘excellent’ accessibility of the Highbridge Road site is acknowledged it is not a point of clear differentiation when it comes to the Assessment of Effects Table where the Key Positive Effect appears to be confined to accessibility to bus stops. This impression of reinforced by the Cabinet report which states ‘Apart from the frontage of the site adjoining Main Road, Sandyfields overall is not the most accessible in terms of its proximity to shops and the primary school due to the significant size and shape of the site; however its proximity to bus services is rated as “excellent”’.

**Basis of the Objection**

5. The objection has 4 elements.
   - The first element concerns basis for the choice of Sandyfields as the most appropriate strategy to accommodate housing growth at Colden Common.
   - The second element concerns, as a matter of principle, the suitability and sustainability of the Sandyfields and Clayfield Park sites as a location for housing development.
   - The third element addresses the detailed concerns associated with accommodating housing on the Sandyfields allocation.
   - The final element is the availability of a reasonable alternative which is the most appropriate strategy for accommodating of housing growth at Colden Common, namely the land east of Highbridge Road.

6. In drafting this representation regard has been had to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance).

**Element 1: Process**

7. The objection under this broad heading is based upon the claim that there legitimacy for the housing developments at the Sandyfields and Clayfield Park sites
is because they were favoured by the local community during the ‘Commonview’ exercise. Significant weight is erroneously being given to this matter in the assessment of suitable alternative housing sites at Colden Common.

8. Only around 10% of the residents of Colden Common engaged with the Commonview exercise. This level of support cannot amount to an endorsement of the strategy being proposed in the Local Plan to accommodate housing growth at Colden Common. It is now evident from the public consultation for this Local Plan undertaken in Colden Common that many local residents were unaware of the Commonview exercise and have now questioned the merit of the strategy, especially the proposed allocation at Main Road on highway grounds.

9. Welbeck is conversant with the outcome of Commonview’s residents’ questionnaire concerning potential location for development within and adjoining Colden Common. What is of significance from the survey is that only some 13.7% of respondents ‘supported’ the allocation at Sandyfields as a housing site. This is not an overwhelming endorsement of the Sandyfields as a housing site. Indeed, respondents considered that the Sandyfields site was one of the better suited sites for commercial use. This comment is not surprising taking into account its current commercial use but this economic benefit has not be considered as part of any balancing exercise by Commonview.

10. The Sustainability Appraisal Report also highlights the supporting text of the Village Design Statement (VDS published in 2012) where at page 8 ‘local residents valued the fact that the village boundary is to the west of Main Road and is screened by trees and hedges, which enhance the rural aspect of the village. Development to the east of this road may harm what the villager’s value’. The Sandyfields site is clearly to the east of Main Road.

11. At page 8 the VDS also refers to the countryside surrounding Colden Common and comments that ‘This rural landscape remains today, particularly outside of the triangle formed by the B3335 (Highbridge Road), B3354 (Main Road) and Church Lane’. The Sandyfields allocation is outside the triangle formed of these roads.

12. The change of the community’s view between the content of the VDS and the Commonview exercise concerning the importance given to Main Road as the boundary of Colden Common has never been adequately explained. The VDS has not been adequately taken into account in the Sustainability Appraisal Report and
the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015. There are no reasons to disagree with
the community’s original assessment that development east of Main Road will harm
what the villager’s value and will, as already indicated, lead to the loss of an
existing employment site.

13. Further, the Commonview exercise was based on a flawed evidence base. Utilising
a more robust evidence base and a comparative assessment of all the potential
sites at Colden Common, the Sandyfields allocation is not the most sustainable
location for housing growth at Colden Common. The analysis undertaken by
Welbeck based substantially on objective metrics clearly demonstrates that the
Sandyfields allocation is not the most sustainable location for housing development
in Colden Common. This point has at long last been conceded in the Cabinet
report. Further, the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 now considers that the
accessibility of the Highbridge Road site (in the currently proposed form) is the
only ‘excellent’ site at Colden Common.

14. Welbeck’s analysis is substantially supported by the original assessment
undertaken by Hampshire County Council concerning the transport merits of all the
potential housing sites at Colden Common. The County Council’s original
assessment for Sandyfields was that is ‘only [has] ‘adequate’ access to shops,
facilities and schools and therefore sites with better access may be considered to
be preferable.’ This assessment has not changed in the updated assessment. As
has already been noted, Sandyfields is not the most accessible site in terms of its
proximity to shops and the primary school but this is principally is due to its location
east of Main Road rather than, as weakly suggested in the Cabinet report, the site’s
significant size.

15. Accordingly, based upon both the process of assessment, the available published
evidence and the flawed criteria to assess the locations for housing growth which
underpinnis the spatial strategy, the Sustainability Appraisal Report and the
Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015, together with the Cabinet report, are flawed
and do not provide a sound basis to support the Sandyfields allocation which is
demonstrably not the most appropriate strategy to adopt as part of the Local Plan.

**Element 2: Suitability of the Sandyfields and Clayfield Park Sites**

16. Significant weight is given by the Council to the Sandyfields allocation being a
‘brownfield’ site and, indeed, the Cabinet report refers to ‘Sites 275/2495 have
existing uses and constitute previously developed land’ (there is also a later
reference to 'part developed and has existing removable uses over much of the area, compared to the rest which are greenfield sites'). However, the Framework’s definition of previously developed land refers to ‘land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure’ (emphasis added).

17. Although it is recognised that parts of the Sandyfields allocation are occupied by permanent buildings (i.e. dwellings) the majority of the site is open and used for the storage of caravans. Under Sustainability Objective 13 of the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 the application of previously developed land status to the whole of the allocation is incorrect because there are ‘A number of the sites are located on Greenfield land outside the settlement boundary (including….275) [i.e. the main part of the Policy CC1 allocation at Sandyfields]. Further, Sustainability Objective 1 only describes the allocation to be only partly brownfield.

18. The storage of caravans does not amount to permanent structures being erected on the site and the storage area cannot be claimed to be part of any dwelling’s reasonable curtilages. The caravan can easily be removed and the land re-used for nursery or agricultural purposes.

19. Accordingly, the assessment in the Cabinet report that the Sandyfields site is a ‘brownfield’ is factually inaccurate and inconsistent with other parts of the Sustainability Update Report 2015 and cannot be given weight as a ‘major positive effect’. If this is an incorrect contention then the site must be in employment use and the site needs to be properly assessed on this basis.

20. What is not given due weight in the assessment is the loss of the job opportunities at Colden Common associated with the displacement of the caravan storage use. The Sustainability Appraisal Report 2015 properly identifies that Policy CP9 of the Local Plan Part 1 should be a component of the assessment of the economy and employment sustainability objective (Would the use of the site lead to a loss of employment land/jobs?). This policy is clear that the loss of existing or allocated employment land and floorspace within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8 will be resisted.

21. If the site is not previously developed land then the use of the vast majority of the Sandyfields site falls within Class B8. Indeed, the description of development for the planning application to extend the caravan storage use specifically refers to a
‘Change of use of existing field to caravan and mobile home storage site (B8); to provide an additional 196 spaces to the existing caravan and mobile home storage facility and erection of a new office building’. It is not demonstrate either in the Sustainability Appraisals Update 2015 or the reports to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee meetings on both 30 April and 16 September 2015 where any consideration has been as to whether the loss of the Class B8 element of the site would accord with the relevant criteria of Policy CP9.

22. It further noted that the Sustainability Appraisal Report 2015 regards the loss of the employment to be only a minor negative effect unless provision is made elsewhere. There is no suggestion in Policy CC1 that any employment provision should be retained. Further, there are no indications form the promoters of the Sandyfields allocation that alternative caravan/open storage provision is being made.

23. It is pertinent to note that when the planning application was submitted to extend the storage facility in 2012 the need for planning permission was justified by some 130 people on a waiting list to park caravans at Sandyfields. It is clear that the storage use is currently a facility valued by the local community.

24. The same concerns about the loss of jobs/employment opportunities and deterioration in the sustainability of Colden Common equally apply to the assumption that all of the Clayfield Park allocation (Policy CC2) (specifically site 888) should be redeveloped for 57 dwellings. Again, there is no suggestion in Policy CC2 that any part of the site should include some employment use. There should be no reliance placed upon the existing employment site being redeveloped for housing but the site should be retained in employment use. The Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 lacks detailed consideration of the loss of employment opportunities on this allocation.

25. The loss of 2 existing employment sites at Colden Common clearly conflicts with Policy CP9 concerning the retention of employment land and the Sustainability Objective 4: Economy and Employment. The loss of employment opportunities should be assessed as being more than just a ‘minor negative effect’ in terms of the overall sustainability of the settlement and with account also being taken of the important storage facility used by the community.
26. By reason of employment uses within both allocated sites at Colden Common the 
Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 should have concluded there a ‘Key Negative 
Effect’. For this reason, the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 is flawed.

27. It is self-evident that housing growth to the east of Main Road does not respect 
the settlement form of Colden Common and the predominantly linear (or frontage) 
pattern of permanent development along this side of the road. The Sandyfields 
allocation is outside the natural triangle of Main Road, Highbridge Road and Church 
Lane which, as identified in the VDS, broadly contain the settlement of Colden 
Common.

28. With the exception of the mobile homes park, there is a lack of significant in depth 
housing development along the east side of Main Road and this is evident from the 
Proposals Map. The proposed allocation would extend permanent housing into the 
rural aspect of the village east of Main Road by up to 360 metres which is some 
270 metres beyond the current boundary of the mobile home park. Extending 
housing development into the open countryside outside the triangle of roads which 
substantially define the settlement would fail to conserve the settlement’s identity 
and would create an unwelcome precedent for more growth the wrong side of 
Main Road. The incongruity of the proposed allocation is evident from the 
Proposals Map.

29. It should also be noted that the erection of 2 or 3-storey dwellings at Sandyfields 
site to achieve the 165 dwellings would have a materially greater impact on the 
visual amenity of the landscape when compared to parked caravans. The roofs of 
the proposed dwellings would project above the existing hedgerows. A greater 
impact on the rural aspect east of Main Road, which is an important part of the 
setting of the South Downs National Park, would arise than assumed in the 
landscape assessment undertaken by the Council which only suggests a ‘moderate 
sensitivity’.

30. Despite the Council’s landscape assessment it is important to note that the 
Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 identifies that the Sandyfields allocation 
would have a ‘Key Negative Effect’ on soils and landscape. Part of this negative 
effect must be attributable to site being adjacent to the National Park rather than 
just being Greenfield land.
31. Sustainability Objective 5 refers to transport and Welbeck does not necessarily disagree with any measured distances between the Sandyfields allocation and facilities within Colden Common. However, the assessments which have been undertaken recognise that Sandyfields is not the most accessible site in terms of its proximity to shops and the primary school and, accordingly, it does not have the same ‘excellent’ accessibility credentials of Highbridge Road. As has already been noted, these points of differentiation are not clearly articulated in the documentation which was used by the Council to determine that the Sandyfields site was the most appropriate housing allocation.

32. Further, to access any facilities within Colden Common on foot or cycle from the Sandyfields allocation requires Main Road to be crossed and then people to walk or cycle along the footways. What is not assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015, whether under Sustainability Objectives 1, 5 or 6, is the effect of actual and perceived severance caused by Main Road divorcing the proposed housing from the settlement. This should have been recorded as a ‘Key Negative Effect’.

33. For example, there are issues with the width of footways along some of the roads and some of the footpaths are not safe and secure for future residents. As has already been noted, the transport appraisal of all the sites in Colden Common undertaken by the County Council states that there are better located sites than this allocation. Future occupiers would be more inclined to use private cars to access the local facilities which could exacerbate the existing parking problems, especially outside the primary school.

34. By reason of the location of the site and it not being wholly previously developed land, it is somewhat difficult to understand the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 saying that the Sandyfields allocation has a ‘Key Positive Effect’ in terms of Building Communities. It is concerning that as part of the consideration of Sustainability Objective 5 in the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 no reference is made to the Sandyfields allocation being divorced from the main part of the Colden Common and its facilities by a busy road. Indeed, the fact that there is an existing access onto Main Road is identified as an important virtue in terms of the report to the Cabinet report (see ‘Is there good access onto the site?’).
35. Policy CC1 does make reference to a safe crossing arrangements but Main Road is the busiest road in Colden Common, it is congested at peak hours and traffic speeds have been demonstrated in the recent Transport Assessment to exceed the speed limit. The severance effects on, in particular, of the elderly, the disabled and young children are not properly assessed. These people are the most vulnerable members of the community, especially young children seeking to cross Main Road during the morning peak period to access the primary school.

36. What is unclear for the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015* is an assessment concerning the biodiversity of the Copse and the protected species which are known to exist within/adjacent to the Sandyfields allocation. Sustainability Objective 11 is silent on these matters.

37. The allocation at Sandyfields refers to the provision of public access to Stratton’s Copse albeit this cannot be ‘allocated’ because the land is within the South Downs National Park Authority’s administrative area. The Copse comprises Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (i.e. has been in existence since at least 1600AD) and is a high priority habitat. No information has been provided concerning the potential effects of housing development abutting a high priority habitat and the effects of both residents and other members of the community having access to the Copse which possesses considerable ecological value and is a home to protected species. Further what affect will the cats of the occupiers of the proposed housing have on the nesting birds and small mammals in the woodland?

38. It is also noted that, despite what is claimed in the Local Plan, access to the Copse does not satisfy a demonstrable need for this type of open space in Colden Common. The available evidence demonstrates that the greatest need is for informal open space (2.84ha) not woodland (0.71ha). Essentially what would be provided is a route to walk through the woodland rather than an informal area of open space which can satisfy a multitude of recreational needs.

39. Accordingly, and as a matter of principle, the allocation of the Sandyfields site to the east of Main Road, is not the most suitable and sustainable location for housing growth at Colden Common, including by reason of its location, failure to integrated with the settlement form, severance by Main Road from the settlement, landscape impact and the potential adverse harm to a high priority habitat. Alternative
allocations should be identified at Colden Common, specifically land east of Highbridge Road which can accommodate up to 70 dwellings.

40. For the reasons related to the employment use on site 888, the Clayfield Park allocation (Policy CC2) should be reduced by circa 25 dwellings to about 32 dwellings and the housing requirement also redirected towards other sites at Colden Common, specifically land east of Highbridge Road which can accommodate up to 70 dwellings.

**Element 3: Detailed Considerations of Sandyfields**

41. As is clear, Welbeck disagree with the principle of allocating the Sandyfields site and part of the Clayfield Park site (site 888) for any housing development. However, in the event the Council continues to pursue such an unsound allocations then there are more detailed considerations which also need to be taken into account.

42. The proposal is for about 165 dwellings to be erected at Sandyfields on a gross site area of around 5.6 hectares which suggests a density of about 30 dwellings per hectare. Such a density might be appropriate on the edge of Colden Common.

43. However, the gross site area of the proposed allocation fails to take into account buffers to provide a setting for existing hedgerows and trees; the need for a buffer between the proposed built development and the Copse; areas for on-site play and land for sustainable drainage features. Such green infrastructure could well occupy a minimum of 1.5 hectares of the gross site. The easement associated with a pipeline inevitably constrains the laying out of this proposed allocation for housing development (rather than being a virtue as suggested in the Cabinet report).

44. Accordingly, the actual density of the housing development would around 43 dwellings per net hectare which is inappropriate on the edge of Colden Common, especially where the site is situated adjacent to, and forms part of the setting of, the National Park. The density of the residential development would be out of character with its location and the general density of housing within Colden Common.

45. The suitability of the Sandyfields site to accommodate 165 dwellings in an acceptable and appropriate manner has been questioned by the independent
Winchester with Eastleigh Design Review Panel who have stated that (emphasis added):

The Panel felt that the site should not be driven by numbers alone and noted that the developable area had shrunk. Concern was raised regarding whether the number of units proposed could be achieved on the site in a satisfactory way and the Panel suggested that there was a need to demonstrate that a development of sufficient quality could be provided.

The Panel felt that there was a need to articulate the design intent and demonstrate how this would be delivered on the site, first establishing the site’s constraints and opportunities which should logically inform an appropriate and attractive design solution which would determine the appropriate number of units.

The Panel felt that there was a lack of clarity regarding the character areas within the scheme and considered that with the exception of the detached dwellings in the northern part of the site, the remainder was similar in character.

The Panel queried how the parking areas would be integrated and raised concern regarding the impact of these on the open space. Concern was also raised regarding the how in practice the ‘green finger’ roads would be achieved given the very tight space indicated for these features which at the very least would require more space for the proposed trees.

The Panel noted that terraces are proposed to the area interfacing with the National Park and that there is no explanation of this area. The Panel also raised concern regarding appropriateness of the large blocks facing on to the relatively small open space.

With regard to the overall design the Panel felt that this was quite urban in form for an edge of village location.

Overall the Panel felt that the scheme was lacking in design coherence and suggested that there is a need to set out the design objectives and then show how this can be achieved in sufficient detail, for example width of roads, location of trees and principles of character areas. The proposed concept and explanation of how this is carried out on the site would then underpin the numbers proposed.

46. For these reasons, and in the alternative of the allocation being deleted, the capacity of Sandyfields should be reduced to a maximum of 100 dwellings. The remaining 65 or so dwellings should be directed towards other sites at Colden Common, specifically land east of Highbridge Road which can accommodate up to 70 dwellings.
Element 4: Most Appropriate Strategy

47. As context, Policy MTRA2 of Local Plan Part 1 does not apply a maximum or upper limit on the number of new dwellings to be erected at Colden Common during the period up-to 2031. Instead, the policy refers to ‘about 250 dwellings’ and there would be scope to allocate more land at Colden Common, including land east of Highbridge Road.

48. The Framework requires that for a Local Plan to be ‘sound’ is has to be justified by adopting the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. As is evident from this objection to Policy CC1 the allocation at Sandyfields is not the most appropriate strategy to accommodate housing development at Colden Common (whether as a whole or part). Similarly, part of the Clayfield Park allocation is unsound (Policy CC2).

49. Either the Sandyfields allocation should be deleted or at least its estimated capacity substantially reduced to around 100 dwellings. As has already been identified, for reasons of maintaining a sustainable community, the assumption that at least part of the Clayfield Park allocation (site 888) will be redeveloped for housing purposes should not be relied upon. The housing capacity estimate should be reduced by 25 dwellings. Accordingly, there is a need for at least one additional housing allocation to be identified at Colden Common to ensure the delivery the ‘about 250 dwellings’ required by 2031.

50. Welbeck has an interest in land east of Highbridge Road, Colden Common which extends to include all the land known as Site 1874. However, as with the recently determined outline planning applications, this objection is proposing only up to 70 dwellings are allocated on the northern part of the site. As acknowledged in the Cabinet report ‘Site 1874 has two sides of the site adjacent to the settlement boundary and is the most contained by existing development and the roads that surround the greater part of the village of all the sites lying outside the current boundary’. Further, the same Cabinet report at long last acknowledges that this site amongst all the potential locations at Colden Common is rated as ‘excellent’ in terms of accessibility to facilities rather than just, for example, access to bus stops.

51. This northern field is also contained by substantial vegetation which, other than to allow vehicular access from Spring Lane, would be retained and augmented. Although an issue raised in the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015, there is no
suggestion that protected trees would be removed and as a result their amenity value would not be lost. As acknowledged by the recent planning application, and contrary to the implication in the report to the Cabinet report, there would be no requirement to remove significant vegetation to provide access from Spring Lane. There would be minimal impact on the landscaped edges of the site.

52. Welbeck maintain its stance that no proper assessment has been undertaken on the effect of just developing the northern field for housing purposes for up-to 70 dwellings with the southern field maintained in open use. It also appears that no account has been taken of the potential for a buffer between the housing and Highbridge Road and the screening of development afforded by the retention of the trees around the site’s boundaries (see parameters plan). The sensitive part of the site in terms of the long views referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 are to and from the southern rather than northern field. The northern field cannot be reasonably described as being ‘highly sensitive’.

53. It is recognised that the site is adjacent to the National Park boundary but the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015 usefully confirms that, as with the Sandyfields allocation, ‘Mitigation is provided to a certain extent by MTRA2 with the requirement that development will need to be an appropriate scale and design. There is also the potential for provision of suitable buffers and green infrastructure that would help minimise negative effects. Potential for a minor long-term negative effect as a result of development at these 3 sites’. What this assessment does not say is that is that the site is unsuitable in landscape terms because of its proximity to the National Park. As already noted, the Council’s landscape appraisals fail to acknowledged that a suitable Green Infrastructure buffer can been provided to reflect the comments in the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015.

54. Recent applications have also quashed any claim or concern that the proposed housing development would cause any significant harm to the setting of the heritage assets of Brambridge House and Park. It can no longer be objectively claimed that the site only performs ‘moderately’ in respect of any effect on heritage assets which is the assessment made in the Cabinet report. The ability for the public to walk across the southern field and to formally enjoy the view along the avenue of trees which frame Brambridge House is missing as a benefit in the appraisals.
55. The southern field would provide an opportunity for informal recreation of the type which the evidence demonstrates is required in Colden Common. Unlike the Sandyfields allocation the informal open space could be identified in this Local Plan because it falls within the plan area rather than the National Park.

56. The recent applications have also demonstrated that, although within the mineral safeguarding area, there is no requirement by the Minerals Planning Authority for the mineral to be extracted before development. Accordingly, this matter is not a negative factor which should weigh against the allocation of the land for housing development as indicated in both the Cabinet report and the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015*. When this matter is taken together with the ability to retain protected trees, the site is not adversely affected by constraints.

57. Because of the lack of a complete assessment of housing development occurring on only the northern part of Site 1874, the following table adopts the Sustainability Objectives identified in the *Sustainability Appraisal Report* and the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015* and applies them to the proposal identified on the accompanying parameters master plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Objective</th>
<th>Assessment of Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Communities</td>
<td>The site is located at Colden Common and therefore accords with the locational requirements of Local Plan Part 1. The site would involve the development of greenfield land but the need for the release of such land is acknowledged as being necessary to meet the housing requirements. The site falls within the settlement form of Colden Common as defined by the triangle formed by Main Road, Highbridge Road and Church Lane. Development would be contained by strong physical features rather than encroach into the rural aspect of the surrounding countryside. The site is not severed from the built-up area by a busy road. The site is situated adjacent to the key facilities within Colden Common, including the primary school and local shops. There are no particular issues of severance associated with all members of the...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The site is adjacent to the National Park. Mitigation is provided to a certain extent by MTRA2 with the requirement that development will need to be an appropriate scale and design. There is also the potential for provision of a suitable Green infrastructure buffer that would help minimise negative effects – as suggested in the *Sustainability Appraisal Update 2015*. Potential for a minor long-term negative effect as a result of development but positive by providing an area of open space which enables views to be enjoyed towards Brambridge House and Garden and the wider river valley.

2. **Infrastructure**

Vehicular access to the site from Spring Lane has the technical approval of the Highway Authority and has been the subject of a road safety audit. No protected trees of merit or other significant vegetation would need to be removed to provide the access.

The opportunity to provide land for informal open space of the type demonstrably required at Colden Common and provides the opportunity to improve the biodiversity of the site.

The site does not adjoin any national or local ecological designations. The proposed housing would not abut a high priority habitat.

3. **Housing**

The site can be developed for a range of housing types, tenures and sizes.

4. **Economy and Employment**

Development of the site for housing would not displace existing businesses nor lead to the loss of jobs. A valuable community resource would not be lost.

By reason of the proximity to the shops there is the greater potential for the future occupiers to use these facilities because they are within easy walking distance.

5. **Transport**

The site has ‘excellent’, easy and direct access to the key local facilities within Colden Common, including the shops and the primary school, and the bus stops providing ready access to Winchester and Chandlers Ford.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By reason of its location, there is excellent, easy, direct and safe access to these facilities from the site without the need to cross a busy road. There would be no worsening of the parking problems at these facilities because of the ease of access on foot or cycle. The principle of the proposed vehicular access from Spring Lane has been agreed with Hampshire County Council. The public right of way within the southern field would be unaffected by the proposed built development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Informal open space provides the opportunity to promote a healthy lifestyle and the location adjacent to the main facilities provides the opportunity for walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>The location of the site within a groundwater source safeguarded zone and on an aquifer are acknowledged. However, subject to appropriate conditions, no objections to the proposal were submitted by the Environment Agency or the Lead Drainage Authority to the recent planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>As with other sites this objective is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>As with other sites this objective is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sustainable Construction</td>
<td>As with other sites this objective is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>The site does not adjoin any national or local ecological designations or a high priority habitat. As is demonstrated by the illustrative master plan, the trees subject of the Tree Preservation Order can be retained. Although there are protected species within and adjacent to the site these can be accommodated with appropriate mitigation. The informal open space and sustainable drainage system provide opportunities for biodiversity enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to a non-statutory Brambridge historic park/garden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the setting of this park and the associated Listed Building are protected by the proposed informal open space and the setting back of development from Highbridge Road.

No objections on grounds of adverse impacts on heritage assets were made by the Historic Buildings and Archaeological Officers during the assessment of the planning application.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Landscape and Soils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | No objections to the planning application on mineral safeguarding grounds were raised. In any event, to extract minerals from this site would be unlikely due to the proximity of existing residential development and the need for an adequate buffer between the workings and the dwellings. 

With housing only proposed on the northern field the development the existing built form of Colden Common (the only site with built development on 2 sides) would be respected and the impact on the wider landscape minimised, including views from the outler of the adjoining National Park. 

The trees subject of the Tree Preservation Order and other vegetation can be retained and augmented to enhance biodiversity. 

There would be a loss of greenfield agricultural land but the loss of such land is recognised as being required to accommodate development. |

| 14. | Built Environment |
|   | The site falls within the settlement form of Colden Common as defined by the triangle formed by Main Road, Highbridge Road and Church Lane. Development would be contained by strong physical features rather than encroach into the countryside. 

The site is of a size (allowing for buffers and other open areas) and be developed at a density which respects and reflects the character of other housing schemes within Colden Common. |

| 15. | Pollution |
|   | The effects would be the same as other sites. |
58. When compared to the Sandyfields (Policy CC1) and part of the Clayfield Park (Policy CC2) allocations, the land east of Highbridge Road is demonstrably the most appropriate strategy to accommodate housing growth at Colden Common because:

- There would not be a loss of employment land contrary to Local Plan Part 1 Policy CP9.
- The site is contained by the triangle formed by Main Road, Highbridge Road and Church Lane and the settlement from of Colden Common would be respected.
- The residential part of the site is the only location in Colden Common contained on 2 sides by existing housing.
- Built development would not extend beyond a clear settlement boundary into the valued rural aspect to the east of the settlement.
- Built development would contained, and physically and visually separated from the open countryside, by Highbridge Road and the proposed green infrastructure buffer.
- The future residents would not be physically severed from the settlement by a busy road.
- The site is located adjacent to the shops and primary school which are the main facilities within Colden Common.
- The site has excellent access to local facilities.
- The site can provide the opportunity to deliver the type of informal open space required to meet a demonstrable need within Colden Common.
- A high priority habitat would be unaffected by development.
- The setting of the non-statutory parkland, Listed Building and the South Down National Park can be fully respected by reason of the location of the built development.

59. In the event that the Sandyfields allocation is retained at a reduced capacity and/or part of the Clayfield Park allocation (site 888) is deleted, even with the 70 dwellings on land east of Highbridge Road then these sites together would not exceed the requirement for 'about 250 dwellings' to be erected at Colden Common during the period up to 2031.
Suggested Policy

60. Together with a specific allocation on the Policies Map, the following policy should be inserted, either as a new policy or to replace Policy CC1, for the omission site to the East of Highbidge Road, Colden Common:

*Land east of Highbidge Road, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the development of about 70 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with other relevant policies and meet the following specific development requirements:*

**Access**
- provide a single point of vehicular access from Spring Lane with separate pedestrian and cycle access from Upper Moors Road together with any wider traffic management or improvement measures that may be necessary;

**Landscape**
- retain and reinforce existing boundaries around the site, particularly along the western edge;
- retain the trees subject of the Tree Preservation Order;
- retain views towards Brambridge House and Gardens;

**Green Infrastructure and Open Space**
- provide on-site open space as Natural Green Space;
- promote biodiversity enhancements within the site;
- include a buffer along the boundary with Highbidge Road

**Infrastructure**
- contribute to the expansion of Colden Common Primary School and other infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
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Scale Parameters
- Maximum building height: 9.5m
- Minimum building height: 2.0m
- Maximum building width: 23.5m
- Minimum building width: 6.0m
- Maximum building depth: 12.5m
- Minimum building depth: 6.0m