

ANNEX 5

Residential Areas of Special Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

List of Respondents

Number	Respondent
001	Highways England
002	Southern Water
003	Andover Resident
004	Chilworth Resident
005	Alfred homes
006	Andover Resident
007	Andover Resident
008	Natural England
009	Andover Resident
010	Chilworth Resident (submitted after the deadline)

ANNEX 5

Residential Areas of Special Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Schedule of Responses

General

Summary of Comment We have reviewed the consultation and have no comments at this time. (001)
Response Noted
Change No change

Summary of Comment I confirm this document has been reviewed and we have no comments to make on this occasion. (002)
Response Noted
Change No change

Summary of Comment Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment. Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again. (008)
Response Noted
Change No change

Summary of Comment My only observation on the SPD is that it doesn't allow for the possibility that more recent housing developments might be worthy of protection. The emphasis should be on maintaining the sense of community, regardless of the size of house or number of trees around it. It may well be that some recent housing developments are regarded as good examples of their type and are therefore worth preserving from inappropriate development. Perhaps this
--

ANNEX 5

could be considered in a future SPD. (003)
Response With regard to the inclusion of more recent housing developments, this is something that the Council could consider as part of the future of the RASC designation and its boundaries as part of the next Local Plan process. The RASC document is a design focused document, creating a sense of community would be the focus of other planning policies.
Change No change

Chilworth Appraisal

Summary of Comment There is a portion of Chilworth which is on the other side of the entrance to the M3 motorway from the rest of Chilworth, in Bracken Place. There are a few homes there which were in a countryside location but this was missed in the current local plan. What is the best way of putting them forward for inclusion either as Residential Areas of Special Character (can this be done now?) or by inclusion in the next plan? (004)
Response The review of the next Local Plan and the settlement boundaries will be the opportunity to consider the area around Bracken Place.
Change No change

Summary of Comment In proposing that Character Area 1G apply to only two properties and then subsequently stating that planning assessments will consider developments in the context of the plot sizes of other properties in the Character Area; the SPD is risking having a prejudicial effect upon the prospects for development at the two properties and would be inconsistent with previous Appeal Decisions. (005) We are very concerned that by creating sub-area 1G and should there be a strict application of the draft policy document, whereby you compare any new planning proposal with existing plot sizes within the sub-area, it would immediately prevent any further development in 1G as a result of only two properties being included within the area. The current properties in sub-Area 1G have average plot sizes of 4 acres which is significantly larger than the average size of the other neighbouring properties in sub-Area 1B (0.5 acres) and therefore the draft SPD should be amended to both facilitate further development in accordance with Government and Test Valley policies whilst also seeking to protect the Area of Special Character. We are simply looking for the SPD to remain consistent with the evidence presented by the Council during the Planning Appeal associated with Holly Lodge and Heathfield. (010)
Response Chilworth Character Area 1G is surrounded by countryside in three sides and is only connected to the remainder of the RASC to the north. The character area itself is made up by

ANNEX 5

two large individual plots which differentiate them from the closest RASC Character Area (1B) which is however immediately opposite on the other side of Chilworth Road where the plot sizes are significantly smaller than the two found Character Area 1G, therefore it would not be reasonable to include any other plots within the same Character Area. The appeal which the comment refers to (APP/C1760/W/16/3159869 - Land at Holly Lodge and the rear of Heathfield, Chilworth Road, Chilworth) where Character Area 1B was used as a comparison took place before the draft RASC SPD was completed and released for consultation and is a material consideration. The Supplementary Planning Document does not intend to prevent development but aim to retain the distinctive local character of these designations. In principle, an acceptable scheme could be permitted in future.

Change

No change

Andover Appraisal

Summary of Comment

It would be appropriate, to provide generalised points that would serve to retain the RASC. These would include statements such as:

- single dwellings only with no sub-division of houses (into flats)
- residential use and occupancy only, except where a building has already been converted for business use (NB: in policy page 17, the building use now is a kitchen design shop, not a cycle repair shop)
- no building forward of any existing building line
- no more than one dwelling per each plot boundary with no division of plots, gardens or adjoining land
- requirement for adequate off road parking, access and driveway, which incorporate trees and shrubs that complement the road vegetation and trees. (006)

Response

- paragraph 5.6 within the general principles chapter does focus on the subject of the sub division specifically raising the issues that converting larger houses into flats can generate, the SPD is not a tool for preventing development.
- paragraph 5.7 within the general principles chapter does focus on the subject of building lines/setbacks at specifies that depth of frontages should be at least that commonly found in the area.
- The purpose of policy E4 & this SPD is not to prevent development, to amend the SPD as suggested is not within its remit; paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 within the general principles chapter do focus on plot sizes and garden development, similarly paragraph 5.12 raises the issue of spacing between buildings to ensure there is no overdevelopment.
- paragraph 5.7 within the general principles chapter does focus on the subject of car parking provision. The focus of the SPD is to first and foremost preserve the special features of the character areas which were included in the original development of a majority of these areas but have come under increased pressure since the increase in the number of private vehicles.

Change

No change

Summary of Comment

Much attention has been paid in the document to the 'mature and, well-treed character and a green feel to the roadside.' We really do appreciate the roundabout in front of our property being left to develop naturally. It is a real feature of this road. Unfortunately, this attention to the overall look of the road does not take into consideration the many beautiful trees in the

ANNEX 5

back gardens which are a feature of this area – keeping pollution levels low and encouraging wildlife. If development is allowed, then these will be felled. (007)

Response

Paragraphs 5.9 and 5.10 within the general principles chapter do focus primarily on trees within RASCs and mention that trees and mature gardens are important landscape features for these areas. They go onto specify that any proposed development would need to be designed to ensure the health and future retention of these existing veteran trees.

Change

No change

Summary of Comment

Concern about back garden developments and infill developments of small closes as stated in the policy – 4.6. We feel that there should be a blanket ban on development, not a desire to 'treat each development proposal on its own merit.' This aim of this document should be to prevent any further development. If one planning application is passed, then this allows for 'creeping development' as has been the case in the past and soon a small close is established. Garden plots in Croye Close have been sold off to build a modern house in the past and now there is a row of modern houses. Similarly, a modern bungalow in Eversfield Close was built in the garden of a house in the Avenue and extremely close to the boundary of a house in Croye Close. This document should be there to prevent this 'creeping development' from happening in the future and to protect the historic environment of the 'Croye Estate' area of Andover. (007)

Response

The purpose of the RASC SPD is to protect the areas identified within the designation from inappropriate development; its purpose is not to completely restrict development within these areas entirely.

Change

No change

Summary of Comment

Para. 1.2 The size of any proposed or original plot, when sub-divided, is not significantly smaller than those in the immediate vicinity; and

The real importance in this phase is 'those'. There have been historical aberrations, like Eversfield Close and Ambleside, which should not be used as precedent going forward because they are outliers of the remaining character in the area. The Avenue area has character in spite of these historic blips, not because of it. By applying a precedent to some of the least characterful buildings we will start a race to the bottom in standards. (009)

Response

While they may have been constructed later than those along The Avenue, the dwellings on Eversfield Close are large, single family homes set within large plots and have become a part of the character of Area 1B when compared to the summary on page 17 of the document. Criterion b) of policy E4 requires any future development's size, scale, layout, type, siting and detailed design is compatible with the existing character of that found within the Residential Area of Special Character. Local Plan Policy E1 requires development to be of a high standard in terms of design and local distinctiveness.

ANNEX 5

Change
No change

Summary of Comment
<i>Page 32. Any 'densification' brought about by sub-dividing plots or by rear development should be avoided.</i>
Strongly support this sentiment. (009)

Response
Noted

Change
No change

Summary of Comment
<i>Figure 1E-1 ; The well vegetated traffic island to the left of the view lends an especially leafy character to this section of the street</i>
Support this view and it does not need heavy handed maintenance as community spirit keeps it in check. The top island provides a barrier between houses preventing overlooking. The top island makes for a better street aspect compared to the bottom island which is overly and aggressively thinned. (009)

Response
This SPD cannot prevent the vegetation from being maintained appropriately for the purpose of highway safety.

Change
No change

Summary of Comment
A lot of the views in the report are solely about how it looks from the front aspects. The rear aspects should also be considered in future work. (009)

Response
This is something that the Council could consider as part of the future of the RASC designation as part of the next Local Plan process, however rear aspects are largely private and not generally subject to public views.

Change
No change