

Winchester District Development Framework

Core Strategy – Issues and Options

December 2008

Settlement Hierarchy and Development Strategy for settlements within the Market Towns and Rural Area

Analysis of Consultation Responses

Settlement Hierarchy and Development Strategy (incorporating Key and Local Hubs)

Introduction

CAB 1743(LDF) Appendix A – proposed the following settlement hierarchy to be carried forward through the LDF :-

That the term key and local hubs are replaced and the following settlement hierarchy of:-

Market Town

Large local centre

Small local centre

Villages

is established using a range of data including catchment populations, population changes, provision of services and facilities that can be used on a daily basis, including public transport and local character. The settlements across the Winchester District will be assessed to determine which category they fall within.

This methodology establishes not only a consistent approach to be applied across the District but will also reinforce the role and function of the larger more sustainable settlements both individually and collectively.

At the meeting discussing CAB 1743(LDF) Appendix A, a number of detailed comments were made relating to the detail of the report and the differentiation and distinctions between the levels of the proposed hierarchy. This matter was consequently deferred for further consideration and analysis.

The suggested hierarchy has therefore been re-examined, taking into account the concerns raised at the last meeting, and this paper examines the hierarchy in more detail and provides recommendations as to which settlement would fall within which level together with the development strategy to be followed in each.

Summary of Issue and proposed options

There are over fifty settlements within the Winchester District varying from self-sufficient market towns of a few thousand population, to small hamlets of a few dwellings originally serving the agricultural industry. A large part of the rural area lies within the proposed South Downs National Park and the attractiveness of the countryside has been influential on how places have evolved and now function.

The Issues and Options document therefore proposed options for a settlement hierarchy to be followed through the LDF which aimed to address development needs at a local level, ensuring settlements remain sustainable in terms of economic, social well being and respecting environmental constraints, whilst making an appropriate contribution to the overall targets required to be delivered across the District.

This paper examines the details of the settlement hierarchy in addition to considering the responses to question 7 and 8 of the Issues and Options questionnaire which proposed three development options for each of the proposed designated Key and Local Hubs:-

Key hubs	Local hubs
Alresford Bishops Waltham Wickham Whiteley	Denmead Colden Common Kings Worthy Waltham Chase Swanmore

Key hubs were defined as:- *Accessible service centres, where the presence of a range of services and facilities can: support a concentration of economic and social activity and opportunities for significant further change; act as a focus for a surrounding cluster of lower-order settlements and; reduce the need to travel by car.*

And local hubs as:- *Settlements with a lower level of service provision than the key hubs, which may have the capacity to accommodate change and provide access to improved local services within the surrounding area and, thereby, contribute to the aim of reducing dependence on travel by car.*

In terms of the Key Hubs the following development options were proposed. The number of dwellings (as shown in Options 2 and 3) is an indication of a level of growth that would be required to sustain the roles of the Key Hubs as proposed by the options.

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Key hub role	Options 3 : Step Change to become a larger or more specialised service centre
<p><i>Maintain existing boundary (including release of site reserved for housing purposes under Policy H2 of the adopted Local Plan - Spring Gardens Alresford)</i></p>	<p><i>Allow for some growth to ensure that the role and function of the hub is maintained and offer opportunities to become more sustainable</i></p>	<p><i>Key hubs would be able to develop beyond their existing boundaries in a sustainable and planned manner to create a new specialist/niche role for themselves by being a local focus for economic and commercial activity.</i></p> <p><i>See Maps 6 – 9 for an indication of options to achieve this level of change.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to remain within current planned limits - this includes existing sites with planning permission for development and sites reserved for future use through the adopted Local Plan • reliance on the re-use of brownfield sites • affordable housing to be delivered at 50% on all sites either through on-site provision or financial contributions • all opportunities for development to maximise the amount of housing delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To examine the boundaries of the settlement to identify land for up to 150 dwellings in each hub in addition to local reserve site • provision of social and physical infrastructure to meet development needs and benefit the wider community • creation of park and walk sites to improve parking provision and support the town centres • a greater range and mix of both market and affordable housing to serve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify land for at least 300 dwellings in each hub in addition to local reserve site • maximise tourism potential as 'places to visit' and where appropriate 'gateways to the national park.' • Opportunities to promote the evening economy would be greater building on economic growth • 40%- 50% of new housing to be affordable • Provision of new premises for employment purposes to serve both the existing and new

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Key hub role	Options 3 : Step Change to become a larger or more specialised service centre
<p>with densities at a minimum of 40 dwellings per hectare,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to the size of sites there will be limited opportunities to maximise the use of sustainable construction techniques and provision of on-site renewable energy • all commercial premises are retained or redeveloped for businesses uses to ensure the stock of employment land is not reduced • limited development opportunities will limit the amount of social and physical infrastructure needed and likely to be achieved and may put pressure on existing facilities and resources. • retain and improve where possible existing greenspace and 	<p>local needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • affordable housing would need to be achieved through 50% on site provision on sites greater than five units • housing densities would be a minimum of 40 dwellings per hectare • greater support to local shopping facilities with more people living and working in the area, and opportunities for an improved evening economy to be created and sustained • developments would be required to maximise the use of sustainable construction techniques and on-site renewable energy • retain and improve where possible existing greenspace and other community, cultural/leisure/ sport facilities, and means of 	<p>population in sustainable locations to reduce the need to travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger developments have the benefit of being able to be designed to deliver densities over 40 dwellings per hectare, but 40 dph would be an average • New development could provide greater opportunities for improved public transport services • Inclusion of sustainable construction techniques and design mechanisms to ensure new development maximises its renewable energy potential and minimises its carbon emissions • Improvements to existing services and facilities would allow neighbouring settlements to become more

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Key hub role	Options 3 : Step Change to become a larger or more specialised service centre
other community, cultural/leisure sport facilities.	access without having to rely on car use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commercial premises are retained or redeveloped for businesses uses, plus additional limited provision • Improvements to the existing services and facilities would allow neighbouring settlements to access these rather than having to travel further afield. 	reliant on these rather than having to travel further afield for goods and services.

The options for the proposed Local Hubs are set out below and again the levels of development as suggested by Options 2 and 3 could offer a number of benefits to either maintain the Local Hub role or to grow and rise to Key Hub status. This number of dwellings may come from a number of smaller sites rather than a single large site.

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Local hub role	Option 3 : Step Change to become a Key hub
<i>Limit development to within the existing defined boundary which has planning permission + redevelopment and infilling</i>	<i>Allow limited growth to support the retention of local services and facilities including release of local reserve site</i>	<i>Promotion of sustainable development to enable the local hub to grow with a corresponding level of facilities and services to become a Key hub</i>

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Local hub role	Option 3 : Step Change to become a Key hub
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to remain within current planned limits - this includes existing sites with planning permission for development • 50% affordable housing to be delivered on all sites either through on site provision or financial contributions • higher density development (minimum 30 - 40 dwellings per hectare) to maximise the use of limited space • lack of opportunities to promote the use of sustainable construction techniques and the use of on-site renewable energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify land for up to 100 dwellings in each hub (including the release of the Local Plan reserve site at Denmead or an alternative) • retention of buildings for employment uses with opportunities to redevelop to serve the local employment market • 50% affordable housing to be delivered on sites over 5 units • retention of existing services and facilities including open space and recreational facilities, and opportunities for their improvement • Greenfield sites to be developed at a minimum density of 40 dwellings per hectare, maximising the use of sustainable construction techniques and the provision of on-site renewable energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify land for up to 200 dwellings in each hub (including the release of Local Plan reserve site at Denmead or an alternative) • 50% affordable housing to be delivered on sites over 5 units • Greenfield sites to be developed at an average of 40 dwellings per hectare, maximising the use of sustainable construction techniques and the provision of on-site renewable energy • promotion of the local employment opportunities, including the provision of new units for employment purposes – identify any specialist local skills/niche markets to ensure balanced communities and opportunities to work closer to home to avoid the need to travel • greater provision

Option 1 : Current planned boundaries	Option 2 : Consolidation of Local hub role	Option 3 : Step Change to become a Key hub
		<p>of walking and cycling routes to encourage local non-car trips</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • greater potential to ensure public transport is a viable alternative • provision of new social and physical infrastructure to correspond to the growing population

Public and Stakeholder Feedback

Public Workshops (Jan 2008)

Below are some of the relevant extracts from the 2008 Workshop report (the full report can be viewed at:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/LDF/Live%20for%20the%20future/workshop%20report.pdf>):-

- some villages must take small development to ensure that they do not stagnate
- growth option supported providing infrastructure is adequate to help support local businesses and improve public transport services
- town/village has reached its optimum limit
- incremental change will allow existing communities to adapt – build smaller developments rather than large ones to retain community identity
- too much growth will spoil character
- large developments will ruin the town and its character
- large village not a small town
- accept some development – natural growth incremental to the size of the village

Issues and Options Questionnaire

Options for Key Hubs

The following settlements were suggested as Key Hubs within the District;

- Alresford
- Bishops Waltham
- Wickham
- Whiteley

Three options for change and/or growth were proposed :

Option 1: existing boundaries. This would allow development only within the existing boundaries and would include the release of Local Reserve Sites (Policy H2 of the adopted Local Plan).

Option 2: Consolidation of the Key Hub role: - Key Hubs should allow for some limited growth (up to 150 dwellings) outside the existing boundary. This would offer opportunities for sustainable development outside the existing boundary and seek to maintain the role and function of the hub.

Option 3: Step Change: - Key Hubs should be able to grow substantially (at least 300 dwellings) beyond their existing boundaries. This would involve sustainable and planned development to create a new specialist/niche role for the Key Hub settlements by being a local focus for economic and commercial activity.

The questionnaire results reveal the following:-

7. Which of the 3 options listed above is the most appropriate for the future development of each Key Hub ?			
7a.	Alresford	Option 1 23% Option 2 60% Option 3 17%	
7b.	Bishops Waltham	Option 1 28% Option 2 57% Option 3 15%	
7c.	Wickham	Option 1 60% Option 2 34% Option 3 6%	
7d.	Whiteley	Option 1 5% Option 2 5% Option 3 90%	

Total responses to Alresford option = 1090
 Total responses to Bishops Waltham option = 1159
 Total responses to Wickham option = 1085
 Total responses to Whiteley option = 1401

Options for Local Hubs

The following settlements were proposed as Local Hubs within the District;

- Denmead
- Colden Common
- Kings Worthy
- Waltham Chase
- Swanmore

Three options were proposed for the development of Local Hubs

Option 1 Current Planned Boundaries: - Local Hubs should maintain their existing boundaries. This would allow development only within the existing boundaries where there is either an existing permission, for redevelopment of an existing site or for infilling between existing sites

Option 2 Consolidation of the Local Hub role: - Local Hubs should allow for some limited growth (up to 100 dwellings) outside the existing boundary. This would seek to strengthen the role of Local Hubs in the local community by supporting the retention of local services and facilities and would include the release of Local Reserve Sites (Policy H2 of the adopted Local Plan).

Option 3 Step Change: - Local Hubs should be able to develop significantly (up to 200 dwellings) beyond their existing boundaries in a step change approach to become a Key Hub. This would include promoting sustainable development to enable the Local Hub to grow with a corresponding level of facilities and services.

The questionnaire results reveal the following:-

8. Which of the 3 options listed above is the most appropriate for the future development of each Local Hub ?		
8a.	Denmead	Option 1 57% Option 2 25% Option 3 18%
8b.	Colden Common	Option 1 26% Option 2 37% Option 3 37%
8c.	Kings Worthy	Option 1 31% Option 2 32% Option 3 37%
8d.	Waltham Chase	Option 1 41% Option 2 29% Option 3 29%
8e.	Swanmore	Option 1 63% Option 2 27% Option 3 10%

Total responses to Denmead option = 579

Total responses to Colden Common option = 512

Total responses to Kings Worthy option = 506

Total responses to Waltham Chase option = 535

Total responses to Swanmore options = 529

In addition to the questionnaire responses many individual comments were made to the amount of growth for the Key or Local Hubs. Some 300 comments together with a standard response from over 350 people were made to the options for the Key Hub growth. A further 146 responses were received to the options for the Local Hubs, plus a petition of over 50 names.

The above questionnaire responses also reflect the results of independent questionnaires carried out by local groups.

Annex 1 and 2 to this report groups those summaries that make relevant comments to this part of the plan together with an officer response and a recommended action.

Other Considerations

Government Advice

The principle of sustainability and the creation of sustainable communities through sustainable development is now well established in Government Planning Policy Statements notably:-

- PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development,
- PPS3: Housing
- PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
- PPS13: Transport

In rural areas, the advice states that most new development should be focused in or near local service centres, with some limited development in other rural settlements to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities especially when remote from, or with poor public transport links with service centres.

In particular one of the objectives of PPS7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas', (2004) states :-

"(ii) To promote more sustainable patterns of development:

- *focusing most development in, or next to, existing towns and villages;"*

The guidance goes on to state that *"Planning policies in Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and Local Development Documents (LDDs) should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of development and sustainable communities in rural areas. This should include policies to sustain, enhance and, where appropriate, revitalise country towns and villages (including through the provision*

of affordable housing) and for strong, diverse, economic activity, whilst maintaining local character and a high quality environment.”

In September 2007 the Government asked MP Matthew Taylor to conduct a review to investigate how the planning system could better support the sustainability of rural communities, focusing in on the rural economy and affordable housing to *‘further support the creation and maintenance of sustainable, socially inclusive, economically vibrant and mixed rural communities- within the context of existing protection for the natural environment.’*

The report ‘Living Working Countryside’ also known as The Taylor Review published in July 2008, can be viewed on the DCLG website at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/livingworkingcountryside>.

This report makes a number of recommendations to the Government and suggests the steps necessary for the planning system to play its role in realising the vision of mixed, thriving and sustainable rural communities. It recognises the complexities of rural living and comments that rural communities cannot stand still - change is inevitable and that market towns and villages are dependant on each other for labour, housing, employment and services, concluding that the right balance of housing and employment opportunities are crucial for all communities to be sustainable.

South East Plan

The Plan (as modified) contains a number of policies which seek to influence the spatial development of rural areas and includes four key principles for rural policy development:-

1. sustainable rural communities	Which are inclusive, tackle disadvantage and provide a range of affordable housing, access to essential services and support for local community-based activities and decisions
2. sustainable rural economies	Which support and develop both a profitable land-based economy, as well as the rural-based manufacturing and service economy, and high quality tourism.
3. sustainable rural environments	Which celebrate and enhance character and distinctiveness; accept change and development which respect that character; provide for a

	wide range of recreation and retreat.
4. sustainable natural resources	Where they are used more prudently with more thought given to alternative energy sources, and the most valuable are protected and conserved.

These principles are then expressed through two spatial polices – BE4 ‘role of small rural towns’ and BE5 ‘village management’.

The Plan generally recognises the role of small rural towns (market towns) in terms of reinforcing their role as local hubs for employment, retailing, community facilities and services as they play a key part in the economic and social functioning of the area and the need to ensure that sufficient housing is provided to meet their needs. The Plan (as modified) defines small rural towns as those generally up to 20,000 population and villages as those settlements with less than 3000 population.

Policy BE4 – the role of small rural towns (‘market’ towns) states:-

Local Planning Authorities should encourage and initiate schemes and proposals that help strengthen the viability of small rural towns, recognising their social, economic and cultural importance to wider rural area and the region as a whole. Local planning authorities, through their local development documents and other means, should :

- I. Support and reinforce the role of small rural towns as local hubs for employment , retailing and community facilities and services*
- II. Encourage community-led local assessments of need and action planning*
- III. Provide for sufficient housing development (especially for affordable housing) to meet identified needs in small rural towns where this would reinforce and develop the distinctive character and role of the town*
- IV. Protect and enhance the character and appearance of individual small rural towns*
- V. Develop public transport networks which meet the needs of both the market towns and their surrounding rural area.*

Many of the District’s smaller villages would be considered under Policy BE5 ‘village management’, which allows for limited development to help meet specific housing and service needs, but also recognises that development in one location may serve a group of villages. The Plan acknowledges that villages form an important part of the network of settlements in the region and that they are often subject to either development pressures or stagnation.

Policy BE5 – Village Management states:

In preparing local development documents, local planning authorities should positively plan to meet the defined local needs of their rural communities for small scale affordable housing, business and service development, taking into account of changing patterns of agriculture, economic diversification, and

continued viability of local services. Local development documents should define their approach to development in villages based on the functions performed, their accessibility, and the need to protect or extend key local services. All new development should be subject to rigorous design and sustainability criteria.

To assist this, local planning authorities should encourage community led local assessments of need and action planning to inform decision making processes.

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

In a District context, the adopted Local Plan guides development to the most sustainable locations. Policy H.3 applies to the larger settlements on the basis that they exhibit a “depth and complexity of development that gives them a more obviously built-up character and that they also contain a high proportion of the District’s services, facilities, medical and educational establishments, employment, public transport and interchange provision, although not every settlement listed contains such provision. Such attributes complement and support the relative self sufficiency and social and commercial durability of these settlements. In terms of creating and maintaining the most sustainable patterns of development which can be achieved, these locations are considered the most suitable. They are generally capable of absorbing development which can be well related to local services and facilities and which, together with an increased emphasis on public transport and providing better facilities for pedestrian movement and cycling, can help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car.”

Accordingly the Local Plan specifies the following ‘H.3’ settlements under this policy approach:-

Bishop’s Waltham	Cheriton
Colden Common	Compton Down
Corhampton	Denmead
Droxford	Hambledon
Hursley	Itchen Abbas
Kings Worthy	Knowle
Littleton	Micheldever
Micheldever Station	New Alresford
Old Alresford	Otterbourne
South Wonston	Southdown
Southwick	Sparsholt
Sutton Scotney	Swanmore
Twyford	Waltham Chase
West Meon	Whiteley
Wickham	Winchester

In terms of shopping function the Local Plan identifies (under Policy SF1) the following settlements on the basis of the range and amount of retail and other provision :-

Main Town Centre: Winchester

Other Town/Village Centres:

Bishop's Waltham
 New Alresford
 Wickham

Denmead
 Whiteley

The issue of how to deal with residential development outside the above Policy H3 approach is covered in Policy H4 and a Supplementary Planning Document adopted by the Council in July 2006 'Implementation of Infilling Policy'. This guidance specifically examines where infilling would be appropriate in the smaller villages of the District and uses a criterion-based approach. The first criterion assesses the suitability of the development proposal in terms of creating a sustainable pattern of development and favours villages with (or with easy access to) *"two or more of the following – primary school, GP surgery or general convenience store (preferably including a sub-post office)."*

Winchester District Strategic Partnership - Sustainable Community Strategy

The Sustainable Community Strategy (March 2007) is based on five key outcomes in terms of what is required to deliver its vision. These outcomes are:-

- Health and wellbeing
- Safe and Strong Communities
- Economic prosperity
- High quality environment
- Inclusive society

As the District is predominantly rural the sustainable future of the areas outside of the built up area of Winchester Town are of key importance to a large portion of the District's population. The creation of settlement hierarchy based on how a settlement functions is a mechanism to ensure that the outcomes of the LDF tie in with the SCS and the various community planning initiatives being undertaken by the wider community.

Sustainability Appraisal

All the options for the Key and Local Hubs were assessed under the sustainability appraisal to determine which would positively progress the sustainability objectives.

Results for Key Hubs:-

“Option 1. Protects existing landscape/ greenspaces and heritage by limiting development to that already planned for or allocated. This option supports SA objectives for community and housing at a basic level but its restrictions means that it is less able to progress key sustainability aspirations for these objectives e.g. to improve access to/ availability of affordable housing and to promote improved sustainable transport options that link communities. Commuting patterns that reflect the need to travel for goods and services are likely to continue if this option is pursued. The long term benefits for biodiversity, heritage and landscape of largely conserving existing settlements in their current form are likely to be offset by the identified negative trends in terms of pollution (e.g. from unsustainable travel patterns).

Option 2 progresses sustainability objectives for housing, the economy and balanced communities through its promotion of enhanced functions for key hubs. This increased growth has potential short and medium terms impacts for biodiversity and landscape objectives which would require mitigation measures. New development has the potential to exploit sustainable build techniques whilst reflecting local distinctiveness and the expansion of service/ employment provision may provide opportunities for a more cohesive community base that is less reliant on the larger urban centres for goods and services.

Option 3 promotes a step change in development around identified key hubs leading to significantly expanded settlements. This level of development has significant short and medium term impacts for core SA objectives relating to biodiversity, landscape and heritage (these impacts may be cumulative where settlements are close to urban/PUSH area). These impacts would require strong mitigation measures to ensure habitat integrity and cultural integrity is maintained. This option strongly progresses sustainability objectives for transport, economy and community by affording opportunity for new, more sustainable developments that address identified issues relating to unsustainable commuting patterns, the availability of affordable housing and the requirement to collocate jobs and homes, supporting the long term aspirations of the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan (2003). This option also creates opportunities for sustainable design and the incorporation of renewables into developments, promoting more sustainable settlements in the long term.

Both option 2 and 3 accord with aspirations of the Hampshire Rural Market Towns initiative which aims to bring a new lease of life to market towns so that they provide convenient access to services both for townspeople and rural communities.”

Results for Local Hubs:-

“Option 1 is largely neutral in relation to sustainability objectives as the scale of development is limited and opportunities to progress sustainability objectives are

therefore also restricted. The exceptions to this occur in relation to landscape, soils and biodiversity issues which typically are most effectively supported where [development] interventions are minimal. This option performs least well in relation to economic, transport and community issues as limited development restricts opportunities to pursue social and economic growth for the benefit of existing and wider communities.

Option 2 whilst proposing a limited range of growth, implies an enhanced role for local hubs that is potentially beneficial for housing, transport, economics issues and wider community development. The progression of these sustainability objectives is synergistic. Potential adverse impacts relate to pressures on natural resources (water, biodiversity, landscape) and can be effectively mitigated at this level. There are also potential health impacts that relate to the accessibility to services where populations increase and the wider, less direct impacts on health and well being on existing communities that can occur as a result of development and change.

Option 3, the step change option strongly progresses SA objectives for housing, transport and the economy. These positive impacts are predicted as a result of both economies of scale and the ability to introduce environmentally proficient buildings and transport networks, waste management facilities close to source. The option provides less progression for SA objectives focused on natural resources (biodiversity, water, climate change) and natural features (landscape) on the basis that urbanisation of the scale suggested will impinge on the current baseline conditions. In particular, water resources for public water supplies are in deficit during warm dry summers in this region (SFRA for Winchester Halcrow, July 2007). The promotion of local hubs to key hubs will result in a significant concentration of key hubs in the southern area of the district (focused in the PUSH area). This may be the most sustainable approach given the concentration of population in this southern area and it has the potential to provide strong support for the development aims of PUSH. However, there is potential for the economic benefits of development to become disproportionately distributed in relation to the rural areas within the district.

There is clear potential to seek a hybrid option where only some local hubs are selected as key hubs and others are either consolidated or maintained as local hubs. This approach accords with guidance from the emerging RSS South East Plan which states that local planning authorities should encourage and initiative schemes and proposals that help strengthen the vitality of small rural towns.”

In terms of the SA results for the smaller rural settlements this was covered in CAB 1743 (LDF) Appendix A and concluded that “Option 2 accords with the wider objectives of PPS1 Planning for Sustainable development which seeks to locate development in a manner that supports and is in close proximity to services that can be accessed by foot, bicycle or by public transport and is therefore preferred from a sustainability perspective”. Option 2 for the smaller

settlements stated to “Allow some small scale growth and change, including affordable housing and employment opportunities, within settlements which have two or more of the following facilities, to ensure these settlements remain sustainable” (followed by a list of specific criteria).

Issues arising and Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives

The purpose of defining hubs was to attempt to clarify the role and function of a number of the settlements within the District and then to explore opportunities for these to grow and diversify to continue to serve their own and neighbouring populations. The Local Plan and other guidance set out criteria for distinguishing between settlements, whether this be based purely on population (SE Plan) or on the range of services and facilities present (Winchester District Local Plan). Few responses received to the proposed options for growth suggested alternative ways of dealing with a development strategy for these identified settlements. The majority of comments were concerned with the inclusion or exclusion of specific settlements or to the amount of growth they could/could not sustain.

The amendment to the spatial distribution strategy which was approved under CAB 1728 (LDF) refers to:-

- Winchester Town
- The Market towns and the rural area
- The M27 corridor urban areas

This acknowledges the fact that PUSH boundary extends well into the Winchester District and will continue to provide a policy overview for this area, but reflects more accurately the nature and function of the settlements that do not have a direct physical relationship with the urban settlements on the District’s southern edge and just beyond, where the majority of the growth is most likely to be located.

The implication of this change, particularly for the proposed Key and Local Hubs, is that Whiteley now falls within the M27 corridor urban area, in recognition that it not only physically relates to the existing urban area of southern Hampshire but that it displays very different characteristics to the other more traditional market towns and larger rural villages within the Winchester District.

The matter relating to development strategy for the PUSH part of the District was considered under CAB 1743 (LDF) appendix C which concluded that both Whiteley and West of Waterlooville should be the focus for large scale development within the revised spatial area of ‘the M27 corridor urban areas’ (subject to further work on their capacity and alternative potential strategic sites).

Consequently, the above spatial differentiation suggests that Winchester Town and the M27 corridor urban areas would be the focus for much of the District’s required housing and associated development. The matter that requires further

consideration is the settlement hierarchy for the 'market towns and rural area' and its associated development strategy.

An issue raised when discussing this matter in CAB1743 (LDF) Appendix A was the proposed terminology of Market Towns, Large Local Centres, Small Local Centres and Villages. To avoid further confusion on this it is proposed that the general term 'Level 1, Level 2, etc' is used to ensure that consideration is given to getting the right settlements within the right categories, rather than creating artificial distinctions through terminology.

A significant amount of data has been collated for each settlement so that they can be assessed on a consistent basis and then be allotted to the appropriate category. The main sources of data are population and an assessment of the level of services and facilities, jobs and public transport currently available within each settlement. Each settlement is 'scored' depending on the number and type of available facilities, with those facilities providing a daily function given a score of 2 and others that may be used less regularly a score of 1.

With both of these data sets there are matters to be borne in mind; with population data this is readily presented at parish levels but requires adjustment to reflect settlements, there is also the issue of whether some smaller settlements function as one e.g. Corhampton and Meonstoke. With regard to the level of existing services, it is recognised that these could change, particularly with the potential closure of some rural shops and the loss of public transport routes. However, planning policies do seek to retain local facilities and services and examination of provision over the last 8 years or so indicates that there have been only limited changes. These matters cannot be pre-empted and the scoring gives an indication of the availability of existing local facilities which are important to reducing car use.

Guidance at both national and regional level recognise the need to reflect a range of data when considering settlement function, and future reviews of such data would inform any subsequent reviews of the LDF.

An issue to be considered is how many sub-levels are required to reflect not only the form and function of the various settlements but also for the supporting policy approach to ensure that the right levels of development and change are permitted to maintain sustainable communities.

The table below lists all the 'settlements' with the Market Towns and Rural Area by firstly their existing policy status within the adopted Local Plan, then by service score (2008) and then by settlement population (at 2001). Population data at settlement level needs to be treated with some caution, especially for the smaller settlements, as this has been derived using 'Super Output Areas' from the Census 2001. These SOAs often cover areas which are larger than individual

settlements, so the numbers below should therefore be considered as estimates only.

Examination of this data reveals that the larger settlements are generally best served by facilities and services and were higher placed in the Local Plan settlement hierarchy. However, there are a number of anomalies, for example some settlements have larger populations but a low service score and visa versa:-

Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4/SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
Bishops Waltham	H3/ SF1	6756	30
New Alresford	H3/SF1	5102	29
Wickham	H3/SF1	1938	26
Denmead	H3/SF1	6118	25
Colden Common	H3	3480	23
Swanmore	H3	2127	22
Droxford	H3	604	21
Kings Worthy	H3	4695	20
Waltham Chase	H3	2392	20
Twyford	H3	828	20
Hambledon	H3	679	20
Hursley	H3	405	20
West Meon	H3	719	18
Sutton Scotney	H3	891	16
Meonstoke + Corhampton	H3/H4	521	16
Cheriton	H3	409	16
Otterbourne	H3	1205	15
Curdrige	H4	727	15
Sparsholt	H3	404	15
South Wonston	H3	2172	14
Shedfield	H4	782	14
Durley	H4	313	14
Southwick	H3	1311	13
Compton Down incl Compton Street	H3/H4	686	13
Headbourne Worthy	H4	276	13
Itchen Abbas	H3 part	443	12
Micheldever	H3	363	11
Micheldever Station	H3	244	11
Knowle	H3	349	11
Lower Upham	H4	454	11

Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4/SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
Bramdean	H4	579	10
Littleton	H3	1328	9
Owslebury	H4	498	9
North Boarhunt	H4	391	9
Crawley	H4	292	8
Warnford	H4	220	8
Bishops Sutton	H4	419	7
Easton	H4	373	7
Martyr Worthy	H4	241	7
Wonston	H4	233	7
Upham	H4	224	7
Bighton	H4	144	7
Old Alresford	H3	599	6
Shawford	H4	217	6
Soberton	H4	363	4
Durley Street	H4	282	4
Newtown	H4	175	4
Tichborne	H4	151	4
New Cheriton/Hinton Marsh	H4	130	4
Woodmancott	H4	43	4
Otterbourne Hill	H4	?	4
Soberton Heath	H4	733	3
Shirrell Heath	H4	681	3
Southdown	H3	518	3
Stoke Charity	H4	329	3
East Stratton	H4	284	3
Exton	H4	230	3
Kilmeston	H4	129	3
Northington	H4	128	3
Hundred Acres	H4	327	2
Abbots Worthy	H4	275	2
Curbridge	H4	149	2
Avington	H4	147	2
Ovington	H4	111	2
Beauworth	H4	102	2
West Stratton	H4	85	2
Beeches Hill	H4	233	1
Chilcomb	H4	155	1
Gundleton	H4	144	1
Hunton	H4	82	1

Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4/SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
Preshaw	H4	58	1
Dundridge	H4	38	1
Northbrook	H4	114	0
Swarraton	H4	104	0
Weston Colley	H4	85	0
Dean	H4	47	0

Whilst it is not possible to explore all the anomalies in detail, some do raise the broader issue of relationship with surrounding settlements and the need to take a wider view of settlement function.

Conclusions and Recommended Response

The above paints a complex picture of matters to be taken into account in determining the role and function of the many towns and villages within the District: it is not simply a matter of determining a ranking system or looking only at one factor, whether it be population or services.

The larger settlements of Bishops Waltham, Alresford, Wickham and Denmead have been examined extensively as they are identified in the Winchester District Local Plan 2006 as market towns on the basis of their retail function. A more detailed examination as part of a retail survey was undertaken to inform the Issues and Options paper (Nathaniel Lichfield 2007). The remaining settlements followed a similar approach through a survey to record the provision of their level of facilities and services (2008).

Examining both population data together with service provision gives a good indication of how settlements support their local population and those residents in the surrounding area in terms of their vitality and viability.

The issue of viability of rural services is a complex matter and with today's modern lifestyles and high personal mobility it is not simply the case that more development will retain local services, although it is anticipated there will be some limited benefit. Many of the responses to the Issues and Options paper requested greater clarity as to those villages that could accommodate development, particularly with regard to the smaller settlements that are currently subject to Policy H4 of the adopted Local Plan and Infilling SPD.

CAB 1743(LDF) promoted four hierarchy levels, and the distinction between these will be based on a combination of the matters mentioned above. Four levels provide opportunities for greater distinction between the numerous settlements to reflect local needs and circumstances. There is however a point

where settlements have such a low level of population and services that development is not particularly sustainable and one of the purposes of the settlement hierarchy is to set out the thresholds beyond which this will be the case and which settlements fall within 'countryside'.

On this basis any substantial development to meet local needs within the District should be directed to the more sustainable locations - Levels 1 and 2 of the hierarchy. If this approach is followed then the accompanying development strategy will direct greater levels of development to those settlements in the higher tiers with more local requirements being met by development in the lower levels.

This follows advice at both national and regional level by directing development towards the most sustainable locations that provide a greater range of services and facilities to avoid unnecessary car journeys.

It is proposed that the above settlements are categorised in accordance with population data (bearing in mind at settlement level these can only be considered as estimates) together with service provision through the scoring system referred to above, with distinctions on the basis of :-

- Level 1 = >5000 population + service score >28 + Local Plan H3/SF1
- Level 2 = >2000 population + service score >20 + Local Plan H3
- Level 3 = service score > 9
- Level 4 = service score 4-8

This would create the following breakdown:-

Level	Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4 SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
1	Bishops Waltham	H3/SF1	6756	30
1	New Alresford	H3/SF1	5102	29
2	Wickham	H3/SF1	1938	26
2	Denmead	H3/SF1	6118	25
2	Colden Common	H3	3480	23
2	Swanmore	H3	2127	22
2	Kings Worthy	H3	4695	20
2	Waltham Chase	H3	2392	20
3	Droxford	H3	604	21
3	Twyford	H3	828	20
3	Hambledon	H3	679	20
3	Hursley	H3	405	20

Level	Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4 SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
3	West Meon	H3	719	18
3	Sutton Scotney	H3	891	16
3	Meonstoke + Corhampton	H3/H4	521	16
3	Cheriton	H3	409	16
3	Otterbourne	H3	1205	15
3	Curdrige	H4	727	15
3	Sparsholt	H3	404	15
3	South Wonston	H3	2172	14
3	Shedfield	H4	782	14
3	Durley	H4	313	14
3	Southwick	H3	1311	13
3	Compton Down/ Compton Street	H3/H4	686	13
3	Headbourne Worthy	H4	276	13
3	Itchen Abbas	H3 part	443	12
3	Micheldever	H3	363	11
3	Micheldever Station	H3	244	11
3	Knowle	H3	349	11
3	Lower Upham	H4	454	11
3	Bramdean	H4	579	10
3	Littleton	H3	1328	9
4	Owslebury	H4	498	9
4	North Boarhunt	H4	391	9
4	Crawley	H4	292	8
4	Warnford	H4	220	8
4	Bishops Sutton	H4	419	7
4	Easton	H4	373	7
4	Martyr Worthy	H4	241	7
4	Wonston	H4	233	7
4	Upham	H4	224	7
4	Bighton	H4	144	7
4	Old Alresford	H3	599	6
4	Shawford	H4	217	6
4	Soberton	H4	363	4
4	Durley Street	H4	282	4
4	Newtown	H4	175	4
4	Tichborne	H4	151	4

Level	Settlement	Existing local plan policy H3/H4 SF1	Population by Settlement (2001 census)	Service score
4	New Cheriton/Hinton Marsh	H4	130	4
4	Woodmancott	H4	43	4
4	Otterbourne Hill	H4	?	4
4	Soberton Heath	H4	733	3
4	Shirrell Heath	H4	681	3
4	Southdown	H3	518	3
	Stoke Charity	H4	329	3
	East Stratton	H4	284	3
	Exton	H4	230	3
	Kilmeston	H4	129	3
	Northington	H4	128	3
	Hundred Acres	H4	327	2
	Abbots Worthy	H4	275	2
	Curbridge	H4	149	2
	Avington	H4	147	2
	Ovington	H4	111	2
	Beauworth	H4	102	2
	West Stratton	H4	85	2
	Beeches Hill	H4	233	1
	Chilcomb	H4	155	1
	Gundleton	H4	144	1
	Hunton	H4	82	1
	Preshaw	H4	58	1
	Dundridge	H4	38	1
	Northbrook	H4	114	0
	Swarraton	H4	104	0
	Weston Colley	H4	85	0
	Dean	H4	47	0

This differentiation creates a number of anomalies which have required a pragmatic judgement to be made:

- Wickham – this settlement has a very good range of services and facilities yet its population just falls below the 2000 population threshold. Given its role as an active service centre providing for a wide rural hinterland, a named

settlement for retail provision under existing planning policy, and with a defined boundary, it therefore should be defined at Level 2.

- Droxford – this settlement has a service score slightly above 20 but a much lower population than other settlements with this level of service score. It therefore is defined at Level 3.
- Littleton – this settlement has a service level at the upper end of Level 4 but a population higher than many Level 3 settlements. Given this, and its relationship to facilities and services nearby in Winchester, it is defined at Level 3.
- Soberton Heath, Shirrell Heath, Southdown – these settlements have a service score of 3, suggesting that they should be defined as ‘countryside’ rather than falling within any of the settlement levels. However their population and built character suggests they should fall within Level 4.

The above approach recognises the value of settlements for their communities, which is an aspect that lies at the heart of ‘place making’ and is fundamental to the spatial planning approach promoted through the LDF. It is also responsive to the nature of the various settlements and reflects the results of the sustainability appraisal through promoting development in a manner that is in close proximity to services that can be accessed by foot, bicycle or by public transport.

By identifying many smaller settlements within Levels 3 and 4 of the hierarchy, one of the concerns about the application of the existing Local Plan Policy H4 can be resolved. These named settlements would be deemed suitable for a specific level or type of development (see below) and do not need to be subject to the Criterion 1 (sustainability) of the Infilling SPD. In fact it would be possible to consult on changes to the SPD alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options, to replace Criterion 1 with a list of the settlements in which H4 would apply.

Following on from the identification of the hierarchy levels it is necessary to establish the development strategy. An aspect raised by many of the responses to the Issues and Options consultation is the need to not only retain the identity of the many smaller towns and villages within the District but also to match the levels of development to local requirements, whether this be housing, employment or community uses.

Advice at regional and national level refers to concentrating development where services exist. On this basis both Levels 1 and 2, due to their service provision and existing population together with their functional relationship with surrounding smaller settlements, warrant consideration of levels of growth to serve their own and surrounding area’s needs over the next twenty years. Notwithstanding this it is envisaged that the levels of growth will be in proportion to those that have occurred in recent years and will take into account

development opportunities within settlement boundaries (through infill and redevelopment) as well as limited greenfield releases. It is envisaged that the levels of development proposed will be gradual over the twenty year plan period.

In Level 3 settlements, which have a lower service provision and smaller concentrations of people, development would be limited to opportunities within settlement boundaries, or infilling where there are no settlement boundaries yet defined. It would be possible to indicate that these boundaries would be reviewed to allow for further limited development if this was considered necessary.

The Level 4 settlements are the least sustainable locations where small scale affordable housing developments with enabling market housing would be permitted to meet a demonstrable local need.

This creates the following development strategy :-

Level 1 = higher order service centres with significant mixed communities where new development will be directed through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s) for housing (including 40% affordable housing) for about 500* new dwellings, (i.e. average 25 dwellings per annum), as well as employment, retail, leisure and other provision to complement the role of these service centres.

**(this target is subject to further assessment with regard to District totals and the amount of dwellings to be delivered at Winchester and the other urban areas)*

Level 2 = lower order centres but providing a good range of services to a sizeable population. Growth to be in proportion to the size and role of the settlement to emphasise the need to retain existing employment and retail provision, plus about 300* new dwellings (i.e average 15 dwellings per annum), (including 40% affordable housing) through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s).

**(this target is subject to further assessment with regard to District totals and the amount of dwellings to be delivered at Winchester and the other urban areas)*

Level 3 = limited new development within the settlement boundaries through infilling and redevelopment, to help retain existing employment and other facilities (including 40% affordable housing).

Level 4 = isolated settlements with limited population and facilities where development would not normally be permitted other than for local needs. Therefore development limited to small scale affordable housing with 'enabling' market housing (no more than 20%) to meet demonstrable local needs.

It is considered that the above distinctions will reflect the existing form, size and functionality of the range of settlements that exist within the Market Towns and Rural Area, but will be flexible enough to respond to local circumstances.

Recommended Approach :

To propose a settlement hierarchy for the Market Towns and Rural Area on the basis of service provision, existing population and relationship with surrounding settlements, together with a corresponding development strategy for the period 2006 – 2026 which will provide opportunities to reflect the nature of the various settlements and community aspirations:-

Level 1 = higher order service centres with significant mixed communities where new development will be directed through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s) for housing (including 40% affordable housing) for about 500* new dwellings, (i.e. average 25 dwellings per annum), as well as employment, retail, leisure and other provision to complement the role of these service centres.

**(this target is subject to further assessment with regard to District totals and the amount of dwellings to be delivered at Winchester and the other urban areas)*

Level 2 = lower order centre but providing a good range of services to a sizeable population. Growth to be in proportion to the size and role of the settlement to emphasise the need to retain existing employment and retail provision, plus about 300* new dwellings (i.e average 15 dwellings per annum), (including 40% affordable housing) through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s).

**(this target is subject to further assessment with regard to District totals and the amount of dwellings to be delivered at Winchester and the other urban areas)*

Level 3 = limited new development within settlement boundaries through infilling and redevelopment, to help retain existing employment and other facilities (including 40% affordable housing).

Level 4 = isolated settlements with limited population and facilities where development would not normally be permitted other than for local needs. Therefore development limited to small scale affordable housing with enabling market housing (no more than 20%) to meet demonstrable local needs.

Annex 1 Key points arising from comments received to Question 7e level of development to be applied to the key hubs

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
Comments received in relation to Alresford:-		
Need additional car parking if to become a key hub and support the surrounding area	This is a detailed matter which will need to be considered when proposals are submitted for consideration	<u>No further action required</u>
Development of Area 1 would require substantial improvements to infrastructure	Noted – any site that is subject to development proposals will be required to provide associated infrastructure	<u>No further action required</u>
Consider further development at Old Park Wood – brownfield site well related to Alresford by-pass	This site is well beyond the defined boundary for Alresford and is therefore unlikely to be suitable for significant growth to meet the needs of the local community.	<u>No further action required</u>
Limit housing to 300 phased between 2011 – 2026 on existing brownfield sites within existing boundaries – allow no windfall development during first 10 yrs of the plan	It is beyond the remit of the local planning authority to restrict windfall developments, these by their nature occur incrementally as opportunities arise. Any housing requirement for Alresford would be required to be delivered over the 20 year plan period.	<u>See main report</u>
Provide southern access onto A31 and new business park to attract new employers to the town Need more light industry Relocate businesses in	These are detailed matters that will require further investigation once the role of Alresford is determined along with the amount of development to be provided over the 20	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
The Dean and Prospect Road to edge of the town and redevelop for housing	years of the core strategy.	
Lack of health facilities to support growth Surgery could not cope with an increase of over 200-300 additional families in the local population	Hampshire PCT has advised that the levels of growth set out in the issues and options paper will be able to be accommodated by existing services and planned provision.	<u>See main report</u>
Concern that housing growth will lead to large retailers moving into the area with adverse impact on the many small independent businesses	The levels of housing growth proposed at 500 over 20 years equates to 25 dwellings a year – Alresford in the period 2000 – 2008 has had some 120 new dwellings – on this basis it is not envisaged that this level of growth will have a detrimental impact on the retail function and mix of the town.	<u>No further action required</u>
Alresford is no longer sustainable due to high property prices and residents commuting out to earn higher salaries.	New housing in Alresford would be required to contribute 40% affordable housing. Currently Alresford is the most self contained settlement in the Winchester District (outside Winchester town) – the strategy proposed will allow this to continue to ensure there is balanced growth with both housing and employment development.	<u>Se main report.</u>
Relocate Perins School to east of Alresford to release land for housing	This is a detailed matter that requires further investigation as to its	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	feasibility and timescale.	
Develop to the north to give easy access to the town centre	Noted.	<u>No further action required</u>
Ensure growth is match by improvements to service provision – schools, health, water , shopping etc	New development will be required to contribute to infrastructure provision in proportion to the scale of development.	<u>See main report</u>
Support option 3 as would create critical mass to resolve some of the issues identified – provision of affordable housing, retention of families within the town	Noted.	<u>No further action required</u>
Support identification of area 2 for development Support area 1 for development	Recent changes to LDF legislation only require strategic sites to be formally allocated through the core strategy – the scale of growth envisaged at Alresford is unlikely to fall within this category however the suitability of sites to come forward to deliver the amount of housing required will be subject to further investigations.	<u>See main report</u>
Allocate site between New Farm Road and Bridge Road for development	See above	<u>No further action required</u>
To focus development on Winchester as the District's most sustainable settlement Option 1 is the most appropriate for Alresford	Winchester Town will be required to accommodate a substantial amount of growth to ensure that the targets expressed in the South East Plan are met. However, Alresford is the most self contained	<u>See main report</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	settlement in the Winchester District outside of Winchester Town – the strategy proposed will allow this to continue to ensure there is balanced growth, to restrict development will be contrary to the results of the sustainability appraisal that recognise the need for growth to pursue wider sustainability objectives,	
Comments received in relation to Bishops Waltham		
Need to provide further local employment	The approach proposed will require both housing and employment growth to ensure that BW remains a sustainable location serving its own and surrounding communities.	<u>See main report</u>
BW must not be overdeveloped – must retain its small town status BW unsuitable for further development – historic communities, impact on natural environment	The level of growth proposed i.e 500 new dwellings over 20 years = 25 per annum is less than that has occurred during 2000 – 2008 with a total of 232 new houses being built.	<u>See main report</u>
Improve existing infrastructure before additional development	New development will be required to contribute to infrastructure provision in proportion to the scale of development.	<u>No further action required</u>
Area 2 is too large, areas 1 and 3 are more sensibly located	Recent changes to LDF legislation only require strategic sites to be formally allocated	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	through the core strategy – the scale of growth envisaged at BW is unlikely to fall within this category however the suitability of sites to come forward to deliver the amount of housing required will be subject to further investigations.	
Support option 3	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
70 -150 houses would not dramatically change BW	Noted.	<u>No further action required</u>
Comments received in relation to Wickham		
Preferred location for growth is to north for 3 and 4 bed dwellings to address current deficit	Noted- The precise mix of dwellings will be required to reflect revised policies set out in the core strategy	<u>No further action required</u>
Wickham must retain separate identity from Fareham SDA	Noted - this matter is specifically referred to in the South East Plan with regard to the SDA and its relationship with Wickham to ensure that physical separation of the two is maintained.	<u>See Appendix F of this report</u>
Wickham unsuitable for further development – historic communities, impact on natural environment	Due to its service level provision, Wickham is a sustainable location for a limited amount of development – the proposed development strategy of 300 over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings per year, in the period 2000 – 2008 74 new dwellings were built in Wickham	<u>See main report</u>
Support growth up to 150 houses	noted	<u>See main report</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
Wickham is a gateway to the Forest of Bere and a resource for recreation and tourism – future plans must recognise these strengths; need to evolve tourism role	The position of Wickham in the settlement hierarchy would not preclude these aspirations.	<u>No further action required</u>
Comments received in relation to Whiteley		
Additional development at Whiteley would require the completion of Whiteley Way and provision of an additional primary school	Noted – covered by CAB 1743 (LDF) Appendix C.	<u>No further action required</u>
Support substantial growth at Whiteley – more than 300 houses	Noted – covered by CAB 1743 (LDF) Appendix C.	<u>No further action required</u>
Whiteley requires completed infrastructure and was originally planned in two phases – this now needs to be brought to fruition	Noted – covered by CAB 1743 (LDF) Appendix C.	<u>No further action required</u>
Whiteley wants more housing and has the room to expand	Noted – covered by CAB 1743 (LDF) Appendix C.	<u>No further action required</u>
Other comments received to options for the Key Hubs		
Winchester to liaise with East Hants to develop hub strategy across mutual boarder	East Hants has undertaken a similar approach to its hierarchy, CAB 1743 (LDF) acknowledged the wider role of a number of settlements within the District in terms of their ‘catchment’ within and beyond the Winchester District boundary	<u>No further action required</u>
HCC supports option 3 for all hubs as will enable a wider range of services to	noted	<u>See main report</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
be accessible by more people		
Need a detailed study of how these can become as self contained as possible with opportunities to live and work locally	The revised settlement hierarchy has assessed a range of information to ensure that the proposed levels of development correspond to the level of services and populations to provide opportunities to live and work locally	<u>See main report</u>
Key hubs should only have natural development not enforced expansion	The levels of development proposed through the revised hierarchy are in proportion to past completion rates of new dwellings, to be delivered through redevelopment, infilling and greenfield release (s),	<u>See main report</u>
Development should be minimal and only in existing towns and cities not small villages	Responses to the questionnaire suggest that there is support for some growth in the smaller settlements to support the retention of local services	<u>See main report</u>
Need to improve infrastructure if to increase housing provision	New development will be required to contribute to infrastructure provision to support any new development	<u>No further action required</u>
Housing growth should match jobs/employment availability	The purpose of the hierarchy is to ensure that those settlements which will accommodate greater levels of development also have local employment opportunities	<u>No further action required</u>
Growth must be accompanied by car	This is a detailed matter to be pursued through	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
parking provision as hubs are serving wider area	development proposals	
Redevelop existing employment sites to reflect changing practices	It will be necessary to retain local employment sites so that they can continue to offer local employment opportunities. This will not however preclude their redevelopment for employment purposes	<u>See main report</u>
Demolish 1960/70's estates and replace with well planned environmentally friendly buildings	This is not a realistic proposition and beyond the remit of the local planning authority	<u>No further action required</u>
Development needs to be controlled to avoid sprawl into the countryside Denser housing will reduce internal traffic movements	Agreed this is one of the purposes of the hierarchy to ensure that the right levels of development occur in the right locations.	<u>No further action required</u>
Only Option 1 will be in accordance with the strategic objectives Option 1 is not appropriate – an appropriate scale of development is 150-300	The revised hierarchy has taken both population and service provision into account to determine the levels of growth and change through infilling, redevelopment and in some cases greenfield releases.	<u>No further action required</u>
Retain green gaps around rural towns and villages to preserve local character	Retention of gaps is dealt with under Appendix F to this report.	<u>See Appendix F to this report</u>
Each hub has different characteristics and the ability to absorb new development differs	The levels of development proposed through infill, redevelopment and the release of Greenfield	<u>See main report</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
Approach is too general Must protect historic character of the market towns (Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Alresford)	sites will allow the character and role of the settlements to be taken into account.	
Focusing on hubs will restrict growth in the rural area which could otherwise contribute to the local economy	The revised hierarchy acknowledges the role and potential of many of the smaller villages within the District,	<u>See main report</u>
Kings Worthy should be a key hub as it can assist Winchester in meeting its affordable housing requirements	Kings Worthy falls within level 2 of the revised hierarchy – where the development strategy suggests growth up to 300 new dwellings. It has a distinct character and is rightly considered independently of Winchester Town whilst acknowledging its relationship with the town particularly for a range of jobs and services	<u>See main report</u>
There are environmental constraints to the key hubs achieving substantial growth which will encourage increased levels of commuting	The levels of development proposed are considered in proportion to past levels of development and accord with the results of the sustainability appraisal.	<u>See main report</u>
Growth should be for local needs housing only	Beyond the top levels of the hierarchy it is envisaged that development will be concentrated on local needs only	<u>See main report</u>
Develop Micheldever station Build a new hub with	This matter has been debated at regional level and subsequently dismissed.	<u>No further action required.</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
modern infrastructure		
Redevelop brownfield sites only	The SHLAA is being undertaken to identify brownfield sites across the District, however the levels of growth required cannot be delivered solely through brownfield sites and will therefore require the identification of some greenfield releases.	<u>No further action required</u>
Object to 1000 houses as BW, Wickham, Knowle	This matter was dealt with under CAB 1743(LDF) appendix C	<u>No further action required</u>
Combine office and residential developments on the edges of existing settlements	Noted.	<u>No further action required</u>
Pedestrianise town centres and create by-pass for through traffic	The revised hierarchy would not preclude this suggestion where it is feasible and deliverable.	<u>No further action required</u>
BW, Wickham and Alresford are not key hubs	Noted – the revised hierarchy offers a more refined approach based on existing facilities and population	<u>See main report</u>
Better public transport is essential for growth of key hubs	The provision of public transport is a consideration in determining the levels and categories within the hierarchy – generally those will access to public transport have a higher service score and are consequently at a higher in the hierarchy	<u>See main report</u>
Option 3 for all hubs includes areas of biodiversity importance which require further	Agreed – detailed assessment will be required when considered development	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
assessment to determine the impact of development	sites and their impact on a range of matters including landscape and biodiversity.	

Annex 2 Key points arising from comments received to Question 8f

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
Comments received in relation to Denmead		
Denmead must maintain its existing boundaries to protect the countryside setting that gives it its rural character	The revised hierarchy recognises the role of Denmead based on its population and service provision – the development strategy proposed of 300 dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 198 new houses were built in Denmead.	See main report
Must retain local gap	The issue of gaps is covered by Appendix F to this report.	
Allow limited growth for up to 70 dwellings but not on Little Frenchies Field to enhance local employment and develop social and recreational facilities. Provide mix of market and affordable to meet local needs. Reserve site should be identified for early release	Existing Local Reserve Sites will remain for the period of saved local plan policies, but their release will depend upon the results of the SHLAA or monitoring of the availability of land supply.	<u>No further action required</u>
Support Denmead as a local hub due to inadequate facilities and no local employment Denmead is overbuilt in	The revised hierarchy recognises the role of Denmead based on its population and service provision – the development strategy proposed of 300	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
proportion to employment and facilities	dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 198 new houses were built in Denmead.	
Support option 1	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
<p>Denmead is a key hub and review boundaries to examine opportunities for growth – consider growth between 200 – 300 dwellings</p> <p>Re-categorise as a key hub as is an aspiring centre that wishes to expand</p> <p>Denmead has greater capacity than Wickham which is categorised as a key hub</p> <p>Support development due to close proximity to A3 and Waterlooville</p>	<p>The revised hierarchy recognises the role of Denmead based on its population and service provision – the development strategy proposed of 300 dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 198 new houses were built in Denmead.</p>	See main report
Comments received in relation to Swanmore		
<p>Allow small affordable housing schemes outside planned boundary but maintain important gaps</p> <p>need more affordable housing</p>	<p>The revised hierarchy recognises the role of Swanmore based on its population and service provision – the development strategy proposed of 300 dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 63 new houses were built in</p>	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	Swanmore. New development will require a 40% contribution of affordable housing	
Too close to Waltham Chase to both be local hubs Avoid merging with Waltham Chase	Noted – the revised hierarchy recognises the size and role of each settlement to serve primarily its own community and immediate rural hinterland.	See main report
Comments received in relation to Waltham Chase		
Too close to Swanmore to both be local hubs Avoid merging with Swanmore Is well placed to accept additional development Allow limited growth(100 dwellings) to strengthen the role of local hubs Remove Waltham Chase as a local hub as its part of a larger parish and only serves the immediate population	Noted – the revised hierarchy recognises the size and role of each settlement to serve primarily its own community and immediate rural hinterland.	See main report
Support option 2 and 3	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
Comments received in relation to Colden Common		

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
No more building	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
Is a sustainable location and should be allowed to develop with new housing	Agree – the revised hierarchy recognises the size and role of each settlement to serve primarily its own community and immediate rural hinterland. The development strategy proposed of 300 dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 87 new houses were built in Colden Common.	See main report
Require development in excess of 200 dwellings to improve service provision	The level of development proposed will be required to deliver infrastructure in proportion to its impact	<u>No further action required</u>
Comments received in relation to Kings Worthy		
Support option 1	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
Development should be contained within existing settlement boundary – option 1 Support option 3 as Kings Worthy is most sustainable local hub	The revised hierarchy recognises the size and role of each settlement to serve primarily its own community and immediate rural hinterland. The development strategy proposed of 300 dwellings over 20 years equates to 15 dwellings a year, during 2000 – 2008 some 155 new houses were built in Kings Worthy .	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
General Comments received in relation to local hubs		
Design must maintain small homogenous groups and engender social cohesion	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
Only allow affordable housing unless are clear local reasons for other development All local hubs should provide affordable housing	The need for affordable housing is recognised across the District, the proposed development strategy acknowledges this need and requires all levels of the hierarchy to provide affordable housing	See main report
Existing settlement boundaries should be allowed to change to allow limited development without expanding into greenfields – retain existing gaps	Gaps are covered by Appendix F to this report. By amending settlement boundaries this will in effect expand onto greenfield sites – levels 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed hierarchy acknowledge the possible need to amend existing boundaries – these will require detailed site assessments to determine the best locations with minimal impact.	See main report
Pursue Micheldever	See comment above	<u>No further action required</u>
Redevelop industrial brownfield sites and relocate light industry	It will be necessary to retain existing employment uses to ensure local opportunities for	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	employment are retained this does not however preclude these sites being redeveloped to improve their offer.	
Impact of development of SDAs near Waltham Chase and Swanmore	See comment above	See main report
Flawed approach – no need for these areas to develop – don't fix things that aren't broken	It is necessary to determine a settlement hierarchy for the market towns and rural area to ensure that the right amount of development occurs in the most appropriate locations.	See main report
Must ensure infrastructure provision alongside housing development	The level of development proposed will be required to deliver infrastructure in proportion to its impact	<u>No further action required</u>
Put houses where jobs are going to be created	The purpose of a settlement hierarchy is to ensure that the right amount of development occurs in the most sustainable locations providing opportunities to live and work locally	See main report
Need to ensure local hubs do not turn into key hubs and outgrow their limited infrastructure	The level of development proposed will be required to deliver infrastructure in proportion to its impact	<u>No further action required</u>
Local hubs too small for realistic development without destroying their character	The amount of development proposed under the settlement hierarchy is in proportion to previous amounts of development.	<u>No further action required</u>
Create more local hubs so development can be fairly distributed	The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	the District therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision.	
Support option 1 for all local hubs	noted	<u>No further action required</u>
Exclude Denmead, Colden Common, Bishops Waltham from PUSH	The PUSH designation was determined some years ago covering the southern parishes within the Winchester District it is beyond the remit of the Winchester LDF to amend this designation.	<u>No further action required</u>
Ensure facilities exist to support housing growth	The level of development proposed will be required to deliver infrastructure in proportion to its impact	<u>No further action required</u>
Settlements should be reclassified – West Meon, Cheriton, Droxford, Durley, Otterbourne, Twyford, Littleton, Sutton Scotney and Micheldever for limited development	The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of the District therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision.	See main report
Levels of development proposed in the options is not appropriate due to proximity of higher order settlements with greater range of services – need more modest proposals to sustain existing services	The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of the District therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision.	See main report
Need to include policy to support existing commercial development in the rural areas, within	The core strategy will cover opportunities within settlement boundaries in	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
and around local hubs	accordance with the settlement hierarchy, more detailed policies will be set out in the development control dpd to be prepared.	
Promote development at key satellite settlements in Winchester's accessible hinterland	The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of the District therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision.	See main report
Designate following as local hubs :- Otterbourne Sparsholt Littleton Sutton Scotney Hambleton South Wonston Hursley Twyford	Noted - The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of the District therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision, which covers these larger settlements.	See main report
Focus on achieving greater self sufficiency in settlements – delivered in a sequential manner within planned boundaries then through sustainable urban extensions	Agree – this is the intention of the settlement hierarchy to promote development to areas with sustainable levels of service provision. The upper levels of the proposed hierarchy acknowledge the need for both redevelopment and infilling within settlement boundaries in addition to greenfield release (s), the scale of these	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	however will be required to be in proportion to the size and character of the settlement in question.	
No evidence to suggest an additional 100 or 200 dwellings will allow facilities to be retained	The retention of facilities is a complex issue, with the provision of modest growth through the hierarchy it is anticipated that this may assist, however the closure of some facilities is beyond the control of the local authority.	See main report
Scale of development must reflect local needs	Agreed – this is one of the reasons for amending the settlement hierarchy	See main report
Review each hub to assess capacity of services to accommodate growth	Data for each settlement is being collated to assess their role and function, early discussions with key services providers indicates that the levels of growth proposed can be accommodated within existing provision.	See main report
Transport links and availability of commercial opportunities should be a key consideration	The availability of public transport has informed the service level scores for each settlement	<u>No further action required</u>
Encourage local shopping facilities to reduce need to travel to key hubs and beyond	Agree - the hierarchy recognises the provision of local facilities including shops which reduce the need to travel.	<u>No further action required</u>
Resolve infrastructure deficits before any new development takes place	The level of development proposed will be required to deliver infrastructure in proportion to its impact	<u>No further action required</u>

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
Create hubs north and north west of Winchester	The settlement hierarchy covers all 50 settlements within the rural area of the District including north and north west of Winchester, therefore distributing opportunities for local growth in proportion to levels of population and service provision.	See main report
Need to resist back garden development with high densities as has negative impact on character	Development proposals within the rural area will be required to satisfy design and layout criteria	<u>No further action required</u>
Allow villages to stay as villages	The hierarchy recognises the limited facilities in some settlements and according proposes that any future growth is for local needs requirements only to allow limited development satisfying specific criteria.	See main report
All places need to accept growth but this needs to be limited to preserve character	Agree– this is one of the reasons for amending the settlement hierarchy to ensure that the scale of development is in proportion to the form and role of the settlement.	See main report
Consider settlements subject to H4 policy	The hierarchy covers all settlements within the rural area including the H4 settlements – some of which will become subject to a more flexible approach to allow development for local	See main report

Key Points (common issues have been grouped)	WCC Officer Response	Suggested Action
	needs.	
Each local hub should be allowed to identify what is appropriate for them	This approach promotes a more responsive system to reflect local needs and aspirations that may be identified through community planning initiatives.	See main report
<p>Consider Micheldever with option 3 as has a train station</p> <p>Consider Shawford as a train station</p>	The hierarchy recognises the provision of local facilities including public transport opportunities and takes these into account when determining the role and function and corresponding levels of development.	See main report