

**COLDEN COMMON VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
PUBLIC CONSULTATION: OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 2013**

The comments received from local residents during the consultation are set out in full below. The representations from development companies promoting their sites are summarised after the residents' comments, but are also available, in full, on the website.

No. / Name(s)	Full text of comments
Representations from Residents	
1	<p>M Childs</p> <p>I have read the report. What we seem to have ended up with is effectively a green light to developers, without any attempt at stipulating in the report any of the requirements of the inhabitants of Colden Common for additional amenities and services that have been voiced and documented at all the meetings.</p> <p>I would have thought that the outcome at the end of this process (the report) should make a strong attempt to drive out additional amenities for the residents, and with future development fully dependant upon the provision of same, as part of the planning process, and the now inevitable planning permission i.e. without additional amenities and services, no development.</p>
2	<p>M & J Blackstaff (see also 9.)</p> <p>We live at address redacted, a listed building directly opposite Site 2494 (and also adjacent to Site 1870). However, we believe that the following two comments have weight beyond our particular interest. We should like to commend the Engagement Group for their work throughout the consultation process and their very professional outputs. Predictably, we are pleased at the apparent 'unpopularity' of Site 1870 (to which the arguments put forward in this note would also apply) but are aware of the likelihood of appeal. Also predictably, we are disappointed that Site 2494 is apparently 'favoured'. Comments as follows:</p> <p>Site 2494 and listed buildings. The Village Design Statement (page 6) gives prominence to the historic (listed) buildings in the village, of which there are eighteen. We believe that Site 2494 is the <u>only</u> site (apart from 1870) whose development would directly affect <u>any</u> listed building. In fact, development on Site 2494 would directly and adversely affect not one but <u>three</u> such buildings that are adjacent to it. They are Yew Tree Cottage, King Charles Cottage and the Malt House. A fourth listed building, The Dell, is also adjacent to Site 2494 but separated from it by woodland. Winchester City Council is responsible, through its Historic Buildings department, for protecting historic buildings from changes that would adversely affect their character. If there is to be no protection of the rural setting of such buildings, then what is the point of a lot of public money being spent to ensure that the buildings themselves be protected? We respectfully request that in making its decision the Council consider the following arguments for Site 2527 as being more appropriate than Site 2494.</p> <p>Site 2527. Swift's Farm is a site only slightly smaller than Site 2494. We wonder how many of the public who 'voted' this site as 'unfavourable' (by a tiny margin vis-à-vis Site 2494) have actually visited it? It consists of a number of quite dilapidated buildings used as industrial units, and their surrounding yards, and frankly it looks a mess. However, it also <u>totally unobtrusive</u>, as would be any housing development.</p> <p>The general desirability of any 'new' sites being adjacent to the existing settlement boundary is understood, and Site 2527 would not be adjacent. However, the overwhelming desirability of using brown field sites before encroaching on green ones leads us to request that urgent consideration be given to treating Site 2527 as an exception site. The arguments put forward against this site in the documentation are also understood, but could be said to apply also to the existing residents of Hensting Lane. It is a highly desirable area in which to live, and we are not aware of a mass desertion by its residents because of their distance from the school and shops, or because of the narrow (but recently much-improved) lane. Not all of the inhabitants of the 250 dwellings that are being forced upon Colden Common will want to be near shops and the school; some will want to live 'in the country'.</p>

3	S Aubrey	<p>Main objective would be to block the developments in Lower and Upper Moors Road as they would change the character of the area and are too large for the centre section of village to accommodate. I understand from the feedback document that these two sites are least favoured by the residents of village this sentiment should be enough for WCC to understand that they would not be welcome developments in the village.</p> <p>Also to make sure the developments which are given green light have been assessed for -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affects to the main road with additional traffic during peak rush hours • Environmental such any changes to flood plains/visual impacts of new builds • Provision of school places for 4-11 year old (WCC has stated that 60 places will be added by 2015 in Colden Common primary school for Brambridge area). • Priority for local professional people, families and key workers as occupants of new builds and not freebie houses for WCC to allocate out as social housing. The village area needs to keep it's current identity and standards.
4	M Smith	<p>In the National Planning Policy Framework the government encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that have been previously developed. We know that we are outside the development boundary, but I would have thought that obeying government policy, and not destroying green fields, was more important. Also in our case the land is unobtrusive, unlike for example the only slightly larger-sized site 2494 at the north end of Main Road, on which development would not only be intrusive but also bang opposite listed buildings. It would also destroy the rural aspect as you enter the village.</p>
5	B Campbell	<p>1. <u>Object to SHLAA site 889 for future housing development</u></p> <p>a) The site is a visually important open parcel of land fronting Main Road, with a treed backdrop against the Avondale Mobile Home Park. The site provides an important open green feature/vista whilst travelling along Main Road and should remain so. It's loss to housing will lead to the last remaining section of the western side Main Road frontage within the existing settlement boundary being developed with yet more houses. Developing site 889 will effectively "close in" this section of Main Road creating a sense of urban landscape to the street scene rather than a village with sporadic open green areas.</p> <p>b) The future development strategy for the village should <u>not</u> automatically "fill in" all sites within the settlement boundary with housing but maintain important open areas of land and allow alternative uses which would support the needs of additional housing. Site 889 should become an Informal Green Space, to meet in part an acknowledged shortfall in the village. The Open Space assessment for the village states "<i>Colden Common has no single significant tract of informal open space but lots of small areas....</i>" The study has identified an overall shortfall of 1.8 ha of green space with existing housing areas along Wessex Way and Church Lane (east) as being "<i>poorly served</i>" at present.</p> <p>c) Site 889 could help to address the issue of poorly serviced areas of informal green space distribution, relating to the south east area of the village and better serve existing residents of The Glen and Avondale Mobile Home Parks which lie alongside or close to site 889. These mobile homes provide an important, alternative form of family housing in the village – over 120 units of living accommodation. Site 889 would offer a more convenient and accessible alternative open space facility and a children's play area to all village residents, as well as those mobile home families which presently have no onsite open space or play area facilities.</p> <p>d) Site 889 would serve the south east side of the village which is relatively distant from other open space/children's play areas. Site 889 is suitably located with good foot access to the rest of the village by way of well lit public footways running north and south along the Main Road and an east-west public footpath link to St Vigor's Way village centre, primary school and to other housing areas.</p>

		<p>2. <u>Object to SHLAA 888 for future housing development</u></p> <p>a) The site is currently used for various employment/storage/retail purposes, and should remain so. There is a well established business operating successfully from the site and its redevelopment for housing would result in the loss of local jobs and one of the few remaining employment sites within the village.</p> <p>b) The site has existing infrastructure services for additional industrial/office buildings which should be utilised for other alternative business should the current business operations cease trading.</p> <p>c) The future development strategy of the village should not automatically seek to remove employment sites from within the established settlement boundary for alternative (housing) land uses. The local plan period covers the longer term – up to 2029, and should be flexible to cater for any unforeseen changes in the local economy and increasing reliance on providing facilities for self employed persons residing in the village and to reduce commuting to workplaces outside the local area. The planning authority would be failing in its duty to relinquish one of a handful of employment sites remaining in the village for housing. The settlement has already seen in recent years a number of employment sites lost to housing. The local plan strategy should include provision for the retention of site 888 as employment land with flexible land use policies to encourage mixed developments such as small office/retail/leisure uses to support the established employment activities on the site.</p> <p>3. <u>Preferred residential development sites</u></p> <p>To achieve a more satisfactory balanced distribution of new housing for the village with closer links to the village centre, primary school, informal open space, children’s play areas and public bus routes the development strategy should not focus on all new housing to the east of the settlement. The allocation of a number of sites distributed around the village would be more appropriate. The development strategy should identify sites at Lower Moors Road, East of Main Road (north of the Black Horse public house) and along the southern side of Church Lane, for future housing.</p>
6	A Guthrie	<p>With regards to the developments proposed in Colden Common we have objections in the way that this appears to have been portrayed. We are in agreement with the points raised in the attached document [8,9: Francis/Blackstaff]. In addition there are other points that have raised our concerns, these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would seem that some of the proposed sites in the previous reviews would have not been accepted had they been voted as preferred sites, as they were too far outside of the current boundary. Surely this would have then distorted views provided to residents believing that all sites had an equal standing and as such would have voted accordingly. Meaning that residents may have chosen a different combination of sites had they been fully aware of some sites being in essence a 'wasted vote'. • There is also the matter that the proposal of the site 2497 shown on the sensitivity site is registered as least sensitive. When we questioned the result given the existence of a 400 year old oak on the boundary of this site and a 200+ year oak inside the site it was said that this would have been because the surveyor may not have been able to see the trees from the road. This is not the case as both can clearly be seen from the road and this should not have been marked as least sensitive. In addition to this the site is in the rear of people's gardens who have not been in discussions with the potential developer about this at all and again this site is not available for development. Again this distorts sites available, shows lack of consistency in information provided and raises concern about the quality of the sensitivity survey carried out.
7	P Gould	<p>Development of site 2494 would seem to me to be inconsistent with the V.D.S. especially for two reasons -</p> <p>(1) because it would definitely increase the amount of traffic travelling on the B3354 between Twyford and Fair Oak which even without traffic works is very often at a standstill at peak hours.</p> <p>(2) most importantly why build on green field sites when brown field sites are available?</p>

<p>8 9</p>	<p>R & R Francis M & J Blackstaff (Joint submission)</p>	<p><u>OBJECTIONS to the proposed development of Site 2494 (Main Road) recommended by Commonview.</u></p> <p>We acknowledge the work of the Commonview team for their efforts to represent the public's views on proposed development sites in Colden Common. However its recommendation, and WCC's acceptance, of Site 2494 as a favoured development site is seriously flawed and fundamentally inconsistent with key reference documents and processes as follows (most of which also applies equally to Site 1870, should it also be considered for development):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is inconsistent with the Colden Common Village Design Statement 2012 (VDS), in particular regarding the preservation of rural character outside the current development boundary, the rural aspect and views along Main Road and its effect on the already significant traffic issues along Main Road. See Appendix for more detail. 2. It is inconsistent with Commonview's own declared Aims 3, 4, 5 and 6 which reinforce the above. See Appendix. 3. Between July and late August 2013 the WCC Landscape Assessments of sites 2494 (Main Road), 1870 (Highbridge Road) and 2561 (Church Lane) changed significantly and without any explanation. In July the assessments favoured 2561 (at that time "not considered a sensitive location") over the other 2 sites ("sensitive locations") yet by late August the situation had been reversed. Taken with other events the impression given is that a series of adjustments were made to the assessments to ensure that certain sites would be targeted for development regardless of the statutory requirement for objective and independent assessment of the best options for the village. 4. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires an objective assessment of all of the evidence <u>before deciding a planning strategy</u>. The central theme of the NPPF is 'sustainable development' where sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves do not mean worse lives for future generations. The NPPF includes, amongst other requirements, the need to assess the impact of any proposed development on listed buildings and their settings. This was not considered in the Commonview process. Development of Site 2494 could not fail to harm the setting of <u>three</u> listed buildings. The Commonview report identified other similarly rated sites whose development would not affect any listed buildings, which were eliminated at the time of the decision to adopt the 'Main Road Development Strategy'. This approach is fundamentally wrong; and this 'strategy' gives the impression of being a convenient means by which to try and justify the exclusion of certain sites from development without due regard for an objective and complete assessment of them all. See Appendix. 5. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the same obligations to assess the impact on listed buildings but more strongly worded (see Appendix). Winchester Local Plan Part One also sets obligations regarding listed buildings and the prioritisation of brownfield sites. <p><u>APPENDIX (Section numbers correspond with paragraph numbers on the 'Objections' page)</u></p> <p><u>1. Inconsistency with the Village Design Statement (VDS)</u></p> <p>Of several possible examples, the following extracts make clear the strong wishes of residents to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "... ensure the preservation of a green, natural patchwork of fields and woodland around the village." (VDS, page 9) • [preserve] "the tree lined rural aspect between the village and Twyford, along the B3354." (VDS, page 10) • [mitigate and not make worse] "the amount of ... traffic using" [the Main Road] "and the congestion which develops at peak periods." (VDS, page 18). <p>Development of Site 2494 would be inconsistent with all of the above.</p>
----------------	--	--

		<p><u>2. Inconsistency with Commonview’s declared aims</u></p> <p>Following are four of the ten published aims of the Colden Common Community Engagement Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The VDS principles are adhered to.” (Aim 3) • “The type of housing provided is sustainable and meets the needs of local residents.” (Aim 4) • “To conserve and where possible enhance our rural village environment.” (Aim 5) • “To protect significant local views.” (Aim 6) <p>Development of Site 2494 would be inconsistent with all of the above.</p> <p><u>3. Inconsistencies in Landscape Assessments</u></p> <p>No further detail necessary.</p> <p><u>4. Inconsistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</u></p> <p>Numerous references to conserving and enhancing the historic environment in the NPPF, including the whole of section 12.</p> <p><u>5. Inconsistency with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</u></p> <p>Section 66 (1) of the Act: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”</p>
10	B Kitchen	<p>We must admit that after attending and contributing to some of the workshops on the proposed development of Colden Common earlier this year that we were surprised that site 2494 was suddenly both added as a site and identified as one of the most preferred development areas. When site 2494 was added, we certainly don’t feel that we had the opportunity to review the change to the plans and priorities before the recommendation was made. However we did trust that due process had been followed.</p> <p>Based on the comments in the attached document [8,9: Francis/Blackstaff], we would urge you to review the situation and assess whether or not the preference for site 2494 (and potentially other sites) is appropriate. We ask you to ensure all of the facts regarding planning and the design statement have been taken into consideration and that there is a clear audit trail as to why the conclusions have been reached.</p>
11	M Thornley	<p>We wish to confirm our support and endorsement for the objections put forward by our neighbours from 34 Main Rd (Michael & Jenny Blackstaff) in their letter to you dated 14th Nov 2013 and the attached document “Objections to site 2494...”.</p> <p>We are strongly supportive of the efforts made by Common View on behalf of the residents of Colden Common and in writing this letter of support we do so in the belief that the scoring of this particular field in lieu of a less obviously visually impacting site at the southern end of the village could well have been different on any other occasion.</p> <p>The following is a copy of our initial letter and which in essence also makes known our views relating to site 2494 (also 1870 which seems to have been supported by others also in Colden Common in light of the recent proposals put forward to WCC).</p> <p>Additionally, we have received recent “flyers” from Wellbeck developers which one supposes could impact on the Common View recommendations should in fact this area receive planning approval in the interim period before all development matters affecting Colden common have been concluded? Presumably this issue will be monitored by Common View and its impact considered as matters progress?</p>
12	W Taylor	<p>As a resident of Colden Common not directly effected by the proposed development referred to in the attached document [8,9: Francis/Blackstaff] I would nonetheless very much like to add my support to the points raised in this document.</p>

13	B Hirst	<p>In response to the publication of the findings from the Community Engagement Event that was held on the 21 July 2013, Swifts Property Ltd wish to express their disappointment that CCPC have chosen to discount Swifts Farm from the proposed development strategy for Colden Common.</p> <p>The responses received from the residents are based upon the questions you posed and whilst you maintain that Swifts Farm was not favoured in the residents survey such information conflicts with the information derived from the survey we conducted at the very same event and which showed that 82% were happy to see Swifts Farm developed for housing and only 18% said the site should be retained for employment and not developed for housing. It was evident from our survey that a significant majority of the residents do not wish to see Swifts Farm developed for industrial purposes and their desire is to see Swifts Farm redeveloped with a low density residential development in keeping with the residential housing in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>It would appear there may be conflicting Government guidelines for in the National Planning Policy Framework the Government seeks to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has previously been developed. Although we may be outside the said development boundary the development of a brown field site would be more attractive to many residents than the destruction of a green field bang opposite listed buildings.</p> <p>How you can propose the destruction of a green field site in preference to the use of a brown field site beggars belief.</p>
14	S Herbert	<p>We would like to register our support for the strategy purposed by not building on greenfield sites in Colden Common, and the development of Sandyfield Nursery, Clayfields and the land off Main Road.</p>
15	E Rothead	<p>I am happy to confirm that I am supportive of the strategy that has been developed, to focus new build on sites around Main Road.</p>
16	E O'Connor	<p>I would like to support the comments made in the document "Objections to Site 2494" [8,9: Francis/Blackstaff], which has been developed by Commonview. I completely agree that a development at this location will have a disastrous effect on the amount of traffic using this road particularly at rush hour. Even now the back up of traffic along this road into Twyford during peak morning hours is intolerable and on some mornings actually prevents me from leaving my house by car.</p> <p>As owners of a listed building next to this site, I also completely agree that development of the site will negatively impact on the setting of these older type building along this stretch of road in a village that already suffers from the over development of high density housing. Preserving the setting of the few remaining historical dwellings is critical to maintaining the integrity of Colden Common Village.</p>
17	I Taylor	<p>Further to latest update just a quick note to record our support for the Development Strategy.</p> <p>We hope all the hard work is not undermined by aggressive tactics being adopted by developers with plots outside the sites identified, without bias, by the comprehensive consultation exercise.</p> <p>For the record we obviously therefore agree with the resident led consultation that development should take place on mainly brown field sites along the Main Road area, rather than green field sites such as plot 1874 and those on Church Lane.</p>
18	A Osben	<p>I have taken part in several meetings to express my views and like many other villagers were grateful and pleased that our views for the future of our village should be taken into account by the City Council. Fundamentally the issue is about the <i>impact</i> on the village environment. Where any development takes place the amount of this impact on the local community must be paramount. Things such as local infrastructure as well as the 'feel' of the village must be taken into consideration, so the decision as to where this development takes place and, subsequently, its impact is vitally important. After considering all the information and seeing the proposed ideas I along with many other villagers felt that development along Main Road as the most sensible of the strategies. My thoughts as to why these are, are summarised below (these probably reinforce what is published already):</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting the development along Main Road enables residents to access the main routes away from the village to Winchester and Eastleigh/Hedge End and M27 easily. • As Main Road is already a main artery along the edge of the village, the impact of any extra traffic would only appear to be minimal. • Extra/new recreational space does not need to be created as there are two areas very close by. • The visual impact on the village and its surrounding in these areas would be slight as there are no long ranging views that would be interrupted therefore not compromising the feel of that particular part of the village. <p>I have also to add that during consultation I, along with many others, felt that development on the western fringe of the village, in particular the land between Highbridge Road and Lower Moors Road would have a negative impact on the village, and was least favoured. It is the threat of development on that area of land that has compelled me to write to air my views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlike the areas mentioned above there will be a major impact on that part of the village. There is a rural feel here, large open spaces with far-reaching views, both from Lower Moors Road and back towards the village from Brambridge. The disappearance of this would be most noticeable if a housing development took place there. • This area of land has been used by many villagers for years for dog walking to sledging which supports the idea that it is an important open space for those activities. Is Welbeck Land's proposal for more recreational space needed when provision is already supplied by the Triangle and the Park opposite the Co-op? Who will use this 'community playspace' on the extreme south-west corner of the village other than the new residents? • The issue of school places is massive. While it is understood that there will be another two classrooms built at Colden Common School the introduction of housing on this area of land will severely limit the chances of those living on the other side of the village of gaining a place in the school by 'skewing' the catchment. <u>This is already a problem where children living along Main Road cannot attend Colden Common School.</u> Housing here, along with new housing development on the eastern side of the village, will create a conflict for places for the school. • Safety is also paramount here. Children living opposite the school will have to cross Lower Moors Road when many vehicles and parents are doing the school run. All this activity concentrated in a small area in front of a school is dangerous. • I would urge the Parish Council to ascertain what the meaning of the City Council statement regarding school places for the "Brambridge area" means as soon as possible. The cynics amongst us do not want to come to the wrong conclusions regarding any decisions that the WCC may (or may have already) made. • I'm not too sure about the access onto Highbridge Road as being entirely safe - restricted sightlines and another junction (Spring Lane) not far away are my reasons for this. • Precipitation run-off. After rainfall large amounts of water run down the hill onto Highbridge Road. The fields soak most of this up, when this is built over what will happen on Highbridge Road? <p>I sincerely hope the Commonview proposals are watertight and accepted. The recent (No Trespass) signage on the land between Highbridge Road and Upper Moors Road and correspondence from Welbeck Land seems to indicate that they will not be too willing to accept a negative result from WCC and pursue the implementation of their plans through other means.</p>
19	R Harvey	<p>We are emailing to express our whole hearted support of the Village Development Strategy. We and our neighbours have dedicated a great deal of time and effort into attending all the meetings and consultations and have produced an excellent plan that meets the future housing needs of the village. We urge WCC to take the views of the villagers of Colden Common seriously and stand by the plan that has been produced both democratically and with a great deal of consideration and thought!</p>

20	R Pickett	<p>There is no need to develop the land between Highbridge Road and Upper Moors Road as enough sites have been identified to provide a gradual provision of housing over the next 20 years. This is preferable to building 120 new homes over a short period which would put unnecessary pressure on existing services such as the primary school and the doctors surgery.</p> <p>Incidentally the layout plan that Welbeck Land sent me shows Tees Farm Road marked as Upper Moors Road, which I know has caused confusion. With regard to Welbeck's layout plan, they show 10 properties with small gardens backing onto Upper Moors Road. This would invariably mean that garden sheds would be positioned at the bottom of the gardens creating an unacceptable eyesore along the road.</p>
21	G Naylor	<p>We confirm unequivocally that we fully support Commonview's position on the future development of Colden Common and consider Welbeck's latest manoeuvres to be extremely unhelpful to villagers in bringing this matter to a satisfactory conclusion.</p>
22	I King	<p>Following the unwelcome further communication from a developer who is preparing a planning application outside the village boundary, I sought some guidance from the local representatives in the area. This included advice on what was expected of residents in the current consultation period. I was surprised to learn that we (all the residents) are expected to formally show support by communicating with the Council our backing (or otherwise) for the plan we contributed to. Having taken part, I would have thought that support was implied. Realistically, this is not going to happen and it appears that WCC will hold that against us in certain (not unimaginable) circumstances.</p> <p>The process is clearly wrong - if people are not happy they normally do something about it - not the other way around. We are NOT planners, civil servants, lawyers et al and we have busy lives to lead - this sometimes appears to be a complex game in which we are at a constant disadvantage.</p> <p>I will be responding separately on the Development Plan/Welbeck application, but I wanted my view to be heard about this aspect of the process.</p>
23	S Smith	<p>I wish to express my thanks to the members of Commonview for all their hard work in formulating a strategy for future housing development in Colden Common. I feel that the proposals submitted to the Parish Council and subsequently Winchester City Council after consultation with residents will achieve the housing target AND development will be within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>I was disturbed to receive the mailshot from Welbrook Land proposing another development on land between Highbridge Road and Upper Moors Road. Although their original plan has been revised regarding density and access my primary objection is to the location.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could note my objections and include them in any further representations to Winchester City Council.</p>
24	A Torode/ Tompkins	<p>G</p> <p>Thank you for all the hard work you have put into producing the development plan for the village. It is appreciated. We are fully supportive of the plan. We also agree, strongly, with the proposal that:</p> <p>'any planning application now would be premature as the housing target for Colden Common covers a 20-year period and any site allocations for housing outside the existing settlement boundary should be dealt with by the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2. Until the settlement boundary is changed as part of Local Plan Part 2, any application for this site (or any other outside the current boundary) should be refused under current policy as the development outside the existing settlement boundary.'</p> <p>The developers have been disingenuous throughout their dealings with residents. Initially, they deliberately tried to give the impression they had planning permission and latterly have tried to sway residents (with yet another glossy brochure) purporting to meet residents needs, despite the overwhelming support of residents against development in that area and their plans. It is a very disappointing and cynical response by them to a very thorough consultation exercise in which they actively participated. We will write to them direct and copy you in. In the meantime please pass on our support to Winchester County Council.</p>

25	M Vidler	I would like to add my name as a supporter of Commonview and consider it unnecessary for any greenfield sites to be developed.
26	S Camp	I would like to add my name as a supporter of the common view.
27	P Curran	I support the Village Development Strategy but I do not support the Welbeck development in Upper Moors Road (Plot 1874). The Village must ultimately decide where the best place for development should be. The number of houses in this area would greatly overcrowd the school and give preference to those new to the village rather than those who have lived here for many years and paid into the local taxes.
28	M Holloway	As residents of Colden Common, we would like to register our support for the newly created Village Design Strategy, in particular the way it was 'resident led' and we felt that we were given a choice to where to accommodate 250 extra houses within the village. We were encouraged to see the total lack of support from the village for the large scale development by Welbeck of Plot 1874 and that the VDS reflex the communities choice that housing development should take place on mainly brown field sites along the Main Road area.
29	C Taylor	Following the Commonview November Newsletter, I write to confirm my continued support for the adopted community led village development strategy and my opposition against greedy developers and landowners attempting to breach the strategy, undo all your hard work and submit inappropriate planning applications for unendorsed sites. Welbeck's tactics over the last couple of years regarding Plot 1874 have been disgraceful and show no regard to the strength of villager's feelings as proved by the consultation exercise. I hope the Parish Council and WCC are robust in their response to these threats to our rural village. The planning strategy housing target is for 20 years. The last thing we want or need is rapid unsustainable growth. This will destroy the rural nature of Colden Common and the surrounding area.
30	C Searle	I, like many others, are deeply opposed to any development in the fields between Upper Moors Road and Highbridge Road. The company Welbeck are full of praise about how the views will not be affected, but as a resident on the edge of this land I can assure you my views will be drastically altered from fields, trees, horses and Brambridge House, to rooftops of 2 and 3 storey buildings, along with all the noise that comes with a housing estate!!!! Also, the long term noise and dust pollution from developing this site will be intolerable and could even put me out of business as, being a childminder, I probably wouldn't be able to use my garden for the children to play in due to this, and no doubt all the dust etc getting into their playroom. Can't imagine the language from the builders at the end of my garden would be acceptable either!!!! Also, whose ridiculous idea was it to turn the footpath along the edge of the field into a bridleway!!!! As a past horse owner it is a fact that the best way to get a ridden horse to go up a long, steep incline is to gallop it, so now when I walk the dog or children along this path to join the other one along Kiln Lane I will have to run (literally) the gauntlet of avoiding horses approaching at speed, plus all the mud that will be created because of this. Very safe, not!!!! I presume this has been considered by the usual "townies" that are keen to develop in every possible green space they never have the pleasure of enjoying for themselves. Finally, I am certain that as soon as the new residents move in the first thing they will complain about is the noise from the surrounding (what is left) of the countryside, which includes my livestock, and no doubt Winchester council will favour them over already established residents and expect me to cull my creatures, so that they are not disturbed!!!! Let's see if the powers that be actually take any notice of what the village wants, bearing in mind this plot of land comes under Brambridge, EASTLEIGH....and not Colden Common, WINCHESTER!!!

Summary of representations from prospective developers		
31	Bloombridge LLP	<p>On an objective assessment of the evidence, sites 1871 and 2561 should be taken forward as preferred development options. The documentation to date has not considered all the evidence, including consideration of fundamental constraints, such as the role of the National Park, listed buildings, archaeology and protected trees. These are highly influential in shaping the character of Colden Common. The 'precautionary principle' should apply as there are alternative sites, such as 1871 and 2561, that have no impact.</p> <p>We have promoted a 'Garden Village' concept that fits comfortably with the Village Design Statement and provides a very strong response to the few constraints associated with sites 1871 and 2561.</p> <p>We request parity with the preferred sites to enable comparisons to be made, based on a full and objective assessment of all of the evidence. The draft Strategy should be put on hold, as a strategy can only be an output (not an input) to the site selection process. We would therefore suggest an approach that is not so much based on squeezing development on to one or two sites, but more on how an assessment of all of the developable sites (i.e. their sustainable capacity, constraints and opportunities) produces a long term master plan.</p> <p>To illustrate the flaws in the process to date, it is worth noting that the questionnaire responses to site 2389, a designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), show strong support for its development. We conclude that these responses, and therefore the entire Common View analysis, cannot be considered to reflect an objective assessment of the evidence. At best the results are subjective, but more likely reflect a desire among respondents to locate development away from where they live, apparently at any cost (e.g. to conservation interests). That is not sustainable.</p> <p>There is logic in (some) development to the east, but a strategy at the expense of other, better alternatives is not sound. A slightly expanded 1871 (say to 40 or 50 dwellings) scores more highly than 2494 on every objectively assessed criterion. Site 1871 (and part of 2561) should be a preferred option for development and brings the added advantage of a choice of housing locations.</p>
32	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	<p>The settlement boundary should be amended to incorporate land east of Highbridge Road for development comprising new housing and community parkland. This would accord with the adopted planning policy and guidance set out in –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NPPF paras 61, 70, 73, 75 and 126 - WDLPR saved policies DP3, T2 - LPP1 policies DS1, CP15 - Principles and guidance in Village Design Statement - WCC Landscape Character Assessment. <p>The site is the most sustainable location for new development over any other potential site because of its proximity to the village centre and local bus stops, including the primary school, community centre, food store and post office.</p> <p>It offers the best opportunity to integrate sustainable development and future occupants of new housing into Colden Common, maintaining the nucleated pattern of development within the 'triangle' of roads which broadly contain the village.</p> <p>Development of the site would provide a natural extension to the village and would be flanked by Highbridge Road, which creates a defensible settlement boundary behind a peripheral screen of trees and hedgerow.</p> <p>The development proposals include multifunctional green infrastructure comprising equipped children's and young people's play space, parkland and recreation facilities; informal green space; and natural green space.</p> <p>Public access will enable a greater appreciation of the Grade II* listed Brambridge House, land within Brambridge Park and the avenue of lime trees from higher ground.</p>

	<p>Enhanced pedestrian and cycle paths will provide for ease of movement and local permeability. The existing Public Right of Way on the southern boundary of the site would be upgraded to provide dedicated pedestrian, cycle and bridleway use.</p> <p>40% affordable housing and a wide choice of homes for a range of household sizes would be provided in accordance with Local Plan Part 1.</p> <p>Proposals address the key issues of concern raised by residents at the Community Engagement day regarding the proposed access from Spring Lane, the provision of community facilities and the loss of access to the site for recreational use.</p> <p>The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment gives a misleading impression of the sensitivity of the site to accommodate development.</p> <p>Commonview survey questionnaire was poorly designed and confusing. Issues such as access, highways and the ability to provide high quality public open space were not included.</p>
--	--