[redacted]

……...

Mix of homes and affordability

There seems to be a good mix of home sizes with Winchester requiring 74 or 40% affordable homes, as opposed to 30% for HBC. However it is anticipated that only 25% or 18 of these will be for a socially affordable rent, which is not sufficient considering the high level of housing need in the area.

Sustainable Transport

It is positive that there will be EV charge points next to all parking spaces.

Paths and roads in the development appear to link with the 2 key cycle/pedestrian routes in the area. However there is no sign of bike storage sheds. These should be available to all homes.

Raised table crossings are needed where footpaths and the bridleway cross the roads.

Noise and Air Pollution

The Noise Assessment noted that homes close to London Road will be subject to 65 to 70 db of daytime noise. [redacted] One would assume that air pollution levels are also high here and levels should be tested. There will be likely impacts on health. Because of this, it is advised that residents should not open their windows, but be supplied with acoustically rated glass and trickle vent or mechanical ventilation. However our opinion is that mechanical ventilation should be avoided as it will increase energy use and carbon emissions.

It is suggested that to reduce noise in gardens to more acceptable levels, a 3 metre high acoustic fence is needed. However this is “not deemed practicable when taking into account visual constraints” and a 2.5 metre high acoustic fence is proposed instead. This is not acceptable. At least the inhabitants of homes close to London Road should be given an option of whether they would prefer 2.5 m or 3 m fences to reduce noise.

The Shadow HRA mentions that the in combination effects of the overall Berewood development will result in air pollution levels above 1,000 AADT. This is mainly coming from a large increase in traffic, much of it travelling along London Road. Nearby homes will be subject to the ill effects of high pollution levels, mentioned above.

To mitigate this there should be a much wider buffer zone of trees between London Road and the homes. A wider belt of trees would significantly reduce both air pollution and noise.

Ecology and Biodiversity
The site is a mix of semi-improved grassland with short perennial vegetation with a species rich native hedgerow and trees along the south-east boundary. The latter will be retained with the exception of a few metres to allow access from the development onto the London Road. Apart from this, there are only narrow turf strips around the development. This is not acceptable. The development should be encircled by sufficiently wide and dense native hedging and vegetation to allow a wildlife corridor around it. Connectivity to parkland and green spaces in the west of the development, should be maintained.

There is no detail of trees to be removed from the site. It is likely that many were removed in earlier phases. A number of trees around the periphery are being retained and there are plans to safeguard these during the construction period. The number of trees to be planted around the development, and in gardens, could be increased and include native species.

There are no badger setts on site but faunal protection measures will be in place during construction. Checks will be made for dormice, amphibians and reptiles, although none have been found yet. Foraging and commuting bats have been seen on site, but not roosting. Bat friendly lighting will be used. Any vegetation clearance will occur outside of bird nesting season. Many homes will have a variety of bird boxes, plus bat boxes and there will be hedgehog “cut outs” through many fences. Such provision appears more sparse towards the centre of the development and could be improved there.

It is positive that an Ecological Clerk of Works will be appointed by the developer for the construction period and that there are plans to maintain habitats for at least 30 years.

It is stated that this development is exempt from assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain. Is there a sound reason for this? Is it because a BNG assessment is being applied to the entire Berewood development, taking areas reserved for nature into account?

We were concerned to see that the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment just submitted, notes potential significant impacts from recreational pressure, air quality and water pollution (with the development being in source protection zone 1c for Bedhampton Springs).

Energy and Carbon Emissions
With think that the Energy Strategy Statement from Briary Energy is inadequate and provides a very poor analysis of the options. We wonder whether they have been influenced by the developer’s wish to maintain profit

levels. We welcome the avoidance of fossil fuel, but their conclusion that only Fabric First and ASHP can be considered is not acceptable.

Solar Thermal, Solar PV and Waste Water Heat Recovery are dismissed as being too problematic and not efficient enough, which we disagree with. Ground Source Heat Pumps (more efficient than ASHP) are dismissed because they require more space for installation, but this should not be a problem if installed during construction.