

# Appendix 2

## Issues and Options Questionnaire

Live for the Future  
Local Development Framework (LDF)  
Core Strategy Issues and Options  
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We hope you will answer as many questions as you feel are relevant to your interests, or where you live or work. Where specified, please expand on why you have chosen an option. If there is not enough room on the printed form, please attach additional sheets referencing the question number.

Please return this form to:

**ldf@winchester.gov.uk** or Head of Strategic Planning  
Winchester City Council  
City Offices  
Colebrook Street  
Winchester  
Hampshire  
SO23 9LJ

**By 5pm on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2008**

<b>Would you like us to keep you informed of the progress of this campaign?</b>	
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If yes, please provide us with your full contact details</i>	Title .....
	First Name <b>The City Of Winchester Trust</b> .....
	Last Name .....
	Address Line 1 <b>.The Heritage Centre</b>
	Address Line 2 <b>32. Upper Brook Street</b>
	Town <b>. WINCHESTER.</b> .....
	Post Code <b>SO23 8DG.</b> .....
	Contact Telephone Number <b>01962851664.</b> .....
	Email Address <b>secretary@cityofwinchestertrust.co.uk.</b> .....

## Background information

Not applicable

Respondent Type			
Member of Public	<input type="checkbox"/>	Government Agency/ Statutory Body	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action/ Resource Group/ Voluntary/ Charitable Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Private Sector	<input type="checkbox"/>
County/ District/ Unitary Authority/ Regional Assembly	<input type="checkbox"/>	MP/ MEP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parish/ Town Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

## THE VISION

The Core Strategy will provide a vision which sets out how the District wishes to change in the future and what type of place it will become over the next twenty years. The Council's proposed Spatial Vision is:

**“Winchester District will evolve and develop as a vibrant and sustainable place to live, work and do business by harnessing the talent and vitality of our diverse communities. New enterprise will deliver sustainable solutions for housing, commerce, transport and other services, whilst promoting and enhancing the District’s rich historical townscape and wider rural landscape”.**

1a. Is this an appropriate vision for the next 20 years?

*(Please tick one box to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with this vision).*

Strongly Agree

Agree

Neither

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

but subject to our comments on the detailed proposals.

1b. If you disagree with this vision, please give examples of what should be included in an alternative vision

Having answered yes to 1a there is no need to answer this question, but we would like to see embodied in the expression of the vision the recognition that changing circumstances could alter government policy, so that local policies should remain flexible in either direction. It is generally assumed that the government’s attitude to the SE will mean that any changes will further increase provision over the 20 year period. This is not necessarily the case. Apart from the likelihood of changes of government and/or growing priority given to climate change measures (that would reduce development), it is also evident that the Panel Report on the South-East Plan places a disproportionate increase in growth, first of all on Hampshire and secondly on Winchester, which might need to be corrected.

## THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The vision and strategic objectives provide a clear forward direction for the District. To enable the vision to become a reality the following strategic objectives are proposed:-

**Objective 1:** Creation of an economy that promotes the varied talents of the District, building on the creative and knowledge based industries that exist, whilst developing the agricultural, tourism and cultural assets of our historic towns and villages and valued landscapes, by ensuring that there are a range of sites and premises available for businesses to set up and expand to meet their full potential and provide jobs to use the skills of the District's population;

**Objective 2:** Provision of a range of housing types and tenures to address the varied housing needs of the Districts' population whilst reducing carbon emissions;

**Objective 3:** Protection and enhancement of Winchester District's most valuable environments, whether these are urban or rural or involve the built or natural environments, to ensure that the changes we are seeking maintain the District as a special place;

**Objective 4:** For the District to mitigate against impacts of and adapt to the impacts of climate change, through promoting lifestyles and maximising the use of technologies that are available to reduce waste and carbon emissions,

**Objective 5:** Provision of the necessary services and support facilities in the right places at the right time, including health, education, shopping etc, to ensure our existing and new communities are attractive and safe places to live and work, and encourage sustainable transport alternatives that reduce the use of the private car and enable people to live close to where they work;

**Objective 6:** Maximise new opportunities for walking, cycling, sport and recreation/play to promote healthy lifestyles and to reduce the need to use the car.

2. Do the above 6 objectives deliver the vision?

*(Please tick one box for each objective to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with this vision).*

**2a. Objective 1** Strongly agree, but there is an inherent conflict between this objective and Objective 3. It is unlikely that it will be possible to provide for the full potential for business growth and at the same time retain the quality of "our historic towns, villages and valued landscapes". To have credibility the objective must indicate priorities. For example, is the provision for expanding business to be infinite and take precedence over the quality of the environment or vice versa? In the opinion of the CWT some aspects of the environment must be made sacrosanct; Objective 1 should acknowledge the conflict and commit to an evaluation of priorities in the detailed stage.

**2b. Objective 2** Strongly agree, but is the reduction of emissions absolute or per new house? If only per new house, the overall effect would be an increase in emissions. Objective 2 should specifically include existing housing stock and commit to the establishment of a carbon reduction target.

**2c. Objective 3** Strongly agree but, as referred to under Objective 1, it is important that the "most valued environments" are clearly identified (with consultation) before commitment to any of the associated objectives. Otherwise the District could rapidly cease to be "a special place". ❖ "All our cities towns and villages face rapid change

*and if this is to be managed effectively and sympathetically, the baseline information on what it is that makes a particular place distinctive, often called the 'critical environmental capital', must be available so that informed and balanced decisions can be made.'* (Winchester City and its Setting).

**2d. Objective 4** Strongly agree – CWT has contributed to and endorses the response to question 15 made by *Winchester Action on Climate Change*. It is not evident that the Strategy adequately addresses the conflict between growth and sustainability or responds to the overriding importance of reducing carbon emissions in the plan period.

**2e. Objective 5** Strongly agree but with the proviso that it is not good enough to commit to providing the services described in this objective (and the housing and business opportunities in other objectives) while only encouraging sustainable transport alternatives. The objectives will only work to the benefit of the District if the provision of appropriate public transport is also a commitment (see CWT response to question 16).

**2f. Objective 6** Strongly agree but with the proviso that formal sport provision does not take precedence over retention of "valued landscapes". Technical planning categories may not distinguish between the two.

2g. If you think an objective is inappropriate, please suggest an alternative. We think that all the objectives are appropriate (subject to the suggested minor changes), but regard them as incomplete. Implementation of the Core Strategy will involve very extensive new development of one kind and another. Since the introduction of PPG3 the government has increasingly stressed the essential importance of good design to the success of development. This should therefore be an objective of equal importance to the others, with a commitment to finding the means of achieving it. It is neither sufficient to leave design to developers, nor to hope that it can be achieved by development control. In paragraph 4.1 of the Strategy for Spatial Distribution are the words "in recent years well designed, modern infill development has exploited the brownfield capacity of the urban area". This is not so; there are a few examples of good design but most are poor and unworthy of their setting.

In addition to making infill on brownfield sites more appropriate and acceptable to the local community, development on greenfield sites would be far more acceptable to the people of the District if it were of first class design. For example, the developer's proposals for Barton Farm are inappropriate for such an important and controversial site because they have been developer led without any design guidance. Expert guidance at an early stage and the setting of high design standards are the only solution. The local planning authority has not provided expert design guidance for a number of years.

The document also lists a public participation preference for housing to be of "traditional appearance". This is clearly an expression of dissatisfaction with the quality of design permitted in the District; traditional appearance is not synonymous with good design, but it is deemed by most people to be safer than what they have come to expect.

**CWT, therefore, urges an addition to the objectives as follows:**

**Objective 7. To ensure that new development enhances the quality of life in the District, it must be designed to the highest possible standards appropriate to the importance of the setting, and expert design guidance will be given at the outset of all projects. ....**

## THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

The South East Plan is the Regional Spatial Strategy covering the Winchester District. It puts an emphasis on existing urban areas and requires amongst other matters, land to be provided for some 12,240 dwellings in the Winchester District over the next twenty years.

These factors have led us to explore the varying role and function of the District's towns and villages and to consider the potential which different parts of the District can offer in terms of growth, sustainable development and achieving the kind of settlement network that helps to reduce the amount people have to travel in order to meet everyday needs.

Evidence gathered in a number of ways and taking account of the availability of local employment, public transport, services and facilities, has led us to suggest a broad division of the District into three areas. This division is intended to allow a clearer focus on the different needs, characteristics and pressures within these three areas:-

- **Winchester Town**
- **The Market towns and the rural area**
- **The southern part of the District that lies within the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)**

3a. Is this an appropriate way to sub-divide the District?

(please tick one box)

Yes

No

Yes, subject only to adequate assessment of the impact of policies in one division as they affect another. The Winchester Town options refer to the knock-on effect of a 'Planned Boundaries' policy on surrounding settlements. Similarly many decisions in the surrounding areas (including PUSH) may have effects on Winchester Town; these should be taken into account and, if harmful, modified where possible.

3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Please specify

none that we can see

## THE SPATIAL STRATEGY: WINCHESTER TOWN

From the District's 12,240 housing requirement, the South East Plan specifies that the non-PUSH (northern) part of the District will need to provide some 5,500 new dwellings.

Winchester Town's position, important role as a hub for facilities and services, retail and economic growth potential (confirmed by recent studies which emphasise the town's attractiveness to retailers and businesses) and commuting patterns, together with the South East Plan's recommendation to increase its housing provision, all suggest that all the options must include major housing provision in Winchester. This includes the 'reserve' sites of Barton Farm, Pitt Manor and Worthy Road/Francis Gardens.

Two options are identified for Winchester Town:-

### Option 1 Planned Boundaries

Under a 'planned boundaries' option, the only extensions to the planned boundaries of Winchester would involve the current 'reserve' major development area at Barton Farm being brought forward, together with the two local reserve sites at Pitt Manor and Worthy Road/Francis Gardens. However, other development and growth opportunities would be limited to within the current boundaries, resulting in other larger settlements, nearby having to offset this by absorbing additional development.

### Option 2 Step Change

Under the 'step-change' option, a series of options for strategic allocations are proposed, in addition to the release of the major development area at Barton Farm:

- 4a. Bearing in mind the housing requirement in this part of the District (5,500 dwellings between 2006 and 2026) and the evidence detailed in the Issues and Options paper, which of the 2 options do you prefer?

*(Please tick one box).*

Option 1

OR Option 2

- 4b. Is there a different option which will enable Winchester Town to address the issues and demands it faces over the next 20 years?

**Answer to 4a. and 4b.** CWT has always argued in favour of an approach to Winchester Town that could be described as 'Planned Boundaries' because we have been unable to envisage any other policy that would not destroy its unique character, described in the SE Plan as "a tremendous and irreplaceable asset". However, it has also been our policy that the nature of Winchester's future development should be judged on the basis of an exploratory exercise carried out by an expert and experienced urban designer leading to a conceptual framework.

We do not believe it to be possible to make a sensible choice between the two options on the basis of words alone. It is as if a householder, contemplating

the addition of further bedrooms, were to make a choice of building them in the garden or adding them in the roof. No one would go firm on such a choice without sketch drawings designed to explore all the implications in addition to comparing the pros and cons in words.

**We therefore urge in the strongest possible terms that, in accepting the imposition of 5,500 additional houses before 2026 (a high proportion of which are to be in or around Winchester) as a working hypothesis, the decision on how this is to be done should be postponed until the options have been tested by the preparation of a conceptual framework exploring the full range of how the growth could best be achieved.**

We also consider it imperative that the committed growth at Badgers Farm, Pitt Manor and Worthy Road should be part of the exploration. The present development plans for Barton Farm are crude in terms of urban design, are poor architecturally and do not take into account infrastructure, in particular the transport implications. An expertly guided design/masterplan could make the development a matter of pride for Winchester rather than an unloved infilling of a green wedge with damaging implications for the rest of the city, for which the City Council would forever be held responsible. ❖ *“This study emphasizes the interrelationship between the historic city and its sublime setting. Damage to one part will echo throughout the entire structure to the detriment of the whole. Good modern building can enhance the City, bad design can ruin it.”* (Winchester City and its Setting).

We still favour limiting Winchester Town’s boundaries for two main reasons:

1. additions beyond the boundaries are likely to devalue the precious landscape setting;
2. imposition of further growth on the infrastructure (which is already under stress) would risk damaging the quality of the urban area. In particular, we do not see how the increased traffic associated with an unprecedented growth in population would be able to use the present internal road system, meaning that road ‘improvements’ would be forced on Winchester Town and, in the process, destroy much of its character.

The Panel Report that recommends a further increase in housing numbers states that “insufficient weight” has been given to the “needs of local business” and that “heritage considerations may have been given too much weight”. This is a subjective opinion for which there is no evidence and contradicts the “tremendous and irreplaceable asset” designation in the Plan. Moreover the issue is not really one of heritage versus business, but of the quality of urban design; heritage and urban design are inextricably linked. A leading objective of the White Paper on Heritage Protection for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (shortly to become law) is given as: “Supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system.” It seems as if the Panel was unaware of this.

If you prefer the 'step-change' approach for Winchester Town, there are 4 strategic growth options for housing and/or business/commercial purposes:

- **Area 1** (North of Winchester (including and beyond the existing boundary of the MDA at Barton Farm))
- **Area 2** (West of Winchester)
- **Area 3** (South-west of Winchester)
- **Area 4** (South of Winchester)

5a. Please tick one box to indicate the area you think is most suitable for major development. (*Please tick one box*)

Area 1

OR Area 2

OR Area 3

OR Area 4

5b. Please give the main reasons for your choice. Are there any major advantages or constraints to developing any of these 4 areas? (*please indicate in your response which Area (1,2,3 or 4) you are referring to*)

**Answer to 5a and 5b.** In the same way that CWT believes it impossible to make a rational choice between the 'planned-boundaries' and 'step-change' options without an expert exploratory urban design exercise to identify the pros and cons and propose solutions, we believe that a choice between the suggested 'external' growth areas would be meaningless without a similar exercise. Indeed, the conceptual framework approach should encompass all the options.

Map 4 identifies the four areas, and the public is asked to make a choice between them giving its reasons. This is a hugely important and complex matter for which a simple answer is requested without any information regarding the implications. The question should not be asked nor a choice made without a full explanation of the landscape, transport and other factors which have a bearing on the matter.

**The CWT urges that the need for development outside the planned boundaries is treated as a working hypothesis and that the decision on where and how this should be done be postponed until the options have been tested by the preparation of a conceptual framework exploring the full range of how the growth could best be achieved.**

❖ *"It is the uniqueness of a place which gives it attraction, which gives it character and distinction. The first duty of a survey is to distinguish the essence of the place."*

*Advice to the Civic Trust on Conservation Area assessment.*

*Donald W Insall CBE FSA RWA FRIBA FRTPI SPdip(Hons), one time consultant to Winchester Council, now a Vice President of the City of Winchester Trust.*

**Questions 6 to 14 are outside the City of Winchester Trust's remit**

---

## CORE ISSUES

The following questions are based on the aims of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and explore what these mean in spatial planning terms across Winchester District. The first of these relate to the critical issues of climate change and transport.

### CLIMATE CHANGE

There are two broad potential approaches to climate change. One of these is based on meeting the various statutory requirements for reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The second is more challenging and would seek to move further towards achieving a 'low carbon' District. However, the technology needed to provide a low carbon development may increase the cost of developing and consequently increase property prices or rents and affect economic growth.

**Option 1:** Should Winchester District **only aim to meet the minimum requirements** for tackling climate change? This would include:-

- carbon reduction targets of 26-32% by 2020;
- adopting the national Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 by 2016;
- require new developments to produce 10% of their energy on site from renewable sources
- require new developments to have more locally based recycling, composting and waste management;
- adopt national standards for water efficiency, sustainable drainage and flood protection.

**Option 2:** Should Winchester District be more ambitious in tackling climate change and **aim to exceed the minimum** climate change targets? This would include:-

- setting more stringent carbon reduction targets;
- adopt PUSH targets (or higher) for the whole District: Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM Level 3/Very Good now, Level 4/ Excellent by 2012, Level 6/ Excellent by 2016.
- require new developments to produce, for example, 20% of their energy on site from renewable sources;
- have more emphasis on waste reduction, waste management on site and biomass plants;
- adopt the more stringent PUSH targets for water efficiency, sustainable drainage and flood protection.

15a. Which of the two options above is the most appropriate for addressing climate change issues for the District? *(Please tick one box)*

Option 1

OR Option 2

15b. If you chose option 2, please say why you consider that more stringent climate change targets need to be set for the District.

**The City of Winchester Trust fully agrees with and supports the Winchester Action on Climate Change [WinACC] submission on this topic**

15c. Are there any other Climate Change targets that Winchester District should aim to meet?

**The City of Winchester Trust also fully agrees with and supports the Winchester Action on Climate Change [WinACC] submission on this topic**

## TRANSPORT

Transport and connectivity are inextricably linked with issues around climate change and bring together many concerns regarding: accessibility to services/facilities, particularly in the District's rural areas; reducing air pollution; commuting patterns within and around the District and; the role and future development of public transport.

One option is to maintain current approaches but to try to make these more effective, with the aim of discouraging car use, mainly by making the alternatives more attractive. However, current policies appear to have had only a limited effect and a more radical option may be needed.

**Option 1** Transport: **Maintain and improve current transport policies**. This would include:-

- Providing bus lanes in urban areas, improving bus stops, frequency and seeking lower fares;
- Providing short-stay car parks in centres and long-stay car parks or park & ride on the edge of centres;
- Minimise car parking provision in new developments;
- To require larger commercial development to produce travel-plans;
- Provide wider footpaths, new cycle lanes and bus lanes particularly in the larger settlements.

**Option 2** Transport: **Change transport policies more radically**. This option would include:-

- Infrastructure improvements funded by transport charges to secure better public transport services; more bus quality partnerships; rail and station improvements (possibly including new stations where viable);
- Extending preferential charging rates for low-emission vehicles in car parks and residential parking schemes;
- Only allow minimal parking in new developments and no parking provision for new developments in the most accessible areas; less long-stay parking in central car parks; more rigorous limits on parking provision in non-residential development;
- Taxing existing private car parks to encourage redevelopment for more beneficial uses;
- Introducing congestion charging, carbon rationing and other measures in congested and polluted areas and at peak times; more traffic free areas; remodel more roads as 'shared space'.

16a. Which of the two options above is the most appropriate for addressing transport issues for the District? *(Please tick one box)*

Option 1

OR Option 2

16b. Are there any other transport improvements that would help address the current and future transport issues within Winchester District?

- It seems unrealistic to apply the same transport policies across the whole district. Our comments apply to Winchester town
- Policies should not be so severe as to prohibit car ownership or use of a car. The emphasis should be on reducing car use and the number of cars per household. We believe that most car owners will not give up their car but will consider reducing car use where options are improved.
- It seems unrealistic to “provide no {residential} parking provision for new developments in the most accessible areas”. How are these residents meant to get to “inaccessible areas”? Some provision, either car pool/car club or limited dedicated spaces should be available for residents cars, preferably in existing car parks close by.
- Improving Winchester rail station should not include more parking. Public transport and pedestrian links to the station should be improved eg proper pedestrian access to station from Andover Rd & proper disabled access from platform to platform.
- Park and Ride should be provided in north and west Winchester and all P&R buses should be available for residents en route
- Workplace parking levy should be used specifically to provide alternatives for commuters eg park and ride & bus/train subsidies
- Road traffic capacity within Winchester should not be improved but strategic improvements such as M3 junction 9 should be pursued to reduce the impact of long distance traffic on local traffic.
- Other radical or innovative solutions such as transshipment centres, restrictions on delivery vehicle sizes and a low emission zone should be considered

## HEALTH AND WELL BEING/INCLUSIVE SOCIETY/FREEDOM FROM FEAR

The strategic objectives include: providing a range of housing types and tenures according to the needs of the District's population, whilst reducing carbon emissions; improving the supply of affordable housing; providing accessible services and facilities where needed and; reducing the need to use the car in combination with sustainable transport alternatives and the promotion of healthier life styles.

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

There are 3 options for affordable housing

**Option 1:** In new developments, there may be alternative measures of achieving affordable housing rather than a percentage requirement as at present. This may be based on the number of habitable rooms or, floor space, or site area.

**Option 2:** New non-residential developments should provide contributions to affordable housing.

**Option 3:** Fully flexible approach - The need for affordable housing should be negotiated on a site by site basis.

17a.	In new developments, should there be alternative measures of achieving affordable housing? (Please tick one box)
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	OR No <input type="checkbox"/>
17b.	Should new non-residential developments provide contributions to affordable housing? (Please tick one box)
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	OR No <input type="checkbox"/>
17c.	Should the need for affordable housing be negotiated on a site by site basis? (Please tick one box)
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	OR No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17d.	Much will depend on the exact provisions of the Planning Bill currently before Parliament. If there were to be a general pot of contributions for all facilities, roads, open spaces, social facilities and affordable housing it would be invidious to have to decide in each case which should take priority. We would need to see how the tariffs are set. The Trust is not persuaded at present that these 3 options are real alternatives. We believe it is important to secure the maximum provision of affordable housing in any new development in the "old City" area; that it should be fully integrated with other new housing and that design standards are paramount.

## HOUSING MIX

In terms of housing mix, an issue that has come to light through community consultation is the lack of mid-sized dwellings, adding to the problem of retaining families within both the larger and smaller settlements and further contributing to the increase in commuting.

There are 3 options for Housing Mix

**Option 1:** Retain the existing approach of providing 50% small units (1 or 2 bed) on all sites.

**Option 2:** Change the requirement so that 50% of dwellings should be medium sized (2 or 3 bed).

**Option 3:** The approach should be fully flexible, with each site being assessed individually to respond to market need.

18a. From the 3 options above, which is the most appropriate for providing a suitable housing mix within the District? *(Please tick one box)*

Option 1

OR Option 2

OR Option 3

18b. The Trust considers that a flexible approach to housing mix in the "old City" is the best way forward but we believe that "market need" is not the only criterion to be considered in agreeing this. Future planning must recognise the critical importance of design and layout, the special character of individual neighbourhoods and the unique historic nature of Winchester.

### Questions 19 – 25

#### 19 HOUSING FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

##### 20 Tourism

##### 21 Business and climate change

#### HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT

##### 22 Shaping settlement patterns and gaps

##### 23 Open space, recreation and 'green infrastructure'

#### INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

##### 23 Developer Contributions

##### 24 Exceptions to Developer Contributions

The Trust makes no response on these topics

Ends

The City of Winchester Trust 11<sup>th</sup> February 2008