

Policy KW1: Cornerways and Merrydale

Overview of Comments:

Support - 6

Neither support or object - 6

Object – 4

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.

Comments in support of Policy KW1: Cornerways and Merrydale		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKJY-D Hampshire County Council	<p>Supports the inclusion of this allocation and confirms the site is available for development and deliverable. The County Council is considering Adults Health and Care accommodation for Hampshire residents, this site may form part of an emerging strategy to provide specialist accommodation. Will keep the City Council informed of any decision that will affect the of the site in advance of the next stage of Local Plan preparation.</p> <p>This allocation could contribute (indicative yield 30 dwellings) to the supply of housing required over the Plan period, or alternatively a site for essential community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and the comments regarding potential specialist accommodation provision and the site capacity are noted.</p> <p>Since these comments were made, Hampshire County Council has confirmed its intention to develop this site for a nursing home scheme of 80-100 beds. As specialist older persons' accommodation can be counted as dwelling equivalents, the existing reference in Policy KW1 to <i>'the development of about 30 dwellings (net)'</i> should be updated to refer to about 45 dwellings or dwelling equivalents.</p>

		Recommended response: Amend policy KW1 as follows: Land at Cornerways & Merrydale, Church Lane, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the development of about 30 45 dwellings or dwelling equivalents (net)
BHLF-KSAR-N8BS-C	Support the allocation, the site is in a sustainable location and was previously used as a care facility. It cannot contribute numerically to meeting housing needs if redevelopment yields the same number of dwellings, it will only be net additions that can contribute. Any net additions are likely to result in an increased density, which will need considering carefully given proximity of existing medium/low density residential form.	Support welcomed and comments on the previous use of the site are noted. The previous institutional use ceased many years ago and did not count as dwelling equivalents at the time. Hence any new dwellings should be treated as additions, although the explanatory text already notes that the capacity estimate is a net figure taking account of the dwellings currently existing on the site. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	Making use of this site at long last is a great plan, it has lain largely unused for far too long.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change

Comments which neither support nor object to Policy KW1: Cornerways and Merrydale		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)	The KW1 policy wording should be revised to allow for developer contributions to be collected towards improvement works at the Cart and Horses junction.	The site allocated by policy KW1 is not directly accessed from the 'Cart and Horses' junction, unlike the allocation at

		<p>policy KW2. Also, policy KW1 already requires development to ‘<i>contribute to any off-site junction improvements necessary</i>’. Therefore, there is no need to amend the policy to enable financial contributions to be collected, as it already requires this where necessary.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86M-T Hampshire County Council (Schools)	<p>30 dwellings is likely to generate up to 9 primary age pupils and 6 secondary. The site is served by Kings Worthy Primary and Henry Beaufort secondary. Kings Worthy is forecasting some capacity and may be able to accommodate. Henry Beaufort will be under pressure from Barton Farm and Sir John Moore Barracks so a secondary contribution may be required.</p>	<p>Comments on the current capacity of schools to accommodate the development are noted. The potential requirement for secondary school places is very modest and appears somewhat uncertain. Policy KW1 includes a general infrastructure requirement (criterion vii) which could achieve a developer contribution if justified.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8BE-X Environment Agency Link here	<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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPZ • principal aquifer <p>Water Quality. The protection of the groundwater will need to be considered as part of this policy.</p>	<p>Comments on the protection of groundwater are noted. A similar point is made by Southern Water (below), which suggests amended wording. It is recommended that this revised wording be adopted.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW1 criterion vi. as follows: Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider. <u>Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.</u></p>

<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86Z-7</p>	<p>The GP surgeries that serve these potential sites are currently over-subscribed by 10,900 and the additional dwellings from the local plan will add a further 581 patients. The NHS will be seeking financial contributions to increase the primary care space by a further 46 sq m.</p> <p>The Winchester surgeries and PCN have been clear that it does not feel able to absorb any further increases in population without significant further investment in primary care infrastructure. Due to the additional healthcare activities that will derive from the Local Plan there should be references in policy KW1 to the requirement for impacts to be mitigated.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Officers have held a number of meetings with the ICB to understand further this representation and others on proposed site allocations in the regulation 18 draft Local Plan. Further information has been sought from the ICB to provide more detail on the nature and scope of any deficit in GP surgery facilities and how it may be resolved. This includes confirmation of which surgeries serve proposed allocations and which may require improvement. At this point it is considered prudent for the Plan and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan to note this position and set out a mechanism to deal with any necessary infrastructure requirements arising from this request. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include the most recent information received from the ICB regarding the capacity of infrastructure and identified need for any improvements.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
-------------------------	---	--

<p>Comments which object to Policy KW1: Cornerways and Merrydale</p>		
<p>Respondent number</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Officer comment</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-NK2C-Y Southern Water Link here</p>	<p>This site is within Southern Water's statutory water and wastewater service area. There is a policy requirement for 'connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network' but since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging we have adjusted our approach and the wording of this requirement is no longer effective. Moreover, our 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) 2. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source and inform Southern Water of the outcome.</p> <p>Accordingly, we propose the following amendments to Policy KW1:</p> <p>vi. 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.</p>	<p>Comments on wastewater connections and the protection of groundwater are noted. A similar point is made by the Environment Agency (above) regarding groundwater protection. It is recommended that the revised wording proposed by this respondent be adopted.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW1 criterion vi. as follows: Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider. <u>Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.</u></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F</p>	<p>A sentence should be added to paragraph 14.71 to refer to the wider network of PROWs that surround the village: <i>“A number of bridleways and byways extend outwards from the village into the wider countryside beyond the settlement boundary.”</i></p>	<p>Comments on public rights of way are noted. Paragraph 14.71 is intended to provide a broad introduction to Kings Worthy. While rights of way are important, the fact that they exist and extend into the wider countryside is not considered to be such a key characteristic of Kings Worthy that it needs to be recorded here.</p>

ANON-KSAR-N8NE-A	<p>Detailed consideration must be given to the increased volume and speed of traffic along Church Lane resulting from this development. Church Lane is narrow and one-way at certain points. An increase of 30 dwellings poses a significant risk to pedestrians. The site needs development but not without significant improvements for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Recommended response: No change</p> <p>Comments on traffic and pedestrian safety are noted. Paragraph 14.74 refers to the need to improve pedestrian and cycle links, so far as the constraints of Church Lane allow, and Policy KW1 criterion ii. requires safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access to the site and contributions to off-site junction improvements where necessary. However, it is accepted that off-site improvements to pedestrian or cycle routes may be needed, not just to 'junctions'. Therefore the reference to off-site improvements should be broadened by adding the words 'or other'.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW1 criterion ii. as follows: Provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access from Church Lane and contribute to any off-site junction <u>or other</u> improvements necessary.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GD-2	<p>If this site is developed for families it will add a lot more traffic to Church lane and another junction close to a hazardous junction at Mount Pleasant. This site would lend itself to housing for older persons.</p> <p>The location of the site and the properties surrounding it does not appear to lend itself to great permeability. However, there is an access path from Willis Waye to the back part of the site which should be retained and</p>	<p>Comments on traffic and pedestrian safety and accessibility are noted. The access path from Willis Waye appears to be a private property access so it would not be appropriate to require this to provide pedestrian, cycle, etc access to the site. However, Willis Waye already links directly to Church Lane and there is an additional existing link via Mount Pleasant. It is important to read the Local</p>

	permeability for pedestrians, cyclists and motability scooters should be facilitated with dropped kerbs where appropriate.	Plan as whole as sustainable and active travel is dealt with in a separate topic. This is a very specific issue that can be dealt with as part of the design process. As part of the design process, an applicant will be required to prepare and submit a Design and Access Statement that will need to consider and take into account all users' needs irrespective of gender, age or disability. Recommended response: No change
--	--	---

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	None.	N/A
Comments from HRA	None.	N/A

Policy KW1: Cornerways and Merrydale

Land at Cornerways & Merrydale, Church Lane, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the development of about ~~30~~ **45** dwellings **or dwelling equivalents** (net). Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific development requirements:

Nature & Phasing of Development

- i. As a brownfield site, there is no restriction on the phasing of development.

Access

- ii. Provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access from Church Lane and contribute to any off-site junction **or other** improvements necessary.

Environmental

- iii. Undertake an arboricultural survey and retain important trees within the site, particularly fronting Church Lane;
- iv. Ensure that development is designed so as to protect the setting and important views of the conservation area and listed buildings along Church Lane, to the south of the site.

Other Infrastructure

- v. Open space to serve the development in accordance with policy NE3.
- vi. ~~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.**
- vii. Identify and contribute to infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

KW12: Cornerways and Merrydale, Church Lane, Kings Worthy

Proposed use: Residential use



IIA Objective	Score
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	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA11: historic environment	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA12: natural resources	Minor negative (-)
IIA13: water resources	Minor 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: Major negative (--); 1b: Major positive (++); 1c: Major negative (--); 1d: Major negative (--); 1e: Minor positive (+); 1f: Major negative (--); 1g: Major positive (++); 1h: Major positive (++); 1i: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site is not within 1,200m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 400m 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 within 201-400m 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: Minor negative (-); 4c: Negligible (0); 4d: Negligible (0); 4e: Major negative (--); 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 above 50 dB or the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are above 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 not within 1,200m 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: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site has low 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: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 12a: Major positive (++); 12b: Minor negative (-); 12c: Negligible (0)

Justification: The majority of the site contains brownfield 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. Less than 25% of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

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

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site falls within a Source Protection Zone 2 or 3, falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (groundwater), or falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (surface water).

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.