

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 DECEMBER 2009

CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION - FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION  
(CHAPTERS 4-6)

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Jenny Nell Tel No: 01962 848278 [jnell@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:jnell@winchester.gov.uk)

RECENT REFERENCES:

CAB 1568 – Winchester District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) - 6 December 2007

CAB 1696 – Winchester District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Initial Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) - 15 July 2008

CAB 1728 - Winchester District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 21 October 2008

CAB 1743 - Winchester District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 12 November 2008

CAB 1772 - Winchester District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 16 December 2008

CAB 1783 - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 28 January 2009

CAB 1799 - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Issues and Options – Feedback on Consultation (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 6 March 2009

CAB 1823 – Winchester District Development Framework – Recommended Core Strategy Preferred Option Document (Cabinet (Local Development Framework Committee) – 25 March 2009

CAB 1908 - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred Option – Feedback on Consultation (Chapters 1-3) - 20 October 2009.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This is the second in a series of reports that reports back on the consultation responses received on the Core Strategy Preferred Option, which was subject to consultation during May – July this year.

This report covers responses to Chapters 4 - 6 of the document, and suggests a recommended way forward given the advice received from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and the need for further technical work to be undertaken before the Core Strategy can proceed to the next stage. The schedules appended to this report cover in detail the responses received to these Chapters which include the development strategies for Winchester Town and the South Hampshire Urban Areas, including the proposed strategic allocations at Barton Farm, Bushfield Camp, West of Waterlooville, and North Whiteley. It also sets out responses received in relation to the proposed Strategic Development Areas included in the South East Plan at North/North East Hedge End and North Fareham.

In general the responses support the development strategies being proposed for the District, in particular in concentrating development in the existing urban areas. There are however a significant number of comments in relation to the proposed strategic allocations, raising site-specific matters. At this stage, given the feedback received in the summer from PINS, it will be necessary to review all the policies in terms of how they are expressed and to follow the PINS advice in terms of needing to specify for each strategic allocation 'what, where, when and how'. Some elements of these assessments have commenced and there is a need to continue with examining the proposed strategic allocations with specific regard to infrastructure delivery/funding and any phasing/contingencies required.

This work is required to inform the revised policies to make them more specific and to reflect any elements of 'local distinctiveness' as required by planning guidance, prior to the next formal stage of Core Strategy publication, which is now to be October 2010.

The remainder of the responses received on the Preferred Option Core Strategy including the development strategy and settlement hierarchy for the Market Towns and Rural Area will be dealt with at the next meeting of this Committee to be arranged in the New Year.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. That the responses to comments received to Chapters 4-6 of the Core Strategy Preferred Option consultation be noted and the Recommended Approaches be agreed, to enable matters raised to be taken into account when preparing the next stage of the Core Strategy.
2. That the Committee confirms the need to undertake the areas of further work identified in relation to the proposed strategic allocations, as set out in the Council's Preferred Option, to enable the Core Strategy to proceed to its next stage.

## CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 DECEMBER 2009

### CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION - FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION (CHAPTERS 4-6)

#### DETAIL:

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting on 20 October 2009, Members received a report setting out the comments received on Chapters 1-3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Option (CAB 1908 (LDF) refers).
- 1.2 This report covers responses received to Chapters 4-6 of the document and sets out a recommended way forward, taking account also of the advice received from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) during August 2009, which emphasised the need to express all policies on the basis of 'what', 'where', 'when' and 'how' will it be delivered.
- 1.3 In addition, the preparation of documents under the LDF is required, prior to formal publication under Regulation 27, to be subject to ongoing public participation as necessary and relevant. Officers therefore took the opportunity to engage with young people at the recent youth event '*What do YOU know?*', held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2009, organised by the City Council and the Winchester District Strategic Partnership to coincide with Local Democracy Week. The results of this are set out in more detail below.

#### 2 Core Strategy feedback

- 2.1 As stated in CAB 1908(LDF) it is not possible at this stage to give a firm view as to the precise amendments to be made to the Core Strategy policies or supporting text in response to comments received. This will depend on the outcomes of the range of additional technical work being undertaken over the next few months. The schedules appended to this report therefore include summaries of the key issues raised, results of the sustainability appraisal assessment together with any other relevant evidence and advice, leading to an officer response and conclusion on each policy issue.
- 2.2 It should be noted that the officer responses set out in the appendices have regard, as the Council must, to current national and regional planning guidance. While officers are aware that these may potentially change in the future, the Core Strategy cannot be progressed on the basis of speculation about future changes to national or regional guidance. The recently-adopted South East Plan is particularly important in this respect, and it is a legal requirement of the LDF process that the Core Strategy complies with the policy requirements of the South East Plan. Nevertheless, the programme for production of the LDF, agreed at the last meeting of this Committee –

CAB1905(LDF), envisages the next stage of the Core Strategy being published in Autumn 2010 and any changes to guidance that may be made prior to that can, therefore, be taken into account.

- 2.3 All representations can be viewed in full on the Council's web site at <http://documents.winchester.gov.uk/preferredoption/Default.aspx>. These web pages allow responses to be searched either by chapter, policy, paragraph number or by name of respondent.
- 2.4 Appended to this report are detailed schedules together with an introduction and summary commentary for each of the following three chapters :-
- Chapter 4 – The Spatial Strategy (Appendix A)
  - Chapter 5 – Spatial Strategy – Winchester Town (Appendix B)
  - Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy – South Hampshire Urban Areas (Appendix C)
- 2.5 The report presented to the meeting on 20 October 2009 (CAB 1908(LDF) refers) referred to Chapter 7 'Spatial Strategy – Market Towns and Rural Area', also being reported to this meeting. However, there were a significant number of comments received in relation to Chapter 7 and there has been insufficient time to give these due attention. These comments will therefore be reported to the meeting of this Committee to be set up in the New Year, to cover these and the remaining comments on the Core Strategy.
- 2.6 The schedules appended are set as follows: a brief introductory commentary to highlight the main issues raised through the consultation, followed by a conclusion along with a recommended approach as to the changes that should be made, or further work which should be undertaken, to move the Core Strategy forward to its next stage. Detailed tables then follow summarising the issues raised, together with an officer response and a Recommended Approach.
- 2.7 The Core Strategy Chapters which are being reported to this meeting deal with the 'spatial strategies' for the urban parts of the District. These include development strategies and proposed strategic allocations for dealing with the housing requirements which have now been established through the adoption of the South East Plan in May 2009. To understand the rationale of the responses set out in the appendices, it is necessary to be aware of the housing requirements and suggested solutions to any potential shortfall in supply, bearing in mind the latest housing assessments. The following section therefore sets out the current housing requirements and sources of supply.
- 2.8 In terms of allocating strategic sites for development in Core Strategies, PINS advise that if there is to be no further policy document setting out the details of what is expected through the allocation, then the policy in the Core Strategy needs to cover these matters in terms of 'what, where, when and how'. PINS

also emphasise that for sites expected to come forward in the early years of the Core Strategy it will be expected that detailed matters such as availability and infrastructure requirements have been resolved, including:-

- *A clear objective/aim for what is intended to be achieved in the overall development;*
- *Identification of site constraints - both those that are fixed and those that need to be overcome or mitigated;*
- *All the different land uses/proposals and their scale that the site is to accommodate (xx housing, yy employment, community facilities etc);*
- *What infrastructure (e.g. transport, education, social and community services) is needed to make that development a viable, attractive, sustainable location;*
- *What of the above needs to be provided by when (i.e. inter-related phasing of all elements) and who will fund it and deliver it.*
- *Milestones for progression of the development, e.g. application submission and commencement on site, phasing and consequences if missed; and*
- *The allocation boundary on the Proposals Map*

2.9 A further element that also needs to be taken into account is the evidence base, including the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which is a key tool to inform and assist the policy decision making process to ensure that the policies expressed in the Core Strategy will deliver sustainable development. This is a process that is required by planning legislation and government guidance and is critical to the LDF process. The schedules appended to this report therefore include a summary of the SA outcome for each of the policies debated. The Core Strategy will need to be subject to further SA at the publication stage.

### 3 Winchester District Housing Requirements and Supply of Sites

3.1 The South East Plan was adopted by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2009, immediately prior to publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Option. The Preferred Option referred to housing requirements from the Secretary of State's Proposed Modifications, which contained a higher requirement for the non-PUSH part of the District.

3.2 It is one of the 'legal requirements' for Core Strategies that they are in accordance with the relevant regional Spatial Strategy. Therefore, the Core Strategy must continue to accord with the South East Plan, including the housing requirements set for the District and its sub areas: the PUSH area (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire), and the non-PUSH area.

3.3 The table below summarises the main expected sources of housing supply over the plan period (2006-2026), taking account of completions, commitments (existing allocations and permissions) and sites within existing built-up areas identified through the SHLAA (note, these figures are provisional and are subject to ongoing work and monitoring as part of the production of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report). This enables an estimate of total supply without any new allocations to be made and

compared to the South East Plan requirement. It will be noted that this shows a continued need for a large amount of housing to be allocated through the LDF process, amounting to at least 6450 dwellings District-wide over the plan period (before any 'contingency' allowance).

- 3.4 The table shows that major allocations will continue to be needed to meet the South East Plan's requirements and uses the examples of the strategic allocations included in the Preferred Option (West of Waterlooville, Whiteley and Barton Farm), which the appendices to this report confirm should be taken forward. It is also clear that other smaller sites will be needed, especially in the non-PUSH area. These however, would be allocated through the Development Management and Allocations DPD, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy established in the Core Strategy.
- 3.5 The strategic allocations included in the Preferred Option resulted from a detailed comparison of potential alternative sites and areas of search which were also subject to sustainability appraisal. Consultation on the Core Strategy under Regulation 25 has not raised any credible alternatives to these locations that have not already been assessed as part of the Issues and Options consultation undertaken during 2007/08. Accordingly, based on the working assumption that the South East Plan's targets will remain, the strategic allocations identified in the Preferred Option remain the most sustainable locations in which to allocate the majority of the additional greenfield housing required in the District during the plan period.

Winchester District Housing Requirement and Supply Estimate (2006 – 2026)

Source of dwelling supply	PUSH	Non-PUSH	Total
Completions 2006-2009	472	945	1417
SHLAA sites*	516	598	1114
Commitments / permissions:	1940	1319	3259
<i>Large sites (10 or more dwellings)**</i>	1828	1025	
<i>Small sites (less than 10 dwellings)</i>	112	294	
Total identified supply	2928	2862	5790
South East Plan requirement	6740	5500	12240
Shortfall to be allocated:	3812	2638	6450
<i>West of Waterlooville</i>	1000		
<i>North Whiteley</i>	<3000		
<i>Barton Farm, Winchester</i>		2000	
<i>Balance (to be allocated through Development Management &amp; Allocations DPD) / contingency / flexibility allowance</i>	??	??	

\* Based on revised SHLAA reported to Cabinet 14.10.09 (CAB1901)

\*\* Includes existing planning permission at West of Waterlooville for 1514 dwellings in Winchester District (including 'live-work')

#### 4 Feedback from Youth Democracy Event October 2009

- 4.1 The Children's and Young People Partnership in conjunction with the City Council organised a specific event for young people to coincide with Local Democracy Week. The purpose of the event was to raise awareness with young people from across the District of the role of elected councillors and how decisions affecting the District are made. Local educational establishments were invited to send students from a range of year groups to participate in the event.
- 4.2 In total, approximately 55 young people attended the event representing Swanmore Technology College, Henry Beaufort School, Westgate School and Sparsholt College (ranging in age from 12 – 18 years).
- 4.3 Whilst specific exercises had been planned for the participants, the LDF team were able to participate through two means - the 'KEEpad' exercises and two exercises using the Core Strategy Preferred Option exhibition boards which had been amended to appeal to younger people. The aim of the exercises was to try and get young people thinking about new development and what features/facilities should be incorporated with the purpose of ensuring a sustainable development. The results of these exercises are set out in full at Appendix D to this report. Given the number of young people represented at the event and the general nature of the questions, these results are purely indicative, but do however give some useful ideas to be taken into consideration when exploring the opportunities presented by the larger developments being planned for the District.
- 4.4 In general, it appears that young people consider matters such as the provision of different transport opportunities plus a range of facilities (shops, schools, health provision etc), key for new large scale developments, followed by a range of house types and provision of 'eco-friendly' buildings. When presented with the opportunity to suggest a feature/facility that could be used as a central element of a new development to bring the young, old and families together, some sort of community/social facility and/or a café/pub/coffee shop received the most support followed by sports/leisure provision.

#### 5 Next Steps

- 5.1 In parallel with reporting the responses on the Preferred Option and suggesting a way forward, officers will be undertaking a range of additional evidence work in light of the advice of the Planning Inspectorate and that received via PAS Spatial Planning Peer Information Sharing. This will involve the need for both new evidence and updating existing reports, given the length of time from when some of these were originally prepared and when the Core Strategy will now be submitted for examination (January 2011).
- 5.2 Officers will continue to liaise with key partners in moving matters forward and colleagues from neighbouring local authorities to ensure a consistent approach.



OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:6 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (RELEVANCE TO):

- 6.1 As part of progressing effective spatial planning of the District, the Core Strategy is one of the key implementation mechanisms for the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy. To this extent the Core Strategy reflects the outcomes of the Sustainable Community Strategy and strategic planning policies have been expressed to cover these where there is a land use planning requirement for their delivery.

7 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 The key resources for undertaking work on the LDF have been approved as part of the budget process. However, the nature and scale of the LDF will require shared resources in terms of utilising skills and expertise from other divisions within the Council, this is now even more critical given the emphasis on delivery and viability of development schemes.
- 7.2 Meetings of the Cabinet (LDF) Committee can be serviced from within existing resources in the Democratic Services Division.

8 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 8.1 The Council's Local Development Scheme has recently been revised and submitted to the Government Office for the South East for approval. Whilst this amendment delays the LDF timescale, there is less risk in following the PINS advice and undertaking additional work at this stage of Core Strategy preparation than in proceeding as originally planned and potentially having the whole Core Strategy deemed as 'unsound' at examination.
- 8.2 Such an outcome would in the longer term create greater risk through having an extended period of aging policy guidance and would require further resources to enable the Core Strategy to be redrafted and for certain stages to be repeated, prior to it being re-submitted for examination. The conclusions and recommendations in this report take account of the PINS advice and include the additional work recommended by the Inspector.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Schedule of Responses to Chapter 4 – The Spatial Strategy  
 Appendix B: Schedule of Responses to Chapter 5 – Spatial Strategy – Winchester Town  
 Appendix C: Schedule of Responses to Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy – South Hampshire Urban Areas  
 Appendix D; Youth Democracy Event Exercises, October 2009

## **1.0 Chapter 4 – The Spatial Strategy**

- 1.1 This section of the Core Strategy sets out the approach to the distribution of development across the District over the plan period. The purpose of the spatial strategy is to set out in broad terms the amount and type of development that will happen, taking into account the opportunities and constraints that exist.
- 1.2 The Preferred Approach expressed is for the District to be sub-divided into three spatial areas. This is based on the studies undertaken to inform the LDF which have revealed that there are three economic areas within the District, as well as other differences. These local economies are focussed on Winchester Town, the substantial rural area and the market towns within it and the District's southern fringe. These areas demonstrate not only individual economic characteristics but also different physical and to some extent social characteristics. At the Issues and Options stage the concept of creating three (slightly different) spatial areas for the District was presented taking into account the following :-
- a) Availability of local employment opportunities.
  - b) Public transport services to neighbouring settlements and further a field
  - c) Range of services and facilities including shops, education and health provision
  - d) Opportunities for growth/change and relationship with neighbouring settlements
- 1.3 A range of alternatives were considered in response to the Issues and Options and presented to this Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2008, which concluded the preferred approach, detailed papers can be viewed at :- [http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/Cabinet/1700\\_1799/CAB1728LDF.pdf](http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/Cabinet/1700_1799/CAB1728LDF.pdf)
- 1.4 The preferred approach was therefore to create the following three spatial areas:-
- a) Winchester Town
  - b) The South Hampshire urban areas
  - c) The Market towns and the rural area
- 1.5 This approach reflects the characteristics of these areas and, more specifically for Winchester District, addresses the contradictions that exist in the southern part of the District. Within this area there are many smaller towns and villages set

within a rural area. These fall within the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) defined area but do not exhibit those essentially urban qualities that are predominant within PUSH. Whilst the PUSH designation cannot be ignored as it is an agreed sub-regional strategy set out in the South East Plan, the spatial strategy for the Winchester District has the opportunity to be expressed with a local focus. The major opportunities for sustainable growth within the PUSH area of the District are all within the M27 employment market corridor, on the fringes of the District.

- 1.6 Overall there seems to be considerable support for this approach. Consultation responses received to Chapter 4 of the Preferred Option concentrate mainly on the detail of the policy expression rather than the principle of the strategy. In particular the key issues are :-
- (i) Use of the sequential approach and use of brownfield sites in advance of greenfield allocations rather than promoting development in sustainable locations;
  - (ii) Level of detail in terms of demonstrating the ‘place shaping’ requirements of the policy and the need to be more specific in terms of the amount, type and broad locations of development.
- 1.7 The Winchester Core Strategy currently promotes a sequential approach to the consideration of sites for development. This follows the principle of exploiting opportunities presented by brownfield (previously used sites), in advance of additional greenfield sites required to be allocated to meet the housing requirements in the South East Plan. This approach maximises the use of existing land resources in the early parts of the plan period whilst the strategic allocations are being planned to deliver thereafter. Smaller non strategic greenfield sites will be identified through the SHLAA process and then allocated for development if considered appropriate in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.
- 1.8 Government guidance in PPS3 states that *“the Government’s policy is to ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities with good access to jobs key services and infrastructure...”*, whilst the advice goes on to say that *“the priority for development should be previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings.”*, it does not specifically require a sequential consideration to the release of sites, unlike the previous PPG3. It concludes that there needs to be *“A flexible, responsive supply of land – managed in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land....”*. Given the diverse nature of the District there is a need for both brownfield and

greenfield sites to deliver the District's housing requirements, accordingly taking the advice in PPS3 and other guidance, development should occur in the most suitable and sustainable locations.

- 1.9 The spatial strategy as expressed in the Preferred Option follows the principles of an urban focussed strategy in accordance with Policy SP3 'Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance', of the South East Plan. Policy SP3 states "*The prime focus for development in the South East should be urban areas, in order to foster accessibility to employment, housing, retail and other services, and avoid unnecessary travel..*". Policy SS1 does not however, emphasise the hierarchical nature of the opportunities for development as proposed through the strategy. Therefore, both Winchester Town and the South Hampshire Urban Areas should be the focus in the District for major development schemes, leaving more appropriately proportioned development within the smaller towns and villages that fall within the Market Towns and Rural Area in accordance with Policy BE4 and BE5 of SEP. This matter needs to be reflected in any revisions to the text in this chapter.
- 1.10 With regard to the matter of 'local distinctiveness' this concept is embodied in PPS12 'Local Spatial Planning'. Advice from both PINS and GOSE is quite clear on this, in that the Core Strategy Preferred Option includes at present, a number of general policies, which either need to be much more locally focussed addressing local issues, or deleted. The spatial strategy in particular is focussed on local matters, however its supporting policies need to be more explicit in terms of the type and amounts of development that are to be expected in the spatial areas. This is critical to ensure that the Core Strategy fulfils its place shaping role in terms of expressing a vision for the future of the places that exist across the whole District, by enabling the application of these policies to deliver the strategic objectives and the spatial vision.
- 1.11 **Conclusion and Recommended Approach**

There is general support for the spatial treatment of the District and its division into three areas reflecting local economic opportunities, character etc. This follows the principles established in the SEP for urban focussed growth, by encouraging development in the most sustainable locations within the District.

**Recommended Approach:**

1. That the spatial strategy for the District, that splits the District into 3 spatial areas is retained;
2. To assess the whole document in terms of assuring that the policies are locally distinct and contribute to place shaping and to update text and policies to refer to the adopted SEP;

3. To redraw and update the Key Diagram as necessary, particularly to clarify the spatial strategy and resultant settlement hierarchy and relevant cross boundary matters;
4. To amend Policy SS1 to incorporate the results of the SA (and other matters raised as necessary); particularly to express the amount and type and broad location of development that will occur in the spatial areas, and how these will be delivered. This may involve incorporating elements of Policies WT1, SH1, MTRA1 as necessary. To emphasise that development occurs in the most sustainable locations in accordance with the hierarchy of the spatial strategy, utilising brownfield opportunities where these exist in parallel to planned greenfield releases; and to recognise the high quality of the historic environment of the Winchester District;
5. That Policy SS2 is deleted and its content applied to the specific strategic site allocation policies WT2, WT3, SH2, SH3, SH4, SH5 as necessary to take into account the specific comments made in relation to SS2, and the results of the SA . Expand these policies to be more locally-specific and expressed in terms of ‘what, where, how and when’, with a focus on delivering the proposed development and associated infrastructure, together with the provision of any identified mitigation.

<b>Chapter 4 The Spatial Strategy</b>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
10448; 36(Swanmore PC); 2229; 10255; 10439	General comments of support	Support noted
36 (Swanmore PC): 10455; 10440 (Cllr Learney on behalf of Winchester	General comments on paras 4.1 – 4.15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State % of growth that 12,240 new homes equates to when compared to existing housing stock</li> <li>• Strategy is too general</li> <li>• Spatial areas diagram needs to be clearer</li> </ul>	A number of these general matters can be accommodated when the Core Strategy is updated and edited. Other comment, such as the strategy is too general, will be addressed when the PINS advice in terms of local distinctiveness is applied to the revised text.

<p>Liberal Democrat Group); 90 (English Heritage); 2647; 10178; 87 (GOSE); 3135; 10412; 10413; 2198; 2191; 2116; 2515; 10438; 2273; 10413;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy should allow for sustainable / Greenfield sites to be brought forward early in the plan period, as large sites have a long lead in time</li> <li>• Emphasis should be on sustainable locations rather than previously developed land</li> <li>• Need to take account of needs outside the most sustainable locations</li> <li>• Clarify what is meant by the sequential approach (para 4.15) (GOSE)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend para 4.10 to recognise the high quality of the historic environment in the smaller towns and villages (English Heritage)</li> <li>• Concern Whiteley has been set aside from the rest of the District and others in PUSH will decide its transport priorities</li> <li>• Policy NRM5 of the SEP has not been taken account of as no alternatives have been considered</li> </ul>	<p>The preferred spatial strategy is the result of the consideration of a number of alternative strategies explored at the Issues and Options stage of Core Strategy preparation (see main report).</p> <p>The sequential approach promotes the concept of using brownfield sites prior to the release of greenfield sites, some respondents suggest that the strategy over-emphasises brownfield development rather than promoting development in the most sustainable and accessible locations. However, the Core Strategy recognises that the amount of potential ‘brownfield’ sites will not meet the District’s housing requirements and accordingly proposes a number of strategic allocations on greenfield sites to address this issue.</p> <p>The preferred strategy concentrates growth around the existing urban areas of the District and recognises the distinct characteristics of both Winchester Town and those parts of the District that lie adjacent to the urban areas of southern Hampshire, whilst taking into account the need for more limited development opportunities presented in the numerous smaller towns and villages. It therefore strikes an appropriate balance between promoting brownfield sites and developing the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>It has been formulated based on an assessment of known constraints and opportunities in accordance</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update references to adopted SEP</li> <li>• Challenge SEP targets – expansion of Winchester is not sustainable</li> </ul>	<p>with Policy SP3 of the SEP 'Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance', and follows the principles of national planning guidance in PPSs</p> <p>SEP Policy NRM5 requires an assessment against the impact of development on biodiversity. The Core Strategy has been assessed to date against sustainability objectives and strategic environmental assessment, including the habitats regulations, which recognises that mitigation will be required to enable some of the strategic developments to proceed. Natural England as the responsible authority for Habitat Regulations has been party to these discussions and agrees with this approach.</p> <p>The position and characteristics of Whiteley have informed the strategy now promoted, which not only recognise its functional relationship with the rest of southern Hampshire but reflect its position within Winchester District. With regard to its transport links these are being looked at via a number of studies being undertaken to ensure that the cumulative growth in this part of South Hampshire will have the appropriate infrastructure delivered.</p> <p>The SEP was adopted in May 2009 and now forms part of the statutory development plan. The Winchester LDF must therefore accord with it. Consequently, there is not a current opportunity for</p>
--	--	---

		<p>challenging the housing targets, this will occur when the SEP is reviewed and revised housing figures are developed for consideration and comment. The SEP does not find the expansion of Winchester Town unsustainable, indeed it highlights Winchester's potential for development.</p> <p><b><u>Recommended Approach:-</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. to clarify that development should occur in the most sustainable locations, in accordance with the spatial strategy, utilising brownfield opportunities in these locations in parallel to planned greenfield releases.</li> <li>7. to amend the text within this Chapter to recognise the high quality of the historic environment of Winchester and many of the smaller towns and villages;</li> <li>8. to assess the whole document in terms of assuring that the policies are locally distinct and contribute to place shaping.</li> <li>9. update text and policies to refer to the adopted SEP</li> </ol>
10409; 2116; 78 (Havant BC), 87 (GOSE)	<p>General comments on paragraphs 4.16 – 4.18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to emphasise that most of the District's development will be concentrated within Winchester Town and South Hampshire as these are the areas which have existing and proposed concentrations of jobs, services etc,</li> </ul>	<p>The previous section of Chapter 4 adequately explains the rationale for the spatial strategy adopted. Paragraph 4.18 already refers to adjoining Districts and it recognises that adequate account needs to be taken of adjoining planning strategies.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amend para 4.18 to reflect strategic developments proposed in neighbouring districts particularly where these are on the boundary between the two districts (Havant BC, GOSE)</li> </ul>	
2174; 10455; 10058; 94 (Portsmouth Water Company); 87(GOSE)	<p>Comments on Key diagram:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• request that the settlements identified for growth and the levels of growth expected in each be made clear on the key diagram (GOSE)</li> <li>• key diagram needs to illustrate all four levels in the Market Towns and Rural Area settlement hierarchy</li> <li>• it should include the regional hub at Southampton and secondary regional town centres at Fareham, Eastleigh and Winchester</li> <li>• the key diagram must include key infrastructure matters outside the district and indicate cross boundary issues where these exist (GOSE)</li> </ul>	<p>It is accepted that the key diagram needs to be redrawn following PINS and GOSE advice and this will therefore take forward the points made. Consideration will be given to the requests to show additional information, this needs to be balanced with achieving a legible diagram.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:-</u> To redraw and update the Key Diagram as necessary, particularly to clarify the spatial strategy and resultant settlement hierarchy and relevant cross boundary matters.</p>
Policy SS1 – Sustainable Development Principles		
<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b></p> <p>The policy sets out a sound base policy with which all development proposals should accord. Positive or neutral impacts are recorded for all objectives However, whilst understandable by the technical user, the policy intentions may not be immediately clear to other users of the plan. The plan provides a useful glossary and consideration could be given to including the terms “environmental assets” and “resources constraints and opportunities”. The importance of the water environment should also be</p>		

<p>recognised either by direct reference or a cross reference to Policy CP7. Waste management is covered by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Planning Strategy and Project Integra Draft Action Plan 2007-2012. Although LDFs should not replicate other plan policy it would be useful if the more domestic scale waste issues were highlighted or cross referenced at some point, as on site community recycling and composting facilities can be useful additions to sites where kerbside collections of all recyclables are not available.</p>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
<p>106 (Scottish &amp; Southern Energy); 4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 10441; 10256; 10413; 10252; 2198; 10450; 10269; 13 (Denmead PC); 3198; 2175; 86 (Environment Agency)</p>	<p>Support Policy SS1</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>87(GOSE); 2101; 10423; 10253; 36 (Swanmore PC); 123; 2515; 10062; 10058; 10261; 10455; 10063; 10060; 96</p>	<p>Specific comments on Policy SS1:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy needs to specify how much development (and what type) is proposed within each of the 3 spatial areas and set out a settlement hierarchy (GOSE)</li> <li>• Should emphasise that the spatial areas are not</li> </ul>	<p>Both PINS and GOSE advise that this lead policy needs to be more locally distinct not only in terms of the amount of development that will occur in the spatial areas but also the types, to follow the 'what, where, when and how' approach advocated by PINS. The policy will therefore require significant</p>

<p>(Southern Water); 10448; 3071; 10416; 10451; 2923; 3199; 10401; 2107; 2117; 10411; 2229; 25 (New Alresford TC); 2191; 1996; 86(Environment Agency); 10212; 2926</p>	<p>listed in priority order, needs to be flexible in applying the sequential approach – and allow for sustainable urban extensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to refer to development viability</li> <li>• evidence base does not reflect the split of the spatial areas with regard to house prices and levels of housing need</li> <li>• Policy should recognise the importance of existing sites to achieve its sustainability objectives</li> <li>• New housing should be located close to employment, services and public transport</li> <li>• Policy needs to place greater emphasis on waste water; water use, water quality etc &amp; provide a positive framework for infrastructure work and support provision of additional water/wastewater infrastructure (Environment Agency, Southern Water)</li> <li>• Policy should include reference to sport, leisure provision</li> <li>• Policy should refer to light industry and need for new businesses</li> </ul>	<p>amendment to cover this issue, and those raised through the Sustainability Appraisal which specifically raises matters in relation to the water environment and domestic waste issues. The revised policy will therefore incorporate the detail necessary to demonstrate the amount of development required, the types, their location and how and when they will be delivered. Development viability is also an issue raised by PINS and it will be necessary to undertake a viability assessment of the proposal to ensure that it is deliverable and will be implemented during the plan period.</p> <p>The purpose of this policy is to provide the guiding principles for sustainable development across the District. This development strategy follows the urban focus/town centre first approach promoted through the RSS and PUSH strategy and reflects evidence of the differences between the different areas. Therefore there is an emphasis on new development being concentrated on those areas of the District where there is existing development and infrastructure including services and facilities. The policy is not intended to imply a priority order of areas.</p> <p>A number of the responses received request specific additions to the policy. These will need to be considered in light of the above, together with</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to co-operate with Basingstoke which is identified as a diamond for growth, to overcome the commuting issue.</li> <li>• Must set limits for population and economic growth. Without limits any growth will conflict with a number of policies in the core strategy</li> <li>• Must address transport and other sustainability issues</li> <li>• Policy should refer to the release of land with level 1 and 2 settlements</li> <li>• Reliance on brownfield land before greenfield is not practical – governments targets should not be accepted</li> <li>• Add an additional category to acknowledge the planning status of the South Downs National Park with its own set of policies</li> <li>• Term South Hampshire Urban Areas has no policy basis – replace with ‘South Hampshire Market towns and Villages and the new communities at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley’.</li> </ul>	<p>how the policy is expressed to ensure it offers flexibility to be able to deal with contingencies and unforeseen circumstances, whilst retaining its guiding development principles. However, it is a strategic policy which cannot be expected to cover every topic.</p> <p>The Winchester LDF will need to be consistent with neighbouring LDFs. However whilst Basingstoke is identified as a ‘diamond for growth’ in the Regional Economic Strategy, Winchester is not. Therefore different priorities apply in terms of economic development. The commuting issue that exists within the District is addressed through ensuring that the housing growth occurs in the most sustainable locations which also provide opportunities for local employment.</p> <p>Given that this is a Core Strategy this policy will not be specific in terms of identifying which of the smaller settlements within the Market Towns and Rural Area will accommodate development. This will be established through the Development Management and Allocations DPD, reflecting the settlement hierarchy established in the Core Strategy (Policy MTRA2). Advice in PPS12 is that Core Strategies can allocate ‘strategic allocations’ that are essential to the achievement of the development strategy and housing requirement for</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the District, which the Core Strategy does. It is a legal requirement that Core Strategies comply with regional spatial strategies, so it is not an option to reject government targets.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park will be covered by a policy in the Core Strategy but it does not exhibit such different characteristics, or require such different policy approaches to the bulk of the rural area to warrant its own spatial area, as this would generate duplication. This approach also applies to the PUSH designation, both of these policy areas are recognised in the Core Strategy but the local characteristics, form and function of settlements has informed the spatial areas to ensure that the Winchester Core Strategy genuinely addresses local characteristics rather than simply reflecting wider designations.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To amend Policy SS1 to incorporate the results of the SA (and other matters raised as necessary); particularly to express the amount and type and broad location of development that will occur in the spatial areas, and how these will be delivered. This may involve incorporating elements of Policies WT1, SH1, MTRA1 as necessary.</li> </ol>
<p>Policy SS2 : Requirements for major large scale developments</p>		

Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:		
<p>This policy effectively progresses key sustainability objectives, in particular those addressing the provision of infrastructure and housing, which were identified as particular issues during the earlier SA Scoping process. No adverse impacts are identified by the appraisal process and the policy should be instrumental in progressing sustainable development on the four major sites. Potential issues in relation to biodiversity are noted cross reference should be made to the parallel HRA report which considers in more detail how specific major developments may impact European sites and how policies may avoid or mitigate those impacts. It is noted that a number of the issues covered by the policy are generic to all major sites (e.g. 40% affordable housing) and all sites will also be subject to other specific policies relating to water, landscape, biodiversity, energy supply and design.</p>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
4 (Bishops Waltham PC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support policy – emphasise the need to open Whiteley Way prior to any development</li> </ul>	Support noted – see responses to Policy WT3 elsewhere on this agenda in relation to Whiteley Way.
78 (Havant BC); 10416; 3198; 3071; 10270; 10448; 91(Natural England); 85(Highways Agency); 2740; 87 (GOSE); 86 (Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the % of affordable housing and the mix of tenure/house types should be expressed in each of the strategic allocations to ensure the requirements meet local circumstances (Havant BC)</li> <li>suggests the allocation of more smaller strategic sites rather than relying on a few large sites, this would provide a contingency if the large sites were not delivered on time</li> <li>bullet points 3-4 need to be more specific of</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose and intent of Policy SS2 is to set out all the common requirements of the proposed strategic allocations in one policy therefore avoiding detailed repetition in the individual strategic allocation policies.</p> <p>Given the advice from both GOSE and PINS about the need to be more locally distinct and more specific in terms of the precise requirements to be delivered through each of the proposed strategic allocations, it is suggested that Policy SS2 is deleted. This will provide</p>

<p>Agency); 2121; 10253; 10451; 2229; 3199; 83 (South East Partnership Board); 77 (Fareham BC); 2191; 2923; 90 (English Heritage); 10420; 10064; 3204; 10460</p>	<p>what's required of developers, particularly transport requirements – mitigation measures need to be specified (Highways Agency)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to emphasise the links with green infrastructure and health and wellbeing matters more (Natural England)</li> <li>• policy should also refer to the requirements of large development to consider the need for adaptation for climate change (Natural England)</li> <li>• clarify if policy applies to the SDAs – much of the detail is being dealt with through the preparation of specific area action plans</li> <li>• policy wording needs to be clarified – be specific about location and quantum of development (GOSE)</li> <li>• clarify whether this policy applies to Bushfield Camp as it sets out residential requirements</li> <li>• needs to acknowledge importance of viability and deliverability of large sites</li> <li>• clarify what's is meant by 'exemplars of sustainable development' need to give examples and be specific</li> <li>• policy should refer to the Water Framework Directive and reference to environmental infrastructure including the need to reduce water consumption (Environment Agency)</li> <li>• policy should specifically refer to the need for sports provision</li> </ul>	<p>the opportunity to expand and focus the existing strategic allocation policies on specific matters that need to be addressed as a result of those proposed developments. Matters such as delivery, viability and flexibility can then be expressed as relevant to that site and its surroundings, in addition to specifying the 'what, where, how and when' matters as advised by PINS.</p> <p>A number of responses request the allocation of smaller greenfield sites to retain a housing supply in the early part of the plan period whilst the larger sites are being planned. Advice in PPS12 states that the Core Strategy should only allocate sites that are essential for the delivery of the development strategy for the District. It is the intention that on completion of the Core Strategy, the Development Management and Allocations DPD will commence which will allocate smaller sites across the District in response to any projected housing shortfall. In the meantime the housing supply in the District will consist of sites with planning permission, and those identified through the SHLAA and the strategic allocations set out in the Core Strategy. It may be necessary to make interim releases of smaller sites in order to maintain an adequate housing land supply, depending on the speed at which the strategic allocations are brought forward.</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• emphasise that design represents the most sustainable option for reducing carbon emissions (South East Partnership Board)</li> <li>• policy needs to be more flexible</li> <li>• need to refer to the historic environment and impacts on it (English Heritage)</li> <li>• need consistency between spatial areas South Hampshire should 'pay full regard' whereas the rest are only required to 'respect' in terms of environmental assets (English Heritage)</li> <li>• the requirement to assess biodiversity impacts in combination is too onerous and should be undertaken by the LPA.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To delete Policy SS2 and supporting text;</li> <li>2. To amend Policies WT2, WT3, SH2, SH3, SH4, and SH5 as necessary to take into account the specific comments made in relation to SS2, and the results of the SA . Expand these policies to be more locally specific and expressed in terms of 'what, where, how and when' with a focus on delivering the proposed development and associated infrastructure, together with the provision of any identified mitigation.</li> </ol>
--	---	---



## **2.0 Chapter 5 – Spatial Strategy – Winchester Town**

- 2.1 This section of the Core Strategy sets out in more detail the development strategy for Winchester Town following the principles established in Policy SS1. The objectives for Winchester Town are “*providing for housing growth and maximising opportunities to diversify the economy whilst seeking to reduce commuting levels and respecting the special character of the Town*”.
- 2.2 This follows the establishment of the development strategy for the Town entitled ‘development with a purpose’, after exploring the two options of ‘maintaining the existing boundaries’ of the Town or a ‘step change’, which would require significant greenfield releases over and above existing planned growth. The ‘development with a purpose’ concept allows for the setting and characteristics of the Town to be taken into account, whilst planning for both housing and economic growth so that Winchester Town remains not only the special place that it is, but that it provides opportunities for growth to maintain its competitive position when compared with other similar towns.
- 2.3 Therefore, two strategic allocations are included in the Preferred Option with the purpose of delivering the above – a residential development at Barton Farm for 2000 new homes and supporting uses and a proposed Knowledge Park at Bushfield Camp.
- 2.4 The bulk of responses to the draft text and policies of the Core Strategy in relation to the strategy for Winchester Town relate to:-
- the need for a flexible strategy, and concern about over-reliance on one large strategic housing allocation,
  - concern over the need to release any greenfield sites given the potential amount of brownfield sites within the Town boundary,
  - promotion of alternative or additional sites that could be released for development on the edge of the Town.
  - Various comments relating to the merits for/against the two proposed strategic allocations.

### A Flexible Strategy

- 2.5 A number of comments received refer to an alleged over-reliance on one large site for housing purposes (Barton Farm) and that, to overcome delivery and infrastructure issues, further/alternative sites should also be allocated. The housing requirement and supply data is set out in the covering report which highlights that, taking existing completions, commitments and SHLAA sites into account, there would remain a shortfall of some 2638 dwellings in the non-PUSH part of the District over the plan period (before taking account of any allocations through the LDF). This matter is currently a critical issue in the District, given that PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a supply of land that is then managed in a way that will ensure a continuous supply of deliverable sites to meet the housing requirements over the next five years of the housing trajectory and beyond. Winchester Town is the largest and most sustainable settlement in the non-PUSH part of the District, with a significant employment base, and also acts as a leisure and cultural centre for a large part of the District. It is also designated as a secondary town centre in the SE Plan (Policy TC1 Strategic Network of Town Centres), so in accordance with emerging Policy SS1 it is a suitable and sustainable location to accommodate a significant part of the non-PUSH housing requirement. Indeed, the advantages of locating significant growth at Winchester are highlighted in the SE Plan and were the reason for increasing the level of housing required in this part of the District.
- 2.6 The issue of allocating a single large site compared to a number of smaller sites was assessed at the Issues and Options stage and the conclusion expressed in the Preferred Option at paras 5.9 and 5.10 respectively. This concluded that there were significant benefits to one larger site on the basis that it would be of sufficient critical mass to meet most of its infrastructure needs, including educational and community facilities, whereas several smaller sites would find it difficult to fund infrastructure or other provision. Financial contributions alone are unlikely to be a suitable alternative to on-site provision. Notwithstanding this there is a recognition that in the early parts of the plan period the strategy is to make the best use of previously developed land through the implementation of existing consents and the identification of sites through the SHLAA. Consequently, the development strategy for Winchester Town is to rely on a combination of sites and locations for development over the plan period, which provides flexibility and avoids an over-reliance on one type of development opportunity. The existence of a large greenfield site reservation to the north of Winchester (Barton Farm) was critical in the Secretary of State's decision to increase the District housing requirement. Also, there is the option to allocate smaller (non-strategic) sites through the Development Management and Allocations DPD, should this be needed to meet the required level of housing (annotated as 'balance to be allocated' in the table at paragraph 3.5 of the covering report).

### Release of greenfield vs brownfield sites

- 2.7 This element to some extent is covered above, in that the strategy is to promote and encourage the development of brownfield sites within the early parts of the plan period whilst the larger strategic allocation is progressing through the planning process. The housing figures quoted above, however, demonstrate that the non-PUSH housing target will not be met in full by the strategic allocation proposed at Barton Farm. Given the character of Winchester Town and the existing constraints on infrastructure, etc the amount of brownfield land both available and deliverable has been taken into account but is not adequate to meet the required level of housing.
- 2.8 Therefore, it is necessary to allocate a 'strategic' greenfield site at this stage to be delivered through the Core Strategy as advised in PPS12, which emphasises that these sites are those considered central to the achievement of the development strategy for an area. It may also be necessary to allocate additional greenfield sites that have been identified through the SHLAA process, which are deliverable and developable, in Winchester or other sustainable locations within the non-PUSH part of the District, through the Development Management and Allocations DPD which will follow the Core Strategy, rather than at the Core Strategy stage.
- 2.9 In addition there are a number of current/expected planning applications for sites on the edge of Winchester which, if permitted, could contribute the non-PUSH housing requirement for this part of the District and to the supply of available and deliverable sites required by PPS3.

### Alternative sites

- 2.10 A number of respondents to this section of the Core Strategy have suggested either alternative sites or additional sites to be allocated through the Core Strategy. At the Issues and Options stage various sites and areas around the edges of Winchester Town were considered as potential strategic allocations within the 'step change' option. A number of respondents suggested that there is a need to release smaller greenfield sites rather than one large greenfield site at this stage. The allocation of a larger site vs smaller sites was explored in the Preferred Option document (para 5.9), where it was concluded that it would be beneficial to allocate a single large site on the basis of the site being of a sufficient critical mass to meet most of its infrastructure needs, including educational and community facilities. Allocations of significantly fewer than

2000 dwellings will find it difficult to fund significant infrastructure or other provision, also a dispersal strategy is likely to be no less intrusive overall than a single larger development. The option of developing several smaller sites has been suggested mainly by those promoting alternative sites but has not received any significant wider support as an alternative option.

- 2.11 Land at Barton Farm, north Winchester was found to be the most appropriate and sustainable site given its location and availability, and to the fact that the site was allocated as a 'reserve' Major Development Area in the adopted Local Plan. This allocation was also a significant factor in setting the South East Plan's housing target for the non-PUSH part of the District. Consequently, it is considered that there is not a need to release an alternative strategic allocation for housing purposes in Winchester Town through the Core Strategy but, as stated above, there will be a requirement for further smaller greenfield releases to be made for the non-PUSH part of the District, through the Development Management and Allocations DPD.

#### Comments on Strategic Housing Allocation at Barton Farm

- 2.12 Around 60 respondents made various comments on Policy WT2. Of these 14 broadly supported the allocation of Barton Farm; 22 objected outright to its inclusion in the Core Strategy; 4 either supported or objected to the site in order to promote alternative sites; and the remainder raised a variety of concerns and comments in respect of the potential development of the site which they would want to see addressed through the policy.
- 2.13 In general, the issues raised by objectors were previously raised in response to the allocation of this site as a 'reserve site' in the adopted Local Plan, and have been the subject of two Public Inquiries. These include matters such as the loss of countryside, impact on the road network, flood risk; and the sustainability of the site. In both cases the Inspectors found the site to be suitable for development, with the potential environmental impacts capable of mitigation, and considered Barton Farm to be a highly sustainable location.
- 2.14 The Preferred Option document includes a generic policy (SS2) setting out various requirements for all the strategic allocations. It is being recommended (see Appendix A on Chapter 4) that these requirements are transferred to each site allocation policy. This would give more clarity in respect of the infrastructure and facilities needed to support the new community and how to mitigate its impacts. In particular, more clarity is required over the status and potential use of the

land to the east of the railway line. The revised policy should also incorporate the results of the further work on infrastructure and delivery requirements recommended by PINS.

- 2.15 A number of respondents made the point that the policy needs to be clearer as to what is meant by ‘this allocation will only be released when monitoring shows it is needed to meet the requirements of the South East Plan’. The updated housing figures (see covering report) confirm that a strategic allocation remains necessary in the non-PUSH part of the District in order to meet the South East Plan’s housing requirements. Alternative sites have been assessed and the representations received do not change the conclusion that Barton Farm is the most suitable and sustainable site for such an allocation. The timing of the Core Strategy and analysis of the ‘trajectory’ needed to deliver 2000 dwellings on this site shows that there is negligible scope to hold back the planning of the site and the revisions to the policy should remove any implication that the site is a ‘reserve’ allocation.

#### Comments on Strategic Employment Allocation at Bushfield Camp

- 2.16 The area of land to the north of Badger Farm Road, known as Bushfield, includes the remnants of a former Second World War military installation and barracks. Since ceasing to be occupied by the Army, the Camp site has reverted to a semi-natural state, to the point where it can no longer be regarded as previously developed (brownfield) land, as defined by PPS3.
- 2.17 The Bushfield area and its immediate surroundings are subject to a number of significant constraints, including:-
- Sites protected for their nature conservation and biodiversity importance
  - Known historic features, with the potential for other, associated archaeology
  - Landscape sensitivity and impact on critical views within and across the town and the Itchen valley
  - The area’s visual contribution to the historic setting of Winchester, St Cross and Compton
  - The proximity of the new South Downs National Park
  - Proximity to M3 motorway junctions
  - Location within the adopted Winchester-Compton Local Gap

- 2.18 The Preferred Option states that in order to meet wider economic development objectives for the Winchester Town: *“Approximately 20 hectares of land at Bushfield Camp which has been previously occupied, will be allocated as a ‘knowledge park’”,* subject to further studies of its suitability, under Policy WT3.
- 2.19 Since publication of the Preferred Option in May 2009, the Council has commissioned consultants to advise on the traffic implications of the strategic allocations, including the proposed knowledge park development, and the measures necessary to accommodate these. Specialist advice has also been sought in regard to the commercial viability and wider deliverability of a high quality, low impact knowledge park development; taking account of the cost implications of any measures needed to overcome or mitigate transport, biodiversity, landscape, archaeology or other, associated infrastructure constraints.
- 2.20 In parallel, the strategic allocation’s landowner has commissioned studies to assess the projected impact of development on the site’s landscape, biodiversity/fauna and archaeology, some of these are being carried out to briefs provided by the City Council. The initial results of these studies have been received and, together with the work carried out on behalf of the Council, will need further consideration once ongoing work is received. This will help to inform the decision as to whether or not this strategic allocation should be confirmed for inclusion as part of the next formal stage of the Core Strategy in autumn 2010.

#### **Conclusion and Recommended Approach:-**

- 2.21 Following the wide assessment at the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy, of the opportunities for Winchester Town to either undertake a ‘step change’ through major housing and economic growth or to remain within its existing ‘planned boundaries’, a hybrid approach was deemed to be the most appropriate. This was expressed as ‘development with a purpose’, and is in line with the South East Plan in terms of its designation of Winchester as a secondary town centre, its comments about the town’s suitability for development, and its promotion and emphasis on urban focused growth, this approach is also supported by the SA results for Policy WT1. The SEP recognised the value of the existing ‘reserve’ housing allocation to the north of Winchester in setting the housing targets for the non-PUSH part of the District. Development with a purpose also supports the Town Forum’s vision to deliver greater economic and community benefits.

#### **Recommended Approach :**

1. To agree and retain the 'development with a purpose' strategy for Winchester Town;
2. That the need for further 'non-strategic' greenfield sites to be released be explored through the Development Management and Allocations DPD, following an assessment of potential sites and an update of housing supply data;
3. To amend Policy WT1 to specify the amounts and types of development required and their broad locations, within the plan period, with the policy to include reference to the environmental assets of the Town given its sensitive nature in terms of location and form;
4. To undertake further work on infrastructure and delivery requirements for the strategic housing allocation at Barton Farm (Policy WT2) to enable a more detailed site allocation policy to be developed, as opposed to alternative or additional strategic allocations;
5. To confirm the aim of promoting the knowledge economy and creative industries and to undertake further analysis of the opportunities presented by existing sites for use to promote the 'knowledge' economy;
6. In relation to Policy WT3 and the strategic employment allocation at Bushfield Camp, given the results of the studies completed so far combined with the, as yet uncertain, outcome of the 'Village Green' proposal, it is recommended that that the City Council should undertake limited further work and technical studies in relation to Policy WT3. These should take account of the results of studies being led by the landowner and be aimed at informing the decision making process to determine the suitability, viability and deliverability of the site at Bushfield Camp for a 'knowledge park', and taking account of the findings of the sustainability appraisal.

<b>Chapter 5 Spatial Strategy – Winchester Town</b>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
	Comments on paras 5.1 – 5.14	
2421; 556; 2088; 121; 3105; 10064; 10413; 10455; 10271; 10412;	<u>Support</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support 'development with a purpose' strategy for the Town</li> <li>• Support the creation of a low carbon economy primarily built on the</li> </ul>	<p>The support is noted</p> <p>A number of the comments made to the introductory paragraphs of Chapter 5 relate to the proposed allocations at Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp – responses to these comments will therefore be</p>

<p>10270; 2088; 2515; 3105; 10440 (Winchester Liberal Democrat Group); 2653; 1996; 10037; 2421; 10171; 10233; 10451; 10047; 10046; 10048;</p>	<p>‘creative and knowledge based ‘ industries linked to universities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Bushfield Camp as a preferred location for economic development – the site can address the lack of modern accommodation in Winchester while respecting its sensitive location</li> </ul> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must improve transport and create an environmentally friendly city</li> </ul> <p><u>Housing targets greenfield vs brownfield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with the need to find land for 2000 houses on a greenfield site – there are enough brownfield sites – options within the town have not been fully investigated need to consider building on car parks</li> <li>• Should not rely on greenfield sites once lost these are gone forever</li> <li>• Reliance on brownfield sites will make it hard to achieve open space and affordable housing</li> </ul>	<p>covered in the sections below dealing specifically with Policies WT2 and WT3.</p> <p>These matters are recognised in the spatial objectives expressed in the Core Strategy and will therefore be covered by policies within the Winchester Town chapter and other sections of the document as necessary.</p> <p>The Council had undertaken an assessment of potential sites available for housing purposes (SHLAA) at the time of publication of the Preferred Option (May 2009). Taking both the SHLAA results and existing commitments there was estimated to be land available for about 2000 dwellings within Winchester Town. The updated housing estimates (taking account of changes to data on completions, commitments and SHLAA sites) continue to show a need to make a planned strategic greenfield allocation through the Core Strategy during the plan period, as there are insufficient sites identified that could come forward for residential development.</p> <p>Further smaller allocations may be required through the Development Management and Allocations DPD. Advice in PPS3 emphasises the need to ensure a flexible and responsive supply of</p>
---	---	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for a ‘step change’ for Winchester came from outside the Winchester area</li> <li>• Need a more flexible strategy rather than 1 greenfield site and SHLAA sites where their deliverability is questionable – need more smaller greenfield sites around the District</li> </ul> <p><u>Barton Farm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with para 5.4 ‘land north of</li> </ul>	<p>land to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is available to achieve the housing objectives. The advice goes on to state that, once identified, the supply of land should be managed in a way to ensure a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites is maintained. Further analysis of housing supply data is set out in the main report. The SHLAA assessment included an examination of car parks across the District. The results of this and those sites that are considered suitable for development are set out in a report to the Council’s Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – <a href="http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/Cabinet/1900_1999/CAB1901.pdf">www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/Cabinet/1900_1999/CAB1901.pdf</a></p> <p>With regard to the point made by some respondents that support for the ‘step change’ approach came from those outside the Winchester area, this is in response to the Issues and Options document which explored this option as a potential strategy for Winchester Town. This strategy was not taken further at the Preferred Option stage of the Core Strategy which promotes an alternative ‘development with a purpose approach’.</p> <p>This section of the plan deals with the strategy for Winchester Town only. The need for other greenfield sites around the District will be explored under the other spatial areas.</p> <p>See responses to Policy WT2 below</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Winchester is the preferred option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Barton Farm is and remains a reserve site – it is the easy option but has problems which cannot be mitigated – concern that the site will not provide renewable energy – developers will not reduce their profits to provide these measures</li></ul> <p><u>Bushfield Camp</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The ‘knowledge theme’ referred to is only one of Winchester’s special characteristics – expand this to refer to ‘high value industries’ as need to remain flexible in current economic climate</li><li>• Growth in advanced manufacturing will encourage in-commuting – commuting issue is linked to house prices not employment opportunities</li><li>• The knowledge park is an unrealistic ambition – will attract more commuters and be a blot on the landscape</li><li>• Support the additional studies underway to provide the evidence for the use of Bushfield Camp as a Knowledge Park.</li></ul>	<p>See Responses to Policy WT3 below</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the plans for the longer term – concern that the Council is happy to destroy Barton Farm but that Three Maids Hill is not suitable for development – Bushfield will have as much landscape impact but this was not rejected on those grounds</li> <li>• Must support existing businesses</li> <li>• Use Bushfield Camp site for housing purposes this is a brownfield site – the site is subject of a ‘village green’ application recognising its use by the public</li> <li>• Bushfield should be preserved as greenspace</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

**Policy WT1 – Strategy for Winchester Town**

**Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:**

The allocations at Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp have not been assessed as part of this policy as they are subject to detailed individual assessment under policies WT2 and WT3 respectively. However it is noted that these allocations maximise the benefits of the existing infrastructure of Winchester Town.

Generally the policy performs well against the objectives in light of the level of development Winchester Town is expected to accommodate. The tension between designs polices and sustainable construction policies are also expressed elsewhere in the plan but with its emphasis on the density and appearance of new development this policy does pose questions about the ability to meet all these policy requirements. It is recommended that guidance is prepared for developers and householders to give clear examples

of how the requirements can be achieved.		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
2191; 10399; 89 (Hants CC); 2687; 2273; 10450; 121; 4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 10451; 10042; 10438; 3224; 10037;	Support for WT1	The support is noted
	Comments on Policy WT1	
10042; 10406; 2123; 10448; 10206; 84(South East Partnership Board); 382; 10387; 123; 10416; 10036; 1964; 10442; 87 (GOSE), 121; 10440 (Winchester Lib Dem Group); 2229; 2421;	<u>General comments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be an overall infrastructure plan before development is allowed</li> <li>• Large scale allocations will provide necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Need to include reference to extra care housing given the aging population</li> <li>• Support development within the built up area of the Town – existing employment sites should be regenerated and better use made of car parks</li> </ul>	<p>These general comments raise a variety of specific issues covered by Policy WT1. The purpose of the Policy is to set out the guiding principles for development and overall vision for Winchester Town up to 2026. The SA results have also raised some detailed issues that need to be explored in terms of the delivery of development and how to reconcile competing policy requirements. This will need to be addressed when Policy WT1 is redrafted to take on board the advice of GOSE and PINS in terms of needing to express ‘what, where, when and how’, in relation to Winchester Town.</p> <p>More specifically the Policy will also need to express in more detail the scale or quantities of development expected within the Town over the plan period as requested by both GOSE and South East</p>

<p>10409; 3104; 10270; 2609; 85 (Highways Agency); 10064; 2194; 10406; 140; 3082; 2421; 2198; 2922; 3071; 1993; 3198; 10031; 325; 2515; 3199; 90 (English Heritage); 10406; 2991; 713; 89 (Hants CC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need housing and employment on both Bushfield and Barton Farm to reduce commuting between the two sites</li> <li>• Role of independent education sector is also important to the Winchester economy and should be recognised in addition to the universities</li> <li>• Need to include provision for sport and recreation in WT1</li> <li>• WT1 should include safeguards for the environmental assets of both the town and the strategic allocations</li> <li>• Policy needs to refer to broad levels of development for various uses, plus Winchester's role as a secondary town centre in SEP</li> <li>• Strategy is insular and does not deal with the need to improving public transport links with surrounding settlements to allow others to access the services and new jobs to be created.</li> <li>• Winchester needs to reduce its carbon footprint not expand it by building on greenfield sites;</li> </ul>	<p>Partnership Board. The Core Strategy, in accordance with the advice in PPS12, will only allocate sites essential to the delivery of the strategy for the District. Therefore the many requests for the allocation of additional residential sites or land for other purposes will be considered as appropriate in the Development Management and Allocations DPD rather than the Core Strategy. The need for additional residential sites will require further analysis in terms of the SHLAA and the need to demonstrate an adequate land supply as required by PPS3.</p> <p>As stated above, the concept of a knowledge economy based around higher value, creative media industries and higher education is the result of the Economic Study (SQW 2008/9). This recognised these strengths in the Winchester economy that could provide a focus for economic growth that would not only promote and encourage the existing strengths of the local economy but that may also have the added benefit of attempting to reverse some of the commuting that the Town experiences on a daily basis, by providing the types of jobs locally which people are currently commuting out to. Whilst encouraging enterprise linked with knowledge/high value industries the strategy does not explicitly preclude other uses or economic sectors from expansion.</p> <p>This economic growth would also have the added benefit of contributing to reducing the carbon footprint of the Town, and would also require a package of transport measures as set out in the transport study (MVA 2009) to mitigate the impact of the proposed developments.</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• must also tackle transport issues</li> <li>• Policy needs to recognise the importance of culture and to retain existing cultural facilities</li> <li>• Support WTI except need for a knowledge park – should not restrict the employment options for Winchester</li> <li>• WT1 should prioritise low carbon housing and include space for allotments and opportunities to grow own food</li> <li>• Concern about traffic impact on strategic road network – mitigation will be required and delivery mechanisms need to be identified</li> <li>• The core strategy should allocate additional land for retail use</li> </ul> <p><u>Housing targets and greenfield vs brownfield</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to reassess the need for 2000 houses in Winchester – not accept government targets</li> <li>• Additional greenfield development should be promoted, sites suggested at :-</li> </ul>	<p>The Core Strategy must comply with the requirements of the SEP including the provision for 12,240 new homes over the period 2006 – 2026. The options for delivering this level of growth across the District were explored at the Issues and Options stage (December 2007) and the conclusion presented in the Preferred Option (May 2009). Since then, further work has been undertaken on the potential of existing sites within the urban areas of the District and clarification has been received from Government as to what sites can be</p>
--	---	---

	<p>land at Kings Worthy; land at Sarum Road; land north of Wellhouse Lane; land at Salters Lane; land at Pitt; land at Harestock; land south west of Olivers Battery; land at Francis Gardens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Piecemeal brownfield development does not necessarily meet local needs and infrastructure is not keeping pace</li> <li>• Object to number of houses for Winchester this will overload infrastructure,</li> <li>• Need to prioritise use of existing sites</li> <li>• Any proposal for development on the edge will compromise the setting of the city and its existing well defined urban edge – contrary to the vision for Winchester set out in WT1</li> </ul> <p><u>Barton Farm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to maximise capacity of Barton Farm as it is the most important site in the non-PUSH</li> </ul>	<p>included within any estimates of housing provision. This has lead to a reassessment of the potential housing supply – see covering report for details. The results of this confirm the need for a strategic housing allocation and will require further land to be identified and released for housing purposes to ensure a continuous supply of available sites as required by PPS3.</p> <p>Those sites suggested as alternatives/additions to the strategic allocations were assessed at the Issues and Options stage as all fell within one of the areas of search for the ‘step change’ option, explored at that time.</p> <p>See detailed comments in response to Policy WT2</p>
--	---	--

	<p>part of the District – express requirement as average density of 40dph rather than a 2000 limit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need small greenfield sites to be released in advance of Barton Farm</li> <li>• Object to Barton Farm – this is an important green lung</li> <li>• Object to single allocation at Barton Farm – over reliance on one site</li> <li>• Size of Barton Farm will not create the critical mass required for all the necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Knowledge Park should be part of a larger Barton Farm allocation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bushfield Camp</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support Bushfield Camp as a knowledge park due to traffic impact; employment development should be in the town centre not on Bushfield Camp; this development will exacerbate the housing/jobs imbalance</li> <li>• Object to employment allocation</li> </ul>	<p>See detailed comments in response to Policy WT3</p>
--	--	--



	<p>– these are only needed in areas of high unemployment not in Winchester</p>	<p><u>Recommended Approach :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to agree and retain the ‘development with a purpose’ strategy for Winchester Town</li> <li>• that the need for further greenfield sites to be released be explored through the Development Management and Allocations DPD following an assessment of potential sites and an update of housing supply data.</li> <li>• to amend Policy WT1 to specify the amounts and types of development required within the plan period for Winchester Town</li> <li>• to amend Policy WT1 to include reference to the environmental assets of the Town given its sensitive nature in terms of location and form.</li> <li>• To undertake further work on infrastructure and delivery requirements for the strategic housing allocation at Barton Farm – Policy WT2</li> <li>• to confirm the aim of promoting the knowledge economy and creative industries and to undertake further analysis of the opportunities presented by existing sites for use by the ‘knowledge’ economy</li> <li>• to complete the technical studies in relation to Policy WT3 to inform the decision making process to determine the viability and deliverability of the site for a ‘knowledge park’.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

<b>Policy WT2: Strategic Housing Allocation- Barton Farm</b>		
<b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b>		
<p>This site generally performs well against the SA objectives and, if required, will assist in meeting the District housing requirement and providing accommodation to meet a wide range of needs. The policy recognises the need to improve public transport, walking and cycling links to reduce carbon emissions and thereby progressing the climate change objectives. The site is well located to meet these requirements. Awareness of the sensitivity of the River Itchen is expressed and this SA will be guided by the findings of the HRA being carried out in parallel. Only two recommendations are made and that is the protection of the tracks crossing the site and their role in integrating the on site GI and the adjacent GI and the risk of light and noise pollution on the northern boundary.</p>		
<b>Response no./Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of key issues</b>	<b>WCC officer response and Recommended Approach</b>
3199;1993; 10064; 2609; 121; 10042; 1872; 10394; 86; 10395; 87; 2121; 10397;10440; 10269; 13 (Denmead Parish Council)	<u>Support for WT2</u>	The support is noted
	<u>Object/Comment on Policy WT2</u>	
10064; 289; 3082 (City of Winchester Trust); 2421;10097	<u>General Comments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The masterplan should be commissioned by the Council not the developers</li> </ul>	While it is important that the Council and the local community are involved in producing the

<p>1993; 2088; 2515; 510; 23(Littleton &amp; Harestock Parish Council); 10455 10448; 89 (Hampshire County Council); 375; 10443; 120; 2173; 325; 10254; 275; 1981; 375; 2428; 10204; 123; 233; 1984; 10406; 2088; 556; 3105 (Save Barton Farm Group); 1984; 3202; 10276; 10039; 10271; 10416; 3198 (WINACC); 3199 (Sport England); 10394; 87 (GOSE); 2121; 86 (The Environment Agency); 85 (The Highways Agency); 1981; 10416; 96 (Southern Water); 10212;3071; 84(South East England Regional</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development will require a management plan covering the whole site</li> <li>• All Inspectors have decided against Barton Farm</li> <li>• The location makes the development unsustainable</li> <li>• Concern over the potential redevelopment of the Henry Beaufort site and the consequent loss of the school playing fields</li> <li>• The development should deliver a number of zero-carbon homes</li> <li>• The development should act as an exemplar, and demonstrate best practice in renewable energy provision</li> <li>• There will be undue noise from the railway</li> <li>• Development at this location would breach several other policies in the CS</li> <li>• Land to the north of Well House Lane should be included to allow for future growth; the precise boundary should be set through the masterplan and might require additional land</li> <li>• Land to the north of Well House Lane should be identified for further housing park and ride and a knowledge based business park</li> <li>• Once Barton Farm is approved this will lead the way for a further 6,000 dwellings on this site</li> <li>• More evidence is needed to identify and support the quantum of retail and leisure uses</li> </ul>	<p>masterplan, experience from major sites elsewhere in the District suggests that it is not essential that the Council funds and prepares the masterplan in order to meet the required high standard of sustainable design.</p> <p>It is agreed that a management plan should be prepared and should cover the whole site as identified in the CS, and that this should be reflected in the policy. The Sustainability Appraisal makes 2 recommendations for additions to Policy WT2 which should also be included in an amended Policy.</p> <p>It is not the case that all Inspectors have found against Barton Farm. The two most recent decisions have commented on the sustainability of the site, with the Local Plan Inspector recommending its inclusion as a strategic reserve site and the appeal Inspector recommending against development solely on the issues of timing.</p> <p>Policy WT2 requires consideration to be given to relocating Henry Beaufort School. If this proves practical then planning permission would be required to determine the future of the current site, which would include an assessment of the extent to which existing open space should be retained.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Assembly); 10177; 10420; 10406; 10270.</p>	<p>proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be kept away from the odour plume from the Harestock waste water treatment plant</li> </ul>	<p>The Core Strategy Preferred Option put forward requirements relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Council has commissioned consultants to test the various options for meeting the Council’s policies on renewable energy and will assess them against a number of scenarios that will test viability. Any amendments to the policies on renewable energy will, if necessary, be reflected in changes to WT2. In preparing a scheme on this site it would be expected that the development would meet the prevailing policy requirements and act as an exemplar. The possibility of developing zero carbon homes would be thoroughly explored, together with the use of renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>The development would be expected to be laid out and properly insulated to mitigate the potential impact of noise from the railway</p> <p>Draft policy WT2 is believed to be entirely consistent with the remainder of the policies in the Coe Strategy.</p> <p>The land identified in the policy is adequate to develop 2,000 dwellings together with the supporting infrastructure. Therefore no further</p>
---	---	---

	<p><u>Need for development at Barton Farm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the reliance of a single site to meet housing needs, more flexibility and contingency is required</li> <li>• Insufficient consideration has been given to the benefits of making more than one strategic allocation in Winchester.</li> <li>• The allocation of a single site increases risks and does not provide the necessary flexibility</li> <li>• No justification has been given to show that 2,000 dwellings are critical to meet the infrastructure needs</li> <li>• The size of the allocation should be reduced; and other strategic greenfield sites allocated i.e. Pitt Manor</li> <li>• A number of smaller greenfield sites should be</li> </ul>	<p>land, including land to the north, needs to be allocated at this time. Neither is it axiomatic that development of Barton Farm will lead to further development in the immediate locality,.</p> <p>It is agreed that the policy needs to be clearer on the quantum of retail (as well as other uses) which might be acceptable. The policy also needs to be clear that development should be kept away from potential odour emanating from the Harestock Waste water treatment plant.</p> <p>A lot of consideration was given to the option of either meeting the housing requirement on a number of sites or through the allocation of one strategic site. The latter was preferred because this will allow for the necessary infrastructure to be identified, phased and delivered. This is particularly important for the provision of primary education. There is currently pressure in the city on primary school places which would require an additional school to meet the level of growth proposed in the SE Plan. This would be difficult to achieve if the growth were to be spread on several sites.</p> <p>The Council assessed a number of sites for</p>
--	---	---

	<p>identified to meet short term needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria for triggering the development must be set out in the policy</li> <li>• The monitoring process that will determine the need for Barton Farms needs to be more explicit</li> <li>• The status of the site is unclear - it is needed to meet the SE Plan targets, but the policy states it will only be released if needed</li> <li>• The housing figures in the SE Plan are not maximum so there is no need to hold back the development</li> <li>• Housing needs can be met by building on brownfield and in-fill sites</li> <li>• There is no justification for the release of this 'reserve site'</li> <li>• The slow down in economic growth both regionally and globally means that this development is not required</li> </ul>	<p>their sustainability and accessibility before concluding that Barton Farm offered the best option</p> <p>While the Council has identified one strategic site the SHLAA has identified a number of smaller sites which can provide flexibility and meet short term needs. The updated housing figures demonstrate clearly that there is not enough previously developed or already-allocated land to meet the housing requirement for the non-PUSH part of the District. Therefore a strategic allocation is required and will need to be started soon in order to meet the SE Plan housing requirement. Given the work already undertaken on alternative sites, Barton Farm remains the most suitable site and the implication that the site can continue to be treated as a 'reserve' site should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>The slowdown in economic activity has not changed the level of housing need in the city; if anything it has only exacerbated matters. The factors which militated for additional growth, the aging population, and an increase in the number of households, still pertain.</p>
--	--	---

	<p><u>Housing mix /density</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question whether the development of 2,000 dwellings will create sufficient activity to support public transport shops etc. If the site were more intensively developed it would take pressure off of other sites</li> <li>• The percentage of low cost housing should be increased</li> <li>• More than 50% of the development should be 2/3 bedroom homes</li> </ul> <p><u>Green Infrastructure (GI)/ Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient explanation has been given on the type of green infrastructure sought; more policy guidance is required on the type and</li> </ul>	<p>The scale of the development and the size of the site means that it will be developed at average densities of around 40 dwellings per hectare. This will provide for a range of housing including a predominance of family housing to meet the needs of the city. Higher densities tend to mean more flats, which make it more difficult to achieve a balanced community.</p> <p>The final mix of houses will be determined in the light of the most recent Housing Market Assessment at the time of the planning application.</p> <p>The percentage of affordable housing reflects both need and, importantly, viability. To increase the percentage would require other infrastructure requirements to be reduced to avoid it jeopardising the viability of the scheme.</p> <p>It is agreed that in developing the policy greater clarity is required in respect of the justification and potential uses for the land east of the railway. However a development of</p>
--	--	--

	<p>amount of GI required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It might be preferable to integrate open space within the development site to the west of the railway; the GI annotation should therefore be deleted</li> <li>• The land allocate for GI should not be a separate allocation</li> <li>• The extent of GI necessary should be determined through the masterplanning process following a full landscape assessment</li> <li>• Allotments should be provided for existing and future residents</li> <li>• Text should be amended to indicate that the land east of the railway is required for recreational and outdoor sports facilities, and to mitigate environmental impacts</li> </ul> <p><u>Transport Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The A 34 and M3 suffer from peak hour congestion and further traffic on the strategic highways network would concern the Highways Agency; therefore specific mitigation measures including funding and delivery mechanisms need to be identified</li> <li>• Objection to principle due to increased traffic; which will only add to CO2 emissions</li> <li>• A package of highways improvements/transport infrastructure should be set out in</li> </ul>	<p>this scale would be expected to mitigate for both the impact on and loss of countryside.</p> <p>The policy should allow for the exploration of the possibility of providing a significant number of new allotments.</p> <p>PUSH has recently published a sub-regional GI strategy which covers the southern part of the District. The City Council is developing its own District-wide GI strategy which will be consistent with and help implement the PUSH strategy. This will consider the needs and opportunities for GI provision in conjunction with the strategic allocations and Policy WT2 should be amended as necessary to reflect the results of the GI strategy.</p> <p>Further transport assessment has been undertaken for the Council by consultants MVA in order to assess the potential impact of the development of Barton Farm on the strategic highways network and to consider what is required by way of mitigation. This will be taken into account in revising Policy WT2 and/or the Core Strategy implementation plan to include more specific transport requirements. The recently-submitted planning application will need to include a full transport</p>
--	---	---



	<p>the policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is likely to lead to increased out commuting; particularly to London; The existing rail infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the inevitable increase in rails commuting</li> <li>• More clarity is required to demonstrate how the development can help reduce in-commuting</li> <li>• Object to the potential impact on traffic on local roads and settlements</li> <li>• Sustainable transport measures are unlikely to be implemented</li> <li>• Park and Ride should be investigated</li> <li>• There is a need to mitigate impact on routes into the city</li> <li>• Support should be given to promoting public transport, including providing the necessary infrastructure, i.e. quality bus shelters</li> <li>• Walking and cycling through and from the site should be a requirement</li> </ul>	<p>assessment of the impact on the surrounding highways and appropriate mitigation measures, which will also inform the development of the Core Strategy’s policies.</p> <p>Work will be undertaken as part of the preparation of the infrastructure delivery plan to give more detail on the range of measures required to address the potential impact on the strategic highways network, the broad costs and responsibilities, and when they will need to be provided. Further discussions with the Highways Agency and HCC as the Highways Authority will take place as part of the policy development.</p> <p>Policy WT2 will require a package of measures to accompany any planning application which promote walking, cycling and public transport, and reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The development will be expected to provide a range of dwelling types and tenures (including 40% affordable), to ensure there is a better match between housing and employment opportunities in the city; this might include targeting some of the housing towards key workers to help reduce in-commuting. The potential role of park and ride on this radial</p>
--	---	---

	<p><u>Landscape impact/ loss of countryside</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to retain countryside around the City</li> <li>• The development will lead to the destruction of countryside and the loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• There will be a loss of biodiversity/wildlife</li> <li>• The development would have an adverse visual impact on the setting of Winchester</li> <li>• The development would destroy Winchester’s unique character</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is subject to flooding/flood risk</li> </ul>	<p>route into the city will also be assessed.</p> <p>Policy WT2 will ensure that the new development meets the highest standards of sustainable design and is laid out to respect and enhance the exiting landscape features.</p> <p>The site is currently intensively farmed so there is an opportunity to both protect the (limited) existing features of nature conservation interest on the site and to use the green infrastructure, including the sustainable drainage system, to enhance biodiversity. Provision will also be required for mitigation on land to the east of the railway.</p> <p>It is known that parts of the site are liable to flood and have been identified by the Environment Agency as being in an area at risk of flooding. Policy SS2 sets out requirements for all strategic allocations, including Barton Farm, and includes requirements relating to flooding. It is being proposed that Policy SS2 be deleted and that its various requirements are incorporated into each strategic allocation policy. Therefore, Policy WT2 would be explicit that those areas within the site that are liable to flooding should</p>
--	--	---

	<p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development will put undue pressure on existing infrastructure, including health facilities.</li> <li>• Question whether adequate infrastructure will be provided</li> <li>• The large infrastructure requirement could delay delivery</li> </ul>	<p>have no built development, and that an integrated system of sustainable drainage should be incorporated to reduce the risk of flooding from surface water run-off.</p> <p>The policy will set out the main items of social and physical infrastructure required to support the new development and to mitigate its potential impacts (some of these are currently contained in Policy SS2 and would be incorporated into a revised Policy WT2). It will also be necessary to prepare a delivery plan for the development which identifies what is required in respect of infrastructure, who will provide it, its potential funding and how it might be phased to ensure timely provision and viability.</p> <p><u>Recommended approach :-</u></p> <p>It is recommended that further work should be undertaken on the infrastructure and delivery requirements for Barton Farm, to enable the next version of the Core Strategy to include a more detailed site allocation policy and explanatory text, rejecting additional / alternative sites. This would be more specific and answer the ‘what, where, when and how’ questions, incorporating matters raised above and the findings of the Sustainability</p>
--	--	--

		Appraisal, as relevant and necessary.
--	--	---------------------------------------

<b>Chapter 4 – Spatial Strategy – Winchester Town – Bushfield Camp (Policy WT3)</b>		
<b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b>		
<p>The policy conveys uncertainty about the viability of the site which raises questions about the provision of adequate infrastructure. The supporting text also acknowledges issues about the biodiversity and habitat sensitivity of the area earmarked for GI. As noted above it is considered that the site may need AA. These factors require further detailed work and could result in the removal of the site from the plan on sustainability grounds unless no adverse impacts are proven.</p> <p>On the other hand, the site performs well in terms of location and has the potential to facilitate long term aims of the Council and become part of the movement towards a low carbon economy. It is recommended that a comprehensive Green Travel plan is required.</p>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
10037, 1993	<p><u>Comments on paragraphs 3.1, 3.4, 11.7 and 11.8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Spatial Vision and the creation of a low carbon economy. The recognition of the important part to be played by the universities is welcomed.</li> <li>• Support references to the University of Winchester and its growing role.</li> </ul>	The support is noted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the promotion of a knowledge based economy</li> </ul>	
120,10037,10085 (SEEDA),10438, 10255 (South Downs Joint Committee)	<p><u>Support WT3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposal to establish a knowledge park at Bushfield Camp.</li> <li>A knowledge park would be fully in line with the Regional Economic Strategy and would improve Winchester's competitiveness and reputation as an important centre for the creative and media sectors.</li> <li>Support a knowledge park development, in preference to more housing. This would bring new jobs and could provide useful links with the City's education providers.</li> <li>Support the allocation's requirement for 23 hectares to be dedicated for public use.</li> </ul>	The support is noted.
9 (Compton & Shawford PC),2191 (Church Commissioners), 3198, 3199(Sport England),10039, 10085 (SEEDA),10251, 10255 (South Downs Joint Committee), 10402, 10406, 10451 (WCBP Ltd & Church Commissioners)	<p><u>Support Policy WT3 with reservations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the allocation, in principle, subject to further studies and information.</li> <li>Support in principle but with reservations regarding landscaping, screening and visual intrusion.</li> <li>Support the allocation. The term 'knowledge-based business park'</li> </ul>	The requirement to examine the site's characteristics, constraints and history in greater depth, as a pre-requisite of confirming Policy WT3 as a strategic employment allocation, anticipates the need to: assess / mitigate the impact of development, in terms of all identified constraints, including landscape sensitivity; ensure that sustainable access and transport provisions can be put in place and; include the provision of

	<p>should be used and the former use of the site should be acknowledged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference is made to further studies; if this site is taken forward its part in framing the spatial strategy for the area should be considered.</li> <li>• Any development on this site should be to the highest standards of sustainable design and transport.</li> <li>• Development should be screened from views from St Catherine's Hill and building height restricted to two storeys.</li> <li>• To mitigate wider development impacts and to integrate with green infrastructure and the network of green spaces, the provision of 'Leisure and outdoor sports provision' should be made a formal requirement of any allocation.</li> <li>• Development should provide facilities for employees, a footpath/cycle path along Badger Farm Road, bus lanes and a shuttle to the Park and Ride site.</li> <li>• Propose a new housing allocation to the south-west of the city, to complement employment development at Bushfield, reduce commuting and establish sustainable methods of</li> </ul>	<p>appropriate on-site facilities as part of any resultant scheme.</p> <p>Policy WT3's specific requirement that 23 hectares will be made available for public use is intended to provide a significant local benefit in terms of providing a new and fully accessible leisure and recreation facility. This is likely to take the form of a small country park which can be linked with other green infrastructure assets within and around the southern parts of the town.</p> <p>Consideration was given at the Core Strategy's Issues and Options stage to various alternatives for major development. Several broad areas at the periphery were identified, in order to consider their suitability for possible release as strategic housing or employment sites. Two of these areas included land adjoining Oliver's Battery. However, with the exception of a possible area of land at Pitt Vale Farm, environmental and infrastructure constraints, together with potential complications of availability and delivery, were such that the two areas were not considered suitable for housing development and, therefore, were not carried forward to the Preferred Option stage.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it remains the case that some new greenfield development will need to be identified, in order to meet the South East Plan's housing requirements. The 'strategic allocations' would be progressed through the Core Strategy, whilst a second</p>
--	--	---

<p>84 (SEERA), 85 (Highways Agency), 86 (Environment Agency), 87 (GOSE), 89 (HCC), 90 (English Heritage), 121, 123, 510, 1872, 1964, 1993, 2121, 2123 (Winchester College), 2515, 2609, 2940, 3082 (City of Winchester Trust),</p>	<p>travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further work will be needed to assess whether a knowledge park development here would complement existing (Chilworth Science Park) or proposed (Eastleigh Riverside) science parks located within the PUSH area to the south.</li> </ul> <p><u>Objections to WT3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential major concerns about the transport sustainability of this site, given a generally poor walking/cycling network, no direct rail access, a location close to a motorway junction and congestion on local roads.</li> <li>• As the A34 and M3 already suffer peak hour congestion, further</li> </ul>	<p>stage of the District's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) will now assess those greenfield sites submitted to the Council which lie adjacent to the Core Strategy's defined 'urban areas' and Level 1 and Level 2 settlements. Taking account of constraints, this additional work will then identify those sites which may have the potential for future allocation through the Development Management and Allocation Development Plan Document, as part of the LDF process.</p> <p>The potential relationship between a knowledge park at Bushfield Camp, the existing Science Park facility at Chilworth, the proposed Eastleigh Riverside development and any negative overlap with these which might arise, are matters which have been considered as part of the viability study carried out for the Council by the consultants Vail Williams. The findings of this study are dealt with in more detail, below.</p> <p>Access constraints, Bushfield Camp's proximity to the motorway network, the likely traffic generation from a knowledge park development of this scale and, in addition, the potential to create additional long distance car-borne commuting trips are all matters which have been subject to recent investigation. Each of these issues has been assessed in the broad context of a new 864-space Park and Ride facility close to the site, which is due to open in 2010 and will bring improved</p>
--	--	--

<p>3135 (H &amp; loW WT), 3202, 10044, 10077, 10171, 10233, 10270, 10276, 10400, 10440 (Cllr Kelsie Learney, on behalf of Winchester Liberal Democrat City Council Group)</p>	<p>increases in traffic would be of concern. The transport assessment [Stage 1 Report] indicates there could be particular problems at M3 junctions 9 and 11. Specific mitigation measures and delivery mechanisms need to be identified to address these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A knowledge park development, with its consequent traffic generation, would negate the benefits of the new Park and Ride facility in terms of local traffic flows and air pollution.</li> <li>• The allocation of this site, which has now reverted to countryside, for a knowledge park development, would be contrary to the ‘Sustainable Development Principles’ contained in the Preferred Options’ Policy SS1, would fail to reduce commuting and would not serve local needs.</li> <li>• Contrary to the declared objective of minimising the use of private cars, development at Bushfield Camp could potentially generate a significant increase in cross-town traffic movements, to the detriment of southern parts of the city.</li> </ul>	<p>public transport links with the town centre and the railway station. Although not intended as a car parking facility to serve the Bushfield site, the presence of Park and Ride, a nearby Sustrans route, other rights of way in the locality and the prospect of improved public transport links to the town are all factors to be considered, in any attempt to exploit sustainable transport opportunities for accessing this site without reliance on the private car.</p> <p>Transport issues have also been the subject of a Transport Assessment commissioned by the Council and conducted by the MVA Consultancy. A final Stage 2 Report has now been received and, whilst the report acknowledges that the new Park and Ride facility under construction and other sustainable travel opportunities referred to above “provide a reasonable platform from which to build a mitigation strategy”, it does indicate that:</p> <p>“Concerns have been expressed by the Highways Agency in relation to this development and regarding its potential impact on the strategic road network, particularly M3 junction 11. The business park style development that is proposed may be heavily car oriented, based on our understanding of similar business parks at Whiteley and Chilworth”.</p> <p>The report goes on to state that parking supply at the proposed knowledge park site is “likely to prove one of the key determinants in shaping the extent to which the</p>
---	--	---



		<p>site is car dependent” ....”Parking supply restrictions must be implemented alongside quality alternatives to the car, to bring about modal shift”. However, there is a potential conflict between restraining parking provision and achieving a commercial attractive and viable development (see below).</p> <p>The report estimates impacts on the strategic road network based on forecast flows from the Winchester strategic allocations (Bushfield Camp and Barton Farm) in combination with forecasts from other PUSH developments. From these estimates, the report highlights that: “The Department for Transport has announced proposals to implement a Managed Motorway strategy on this section of the M3 (junctions 9 -14), subject to further investigation. Details of the proposal are unclear at this stage but might include selective hard-shoulder running, variable speed limits and improved incident management and, if feasible, would be delivered after 2014. Forecasts for overall capacity increases are not available but experience from elsewhere, principally the M42 Active Traffic Management Pilot scheme, would suggest capacity increases of between 7% and 22%. Taken in combination with traffic reductions from smarter travel intervention, M3 volume/capacity levels would return to current levels. However, the impact on individual junctions, principally junction 11, needs further consideration as the Managed Motorways concept largely targets links capacity rather than junction</p>
--	--	---

		<p>capacity. The combined impact of Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp, even with smarter travel interventions, may create congestion at this junction even with motorway link flows constrained”.</p> <p>In its response to the Core Strategy Preferred Option the Highways Agency has indicated in regard to the Bushfield Camp employment allocation that any addition to current peak-hour congestion on the A34/M3 would be “of concern...without careful consideration as to mitigation measures”. The Agency has made it clear that specific mitigation measures and the funding / delivery mechanisms for these would need to be put in place prior to the Core Strategy’s Pre- Submission consultation stage. It has also indicated that “There are no further planned capacity improvements on this section [M3 south of Junction 9 and along the M27] before 2014”.</p> <p>In view of the findings of the consultant’s final report, the fact that these have yet to be discussed with the Highways Agency and that the Department for Transport has not yet produced a definite strategy for applying Managed Motorway measures for junctions 9-14 on the M3, further consideration of the highway and mitigation implications of a knowledge park development will be needed. The transport assessment has clarified the scale of the likely transport impact on the M3 and junction 11 and further consideration now needs to be given to how / whether this can be</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A knowledge park development here would affect the site’s regenerating biodiversity and harm Winchester’s nationally and internationally important assets, countryside and water table.</li> <li>• A strategic employment allocation would result in a loss of ecological</li> </ul>	<p>accommodated. In addition, the promoters of the site are undertaking their own transport work which will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>With regard to the issue of cross-town traffic, the Bushfield Camp knowledge park is not intended to serve new housing at Barton Farm. The transport assessment confirms this by saying “a small proportion of car trips departing from Barton Farm will be destined for employment at Bushfield Camp.”</p> <p>The Core Strategy has been assessed to date against sustainability objectives and strategic environmental assessment, including habitats regulations. These recognise that the policy allocating this site will have to include the mitigation required to avoid adverse impact on the River Itchen SAC. Natural England, as the responsible authority for the Habitats Regulations, has been party to these discussions and has agreed this approach.</p> <p>Prior to any confirmation of the Bushfield Camp policy allocating the site for knowledge park development, further assessment of the effects of development is needed, in order to establish both local and ‘in combination’ impacts on nearby sites of national and international importance. Maintaining and enhancing local biodiversity and nature conservation interest are regarded as priorities and, therefore, the landowner and</p>
--	---	--

	<p>interests (SINC), given its scale. Further studies are needed and should include flood risk, ecology, historic land use, contamination potential and viability. Viability will partly depend on the effluent generated. This would be dealt with at the Morestead WWTW, which has discharge limits constrained by Groundwater and Habitats Regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The undeveloped site provides the backdrop to the internationally important Chapel of St Cross and should be maintained as such. The proposal fails to recognise the informal use and enjoyment of this site by local people.</li> <li>• Development of the now 'greenfield' Bushfield Camp site would be visually intrusive, in terms of the setting of both Winchester and the South Downs National Park and would also erode the Winchester - Compton Street Local Gap.</li> <li>• There should be a requirement for an assessment of the potential development's impacts on the historic environment.</li> </ul>	<p>promoter of a knowledge-based development, the Church Commissioners, has appointed specialist consultants to survey the site's biodiversity and assess, on the basis of known and updated information, the likely consequences of development and the effects on flora, fauna and other elements of the natural ecology. This work will, in addition, consider measures to mitigate both the local and wider impacts of development and to integrate the developed part of the site (20 hectares) with the publicly accessible remainder. It will not only focus on the need to support biodiversity but also the requirement to improve sustainability by strengthening/creating linkages with other green spaces and pedestrian and cycle routes in the locality.</p> <p>With regard to arrangements for waste disposal and, in particular, the capacity limits which currently apply at the Morestead Waste Water Treatment Works, this issue will need to be fully examined. However, such an assessment may be better informed when the exact nature and scale of development, the number of employees and the capacity of any scheme to limit/deal with its own waste are more clearly known.</p> <p>It is fully accepted that historic St Cross and its Hospital Chapel, the City, its Cathedral and the newly designated South Downs National Park to the east, are all key elements in the exceptionally fine surroundings of the Bushfield Camp site. Due its prominent location</p>
--	--	---

		<p>overlooking the valley of the River Itchen, great care would need to be taken to ensure that any built development on this site will not result in a harmful impact on these features and fully conforms to the open downland character prevalent on both sides of the valley.</p> <p>To demonstrate visual and landscape impacts and take into account the effect of development on views of the site from all key points within and around the river valley, the promoters of the site have commissioned a detailed assessment of these factors, in accordance with a brief produced by City Council officers. In addition, given the known presence of archaeological remains in the vicinity, together with the remaining evidence of wartime occupation, an additional study has been commissioned by the landowner to assess the extent and significance of any, as yet unrecorded, archaeology and to give details of any appropriate recording, preservation and, possibly, subsequent interpretation which might be deemed necessary.</p> <p>Currently, work on each of these three commissioned studies is in progress and it is expected that they will be concluded shortly. Quite separately to that an application is currently before Hampshire County Council, for the designation of the greater part of the Bushfield Camp area, as a 'Village Green'. This application is referred to in more detail, below.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>A requirement of Policy WT3 is for the dedication of 23 hectares of open land, adjoining the former Camp area, for future public use in perpetuity. The Preferred Option expects that the land would be 'gifted' by the current owner for this purpose and laid out for public access and enjoyment as a small country park, together with a programme for ongoing management and maintenance.</p> <p>The owners of the site have indicated that that are willing to make the land available, but not to fund the costs of its laying out or maintenance. Accordingly, the viability assessment commissioned by the City Council is based on the assumption that these costs would not be met by the landowner. Advice on the potential cost implication of this has been provided by the Council's Landscape and Open Spaces Team.</p> <p>Firstly, it would appear that the costs associated with site preparation could be relatively moderate, perhaps in the order of £45,000. Assuming visitor access would be primarily geared towards pedestrian entry from St Cross, Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery, attention would need to be given to fencing, low-key signage and general preparation consistent with low-impact visitor use. Although it is not anticipated that any other significant construction or engineering works would be needed it may, however, be necessary to make a limited provision for vehicular access and operational/disabled parking.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>However, in terms of ongoing management, there would need to be an emphasis on landscape restoration and long-term support for improving biodiversity, in order to help mitigate landscape/biodiversity impacts. The latter, in particular, could require site wardening with the additional costs this would involve. It is estimated that annual site management / maintenance would cost approximately £45,000 annually, for the northern part of the site. In line with accepted practice, the commuted sum payable for such maintenance (based on a twenty-year maintenance period) would amount to £900,000.</p> <p>A further potential constraint on this site's development as a knowledge park, which was identified through the Preferred Option process and set out as a requirement of Policy WT3, concerns the commercial viability and potential deliverability of this type of venture. An assessment of this needs to have regard to any measures necessary to resolve transport, biodiversity, landscape or other issues and take into account the context of the current and expected economic climate.</p> <p>In order to explore these matters in some detail, consultants Vail Williams LLP, were commissioned by the Council to produce an "Evaluation of Development Interest and Viability of a Proposed 'Knowledge Park'". A copy of their final report and its findings can be viewed on the Council's website:</p>
--	--	--

		<p><a href="http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?nc=TCDX&amp;id=23093">http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?nc=TCDX&amp;id=23093</a></p> <p>The consultant’s initial assumption was of a high value employment development, within mainly office-type buildings and designed to attract and retain quality “high end” employers to Winchester. Such a development could qualify as a science park, if business and technology support were provided, otherwise it would be better categorised as a business park. “A significant strength of the site is its close proximity to the M3 and this is an important factor in the perception that the site would attract occupiers if it is developed”.</p> <p>The consultants made a number of direct approaches to academic institutions, including the Universities of Winchester, Southampton and Sparsholt College. However, in summary it has been concluded that “Indications of demand for floorspace at Bushfield Camp, from local academic institutions, are modest, although warm in spirit due to the positive economic development potential....The University of Winchester and the University of Southampton Science Park would contemplate a greater role in the development but this is very much subject to demand and a fresh look at the land values suggested by the Church Commissioners’ consultants”.</p> <p>The report goes on to state that; “Anecdotal feedback from commercial property agents</p>
--	--	--



		<p>suggests that occupiers would locate at Bushfield Camp if a scheme was built, but this does not address the issue of financial viability/delivery....Competing supply is focused on Winchester city centre although this is somewhat limited and of varying quality. However, in the 'out-of-town' market there is significantly more competing supply. This is situated along the M3 and the M271, but more particularly along the M27 towards Fareham at Solent Business Park. This supply will help to contain rental growth”.</p> <p>Due to some limitations regarding the landowner’s development assumptions and detailed financial appraisals the consultants have made it clear that “Our appraisals at this stage can only give a broad assessment of viability and we note that some of our assumptions as to cost may have been conservative”. Nevertheless, the report’s conclusion are that: “There is limited funding available for speculative development and investors are extremely risk averse...In our opinion the development is not viable at today’s yields and even assuming significant improvement in the market a negligible land value would need to be attributed to the site if development of a ‘knowledge park’ is to occur. We have made some allowance for alternative land uses as part of the mix of development that we have appraised (including a hotel and some ancillary retail facilities) but a much more valuable mix of uses would be required to catalyse development and meet the landowner’s stated</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative sites within the urban area have not been properly examined. These could be better served by public transport and Park &amp; Ride, absorb underused land, benefit the town’s retail vitality and enhance established employment areas such as Winnall or Bar End.</li> <li>• Object to a knowledge park allocation at Bushfield Camp. Land to the north of Barton Farm is more suitable: having less impact on the PUSH strategy; being part of a mixed development with better access to the town centre and better delivery prospects; having lesser landscape constraints and; lower site preparation costs.</li> </ul>	<p>expectations in terms of land value”.</p> <p>The site’s landowner/promoter is undertaking its own assessment of economic issues and initial work highlights the difficulties of assessing viability for an innovative use over a long period of time. This is, therefore, an area where further work is needed and can be informed by the results of other studies currently underway.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in personal travel and public transport terms, a town centre location would offer the broadest range of alternatives and, in that particular sense, would provide a good employment location. There are, however, no single sites within the urban centre which are both available and of a sufficient size to accommodate a cohesive, new-build knowledge based development of a kind which has the potential to make a significant contribution to the local economy.</p> <p>Alternatives, including sites within the urban area and on other greenfield sites (including north of Barton Farm) were assessed by the Winchester Economic Study Supplementary Report. This concluded that Bushfield Camp was the best available option, but if ongoing work on constraints and deliverability shows that this is not achievable other alternatives may need to be considered.</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can confirm that Worthy Down would not be available as an alternative allocation site, due the MOD's plans for that site.</li> <li>• The Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy will need to set out an alternative strategy, if studies show that Bushfield Camp is not an appropriate location for a knowledge park.</li> <li>• The alternative concept of designating the site a 'Village Green' is to be encouraged and would provide recreational and health benefits for the local population.</li> <li>• All of the Bushfield Camp site should be returned to agricultural production.</li> <li>• A wind turbine or multiple turbine wind farm would be a more appropriate use of the elevated Bushfield Camp site. This could produce a significant renewable energy source, would allow recreational use, maintain biodiversity, generate no extra traffic and require minimal off-site infrastructure investment.</li> <li>• The entire site should be designated a Country Park, giving greater opportunities for landscape and</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst it has been accepted from the outset that Bushfield Camp is subject to a number of constraints, the potential for a high-quality, low visual impact employment use on the upper part of the site has also been recognised. A further benefit would be to provide both the type of employment and a working environment which would be attractive to those currently commuting to work at destinations away from the town.</p> <p>If the various further investigations mentioned above show that Bushfield Camp is not acceptable or deliverable, it will then be necessary to reconsider the economic development objectives which have driven the Core Strategy's 'development with a purpose' option. Nevertheless, the concept of a knowledge-based economy (as opposed to the Bushfield site) has been widely supported and should, in principle, be retained.</p> <p>If this were the case, the Strategy's policies would then need to be proactively applied, in order to retain existing significant employment sites and to direct development at these and other opportunity locations towards appropriate forms of development/redevelopment. There would also need to be a reappraisal of the development potential of town centre sites, particularly any near to the railway station.</p> <p>The 165 hectare area of land, to the north of Well</p>
--	--	---

	<p>biodiversity restoration.</p>	<p>House Lane and the Barton Farm site is promoted by a respondent as an alternative to Bushfield Camp. This option has already been considered as a possible employment extension to the strategic housing allocation to the south of Well House Lane (Policy WT2). However, this employment allocation alternative was not progressed to the Preferred Option stage as the allocation of only part of this large and contiguous area, sufficient to meet projected employment needs, would have the effect of opening up the remainder to further development pressures during the LDF plan period. Also, whilst the traffic impacts of 2,000 new dwellings at Barton Farm have been previously examined and found acceptable, up to Secretary of State level, the impact of further growth beyond this has not been formally tested. It is, therefore, possible that the Highways Agency’s current “concerns” regarding levels of congestion at M3 junctions 9 and 11 and its requirement for the “credible identification of realistic and deliverable mitigation measures to minimise individual and cumulative impacts”, may result in the Agency objecting to a strategic employment allocation north of Well House Lane and, consequently, calling into question the deliverability of such an allocation.</p> <p>The MOD’S requirement for an ongoing operational use of Worthy Down is noted and rules this area out as an option for knowledge park development during the plan period.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

		<p>A knowledge park employment development at Bushfield Camp covering 20 hectares would be adjoined on its north and east sides by some 23 hectares of open access land managed as a country park, but with the primary emphasis on supporting and enhancing the site's biodiversity and nature conservation interest. In visual terms such a recreational facility would open up and restore the site's essentially 'downland' character and, in terms of public access and enjoyment, and would legitimise the technically unauthorised public use of the site in recent years, certain aspects of which have been tolerated by the landowner.</p> <p>A knowledge park development of a compact form and sensitive, sustainable design may have limited impact on the wider landscape (subject to the outcome of landscape studies) and, as a positive benefit, provide the opportunity to create an informal and visually open 'downland' setting. In addition it could ensure public use, in perpetuity, of the most prominent and sensitive north-facing parts of the site.</p> <p>With regard to the application for a 'Village Green' designation at the Bushfield Camp site which has been received by the responsible authority, Hampshire County Council, this has recently completed a period of public consultation and is awaiting a decision by the County Council. Two objections to the application have been received and, if it is considered that these are of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>sufficient weight, the matter may be referred to a non-statutory public inquiry. If the eventual outcome is that the application (which affects the former military camp area, as well as the open land to the north) is approved and a Village Green formally designated, such a decision would have serious consequences for the pursuit of a knowledge park development.</p> <p>Part of the site has, intermittently, been used for agricultural production. This arrangement may continue until the site's long-term future is resolved.</p> <p>Multiple wind turbines as an alternative form of use on the Bushfield Camp site could potentially generate electricity for use on or off-site. However, whether or not the site's elevation, orientation and wind-flow patterns are sufficient to make this a viable energy proposition in its own right has not been explored in any depth. Any such alternative use of the site may also come at the cost of significant visual impact on the historic setting of St Cross Hospital and the setting of the City and its Cathedral, as well as the River Itchen, its valley sides and the South Downs National Park to the east of the site. Whether this would be acceptable will depend on the results of the landscape work currently underway.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in terms of a knowledge park, it is expected that any development here would meet the Core Strategy's policies and standards and, therefore,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>demonstrate an acceptable contribution towards the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions and the generation of renewable energy in the District.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:</u></p> <p>Given the results of the studies completed so far combined with the, as yet uncertain, outcome of the 'Village Green' proposal, it is recommended that that the City Council should undertake limited further work and technical studies in relation to Policy WT3. These should take account of the results of studies being led by the landowner and be aimed at informing the decision making process to determine the suitability, viability and deliverability of the site at Bushfield Camp for a 'knowledge park' and taking account of the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
--	--	---

## **Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy – South Hampshire Urban Areas**

In terms of housing provision the South East Plan requires the PUSH part of Winchester District to accommodate an increase of 6,740 dwellings, of which 472 were completed by April 2009. The current Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and other work suggest that within PUSH there are some 2,450 dwellings either committed or identified with potential for development. Development from all sources within settlements in the PUSH area over the whole plan period (to 2026) is therefore likely to contribute over 2,900 dwellings of the total South East Plan requirement of 6740. The 'shortfall' of about 3,800 dwellings will therefore need to be made up by new greenfield allocations.

Much of urban South Hampshire lies to the south of the M27 motorway and has a different character to the rural settlements in Winchester District. These market towns and villages do not have a clear or direct relationship with the PUSH urban settlements, indicating that most of the southern part of Winchester District does not fall within the 'core' PUSH area, even though the South East Plan includes it within PUSH.

Nevertheless, the main urban areas in PUSH come very close to the Winchester District boundary and in some cases planned growth adjoins or extends into the District, such as in the case of the SDAs and at Whiteley and West of Waterlooville. The South East Plan's strategy for the PUSH area is that most growth should be located within or adjoining the main urban areas (Policy SP3) whereas its policies for rural settlements suggest these should be the focus mainly for development to meet local needs (Policies BE4 and BE5).

Therefore, in accordance with the PUSH urban-centred strategy, the conclusion after consideration of the issues and options for this part of the District, was that the need for development was best met by major greenfield development focussing on the urban areas that fringe the District, at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley. This approach will also focus housing development on locations where there are already large existing and planned employment areas, supporting the economic growth objectives of PUSH.

The South East Plan also requires two Strategic Development Areas (SDAs), one north of Fareham and another north/north-east of Hedge End. Both SDAs are centred within adjoining Districts – the Fareham SDA is within Fareham Borough and the Hedge End



SDA will be mainly within Eastleigh Borough but may extend partly into Winchester District. Therefore the City Council's Core Strategy needs to establish policies for the SDAs, insofar as they affect the District.

Consequently the Preferred Option expressed policies for the allocation of two strategic residential allocations at North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville, in addition to broad policies covering the SDAs.

With regard to the spatial strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas, responses received on Policy SH1 relate to the flexibility of the strategy and the potential traffic impacts of such large scale development in this part of the District, particularly when taking into account the levels of development planned in adjacent Districts. Flexibility issues have been dealt with elsewhere in this report, particularly in relation to the allocation of a limited number of large strategic sites vs numerous smaller ones. Traffic issues are of concern in this part of the District and the cumulative impact of the planned development within Winchester District and neighbouring authorities along the M27 corridor including the two SDA is likely to be significant. The City Council has commissioned a transport assessment study of the strategic allocations within the Preferred Option which looks at the cumulative impact of the Core Strategy's development proposals alongside development in other parts of South Hampshire. Other studies are also in progress to explore such impact and the levels/types of mitigation required, in particular a study of the M27 (Junctions 5 – 12) which will look at the interactions between development proposals at Hedge End and Fareham SDAs, Whiteley, and the Eastleigh RiverSide employment area.. The Highways Agency is responsible for the strategic road network and is involved in these processes and will be influential in their outcome and recommendations as to mitigation measures which the Local Authorities will be required to incorporate into their LDFs, and subsequent strategic policies.

Whilst further work is necessary and ongoing in relation to the SDAs and strategic allocations, the analysis of comments on the spatial strategy for the Urban South Hampshire Area (Policy SH1) has confirmed that it is appropriate to retain this sub-area definition and the proposed strategy of concentrating development in the most sustainable urban locations around the edge of the District. Whilst some respondents are critical that this sub-area is not recognised in the South East Plan, it is entirely appropriate for the Core Strategy to reflect the local distinctiveness and characteristics of the District and to develop a spatial strategy which meets the SE Plan's development requirements accordingly. The following briefly summaries the main issues made in relation to the proposed strategic allocations.

### Comments on Strategic Housing Allocation West of Waterloo

A large percentage of respondents made the same point that the map accompanying policy SH2 implies that the MDA will be developed with matching infrastructure, and that there is a need to reserve space in the new development to meet infrastructure shortfalls within neighbouring settlements. However it is not entirely clear as to what deficiencies in infrastructure these respondents are referring to or how the MDA might make up for any shortfalls. Nor is it clear how this can be deduced from the accompanying map. Nonetheless, much of the proposed infrastructure to support the new community will provide a resource for both the new and wider communities, including the open space, sports and recreation facilities. It is expected that the development will also provide a cemetery, household waste recycling facility and make a financial contribution towards improving local facilities at the Waterloo Leisure centre, all of which will benefit the wider community.

Another significant number of the responses gave broad support for the proposals, on the condition that a church and a large community hall are provided. Discussion with faith groups in the area have not identified the need for a new church on this development, but the development would provide a large multi-purpose community centre which could be used by faith groups for a variety of purposes.

Otherwise the remainder of the responses largely deal with the need to be clearer about the infrastructure requirements, and their phasing and delivery. This point reflects the advice received from PINS and further work is proposed to enable more detail to be included within Policy SH2 in the next version of the Core Strategy.

### Comments on Strategic Housing Allocation North Whiteley

Two items of essential infrastructure were consistently raised by respondents as a prerequisite to the development of this site: the completion of Whiteley Way and the provision of two primary and one secondary school. The need for the timely delivery of these and other infrastructure/facilities is reflected in draft policy SH3.

It was also consistently stressed that it is essential to continue to hold a dialogue with Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission in respect of the environmental sensitivity of this site. This matter is also reflected in the sustainability appraisal and the screening report published in accordance with the Habitat Regulations. Similarly, the capacity issues surrounding J9 of the motorway were raised, along with the need for a continuing dialogue with the Highway Authority and Highways Agency about the impact of this development.

Comments on Hedge End SDA

The Hedge End SDA is a requirement of the South East Plan, which has been statutorily adopted since the publication of the Preferred Option. It is a legal requirement of Core Strategies that they 'conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy'. In order to progress the Core Strategy it must be assumed that the South East Plan will remain in place and that the Core Strategy will be required to conform to it. Therefore, it is not an option for the Core Strategy to reject the principle of the SDA, as requested by some respondents, or its location 'to the north and north-east of Hedge End'. Since publication of the Preferred Option, PUSH has appointed a Project Officer for the SDA, who will lead various studies to help to determine which areas are suitable for development. These will enable consistent conclusions to be drawn about land in both Eastleigh and Winchester.

The advice from the Planning Inspectorate was clear that the SDA is potentially of such fundamental significance for the District that failure to deal adequately with it could render the whole Core Strategy 'unsound'. The Publication version of the Core Strategy will therefore need to include a more definitive Hedge End SDA policy, in accordance with the PINS advice received during the summer.

Comments on Fareham SDA

The Fareham SDA is also a requirement of the South East Plan, which has been statutorily adopted since the publication of the Preferred Option. Many of the comments received were concerned with the extent to which the gap between the SDA and Wickham/Knowle and/or green infrastructure should extend into Winchester District. Policy SH2 of the South East Plan refers to the SDA being 'within Fareham Borough to the north of the M27'. Policy SH2 also defines the main components of the SDAs but the areas of open land to be maintained between the SDA and existing settlements (gaps) are clearly intended to be 'between' the SDA and the settlements and can therefore include land within Winchester.

**Conclusion and Recommended Approach:-**

Therefore, in accordance with the PUSH urban-centred strategy, the development strategy promoted after consideration of the options for this part of the District was the need for development being met by major greenfield development focussing on the urban areas that fringe the District, at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley. This approach will also focus housing development on locations where there are already large existing and planned employment areas, supporting the economic growth objectives of

PUSH. All the policies need to be redrafted to follow the 'what, where, how and when' approach, and further work is required in terms of specifying not only the infrastructure required but also matters to mitigate the impact of these developments given the sensitivity of the environment in this location. Consequently, there is a need to continue the already ongoing dialogue with the key agencies and adjoining districts given the cumulative impact of development in this area.

**Recommended Approach :**

1. To update the introductory and explanatory paragraphs to Chapter 6 to reflect any changes in advice or circumstances, the results of any additional work, and to ensure consistency with the strategies of other PUSH authorities, including references to the potential allocation at Woodcroft Farm to ensure consistency with any planning allocations for the adjoining land in the Havant Core Strategy;
2. To maintain the development strategy for the South Hampshire Urban Area set out in Policy SH1 of the Preferred Option;
3. To update Policy SH1 following PINS advice to be more locally specific and to quantify the different amounts of development expected to be delivered through the Core Strategy for this spatial area. This will provide an opportunity to ensure that the Policy fully reflects any local issues and circumstances;
4. To update and amend Policy SH2 as necessary to take into account the comments made by PINS and the results of the sustainability appraisal, including deletion of references to 'reserve' within the policy, addressing integration issues, establishing more detailed GI requirements, and undertaking the necessary research to establish a detailed delivery and implementation plan to ensure that the provision of infrastructure in line with the new development;
5. To update and amend Policy SH3 as necessary to take into account the comments made and the results of the sustainability appraisal, and specifically, to continue and progress with the infrastructure delivery plan for the site given its location and the environmental constraints that exist, particularly to assess the traffic impacts of the site in conjunction with other nearby development and propose mitigation measures as necessary;
6. To complete the feasibility studies currently being undertaken in order to enable a more detailed policy and explanatory text regarding the SDA to be included in the next version of the Core Strategy. This should establish the key principles for the SDA, indicate the extent of the SDA on a map base, along with an indication of the broad land use types and, depending on the outcome of the feasibility studies and potential changes to regional planning guidance, cover possible contingencies;
7. That work on detailed land allocations and development requirements for the Hedge End SDA, if needed in Winchester District, should follow in the Development Management and Allocations DPD;

8. That Policy SH5 be retained generally in its current form, but with further clarification of the open areas proposed within the District and a better indication of how these relate to the SDA itself (within Fareham Borough);
9. To update Policy SH5 and explanatory text, if necessary, taking account of Fareham Borough Council's progress on its Core Strategy and Area Action Plan (AAP).

<b>Chapter 6 Spatial Strategy – South Hampshire Urban Areas</b>		
<b>Response no./Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of key issues</b>	<b>WCC officer response and Recommended Approach</b>
	<b>Comments on paragraphs 6.1 – 6.18 :-</b>	
2740; 2033; 36 (Swanmore PC); 2923; 1918; 10193; 2116; 90(English Heritage); 2647; 10460; 10408	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to statement that the Hedge End SDA 'may' extend into Winchester District – need to give certainty and demonstrate deliverability</li> <li>• Hedge End SDA should be brought forward by the Core Strategy and shown on a proposals map</li> <li>• Object to Hedge End SDA – this would destroy the countryside around Durley</li> <li>• Need to clarify para 6.3 to include reference to the strategic allocations</li> <li>• Support North Whiteley allocation – amend text to refer to proximity and benefit of Solent Business Park – must have a robust masterplan for the site to achieve the infrastructure improvements required – site needs to be subject to viability – timing will be critical as to what infrastructure can</li> </ul>	<p>See responses to Policy SH4</p> <p>Para 6.3 is summarising the housing requirements for the PUSH part of the District and will be updated in the next version of the Core Strategy. See responses to Policy SH3</p>

	<p>actually be provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to North Whiteley – there has been inadequate consideration of contingency sites or alternatives, the strategy relies on a limited number of large sites – this is flawed and the Plan should include a range of contingency sites including land to south of Whiteley</li> <li>• Support statement that Wickham, Bishops Waltham and Knowle do not meet the development needs of PUSH</li> <li>• Role of market towns in meeting some of the sub-regional requirements needs to be made clear – must acknowledge the role of the market towns in contributing to the sub-region particularly Denmead and Wickham</li> <li>• Must also refer to listed buildings and other protected/recognised historical assets (English Heritage)</li> </ul>	<p>The South East Plan’s strategy for the PUSH area is that most growth should be located within or adjoining the main urban areas, whereas its policies for rural settlements suggest these should be the focus mainly for development to meet local needs. This strategy is reflected in the Core Strategy, with the major allocations identified adjoining existing urban areas. The levels of development within the smaller settlements follow a settlement hierarchy based on level of service provision and size of population.</p> <p>Any development that occurs within the market towns and villages that also lie within the PUSH designation will count towards the PUSH housing requirement and therefore contribute to the sub-regional requirements. It is not envisaged given the size and scale of the market towns and villages that they will be subject to strategic allocations. Any allocations required to deliver the housing requirements will be firstly identified in the SHLAA and then allocated through the Development</p>
--	---	---

		<p>Management and Allocations DPD. The historical assets of many of the market towns and villages are acknowledged and amendments to future versions of the explanatory text should recognise this.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <p>To update Policy SH1 following PINS advice to be more locally specific and to quantify the different amounts of development expected to be delivered through the Core Strategy for this spatial area. This will provide an opportunity to ensure that the Policy fully reflects any local issues and circumstances.</p>
<p>10253; 10275; 841; 2324; 2341; 2349; 2354; 2359; 2360; 2361; 2362; 3107; 3116; 3118; 3119; 3129; 3132; 3133; 3147; 3223; 10070; 10103; 10104; 10106; 10107; 10109; 10110; 10111; 10112; 10277; 10278; 10279; 10280; 10281; 10282; 10293; 10285; 10286; 10287; 10288; 10290; 10291; 10292; 10293; 10294; 10295; 10296; 10297;</p>	<p>Support para 6.12 - release of West of Waterloo MDA if it reduces the need for development in neighbouring settlements and on greenfield sites.</p>	<p>The housing requirements for the District are set out in the main report and summarised for the PUSH part of the District above. These indicate that further greenfield allocations will be required to deliver the whole of the District's housing requirement over the plan period. The bulk of the PUSH requirement will however, be met through the two strategic allocations proposed at Whiteley and the remainder of West of Waterloo, providing some 4000 new dwellings out of a requirement of 6740 (excluding the original 2000 welling allocation at West of Waterloo).</p> <p>Development at West of Waterloo (and Whiteley) will, therefore, avoid the need to allocate alternative areas. However, it will be necessary to ensure that</p>

<p>10298; 10299; 10300;  10301; 10302; 10303;  10304; 10305; 10306;  10307; 10308; 10309;  10310; 10311; 10312;  10313; 10314; 10315;  10316; 10317; 10318;  10319; 10320; 10321;  10322; 10323; 10324;  10325; 10326; 10327;  10328; 10329; 10330;  10331; 10332; 10333;  10334; 10335; 10336;  10337; 10338; 10339;  10340; 10341; 10342;  10343; 10344; 10345;  10346; 10347; 10348;  10349; 10350; 10351;  10352; 10353; 10354;  10355; 10356; 10357;  10358; 10359; 10360;  10362; 10363; 10364;  10365; 10366; 10367;  10368; 10369; 10370;  10371; 10372; 10373;  10374; 10375; 10376;  10378; 10379; 10380;  10381; 10382; 10383;  10385; 10428; 10429;  10430; 10431; 10433;</p>		<p>there is a continuing supply of housing land available in accordance with PPS3 and the need for a 5 year supply of available and deliverable housing sites. This will require the identification of additional sites through the SHLAA process and their subsequent allocation in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <p>To maintain the development strategy for the South Hampshire Urban Area set out in the Preferred Option.</p>
---	--	--



<p>10434; 10435; 10436</p> <p>10253; 10275; 841; 2324; 2341; 2349; 2354; 2359; 2360; 2361; 2362; 3107; 3116; 3118; 3119; 3129; 3132; 3133; 3147; 3223; 10070; 10103; 10104; 10106; 10107; 10109; 10110; 10111; 10112; 10277; 10278; 10279; 10280; 10281; 10282; 10293; 10285; 10286; 10287; 10288; 10290; 10291; 10292; 10293; 10294; 10295; 10296; 10297; 10298; 10299; 10300; 10301; 10302; 10303; 10304; 10305; 10306; 10307; 10308; 10309; 10310; 10311; 10312; 10313; 10314; 10315; 10316; 10317; 10318; 10319; 10320; 10321; 10322; 10323; 10324; 10325; 10326; 10327; 10328; 10329; 10330; 10331; 10332; 10333; 10334; 10335; 10336;</p>	<p>Para 6.14 – development at Woodcroft Farm, Havant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site should not be accessed from the Winchester side via country lanes used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders;</li> <li>• The site lies within the Denmead gap and should not be developed</li> <li>• Object to the development – impact on SINC and increase in road traffic</li> </ul>	<p>In responding to a consultation on Havants Core Strategy the Council made the following comments :-</p> <p><i>That Havant Borough Council be informed that the City Council objects to the Havant Core Strategy indicating a potential site extension into Winchester District, as it should not prejudice the future of land in the Winchester District adjoining the proposed Strategic Site at Woodcroft Farm. The land within the City Council's area is currently subject to countryside and Local Gap policies and the City Council will determine through its proposed Development Management and Allocations document whether these should continue to apply. Accordingly, the City Council would seek to ensure that the Havant allocation can be developed independently and protects the adjoining countryside in the Winchester District. The City Council therefore requests the establishment of a firm buffer between any development within Havant Borough and the remaining countryside within Winchester District. Furthermore, the Council should advise Havant that it is willing to work closely with the relevant Councils.</i> (Source: Planning and Access Portfolio Holder Decision 237, 23 July 2009)</p> <p>Therefore the sensitivity of the site is fully recognised, including its proximity to the current Denmead Gap and the limitations on access.</p>
---	--	--

<p>10337; 10338; 10339;  10340; 10341; 10342;  10343; 10344; 10345;  10346; 10347; 10348;  10349;10350; 10351;  10352; 10353; 10354;  10355; 10356; 10357;  10358; 10359; 10360;  10362; 10363; 10364;  10365; 10366; 10367;  10368; 10369; 10370;  10371; 10372; 10373;  10374; 10375; 10376;  10378; 10379; 10380;  10381; 10382; 10383;  10385; 10428; 10429;  10430; 10431; 10433;  10434; 10435; 10436</p>		<p>Nevertheless, if the site remains an allocation in the Havant Core Strategy it will be necessary for Winchester's Core Strategy to acknowledge this proposal given its proximity to the District's boundary and to demonstrate a consistent approach with a neighbouring Local Authority (a key requirement of LDFs as set out in PPS12).</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <p>To update the references to the potential allocation at Woodcroft Farm to ensure consistency with any planning allocations for the adjoining land in the Havant Core Strategy.</p>
87 (GOSE)	<p>Para 6.15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete term 'reserve' site if this is to remain in the Core Strategy as an allocation – the site also needs to be indicated on a plan if the Core Strategy is allocating it for development (GOSE)</li> </ul>	<p>The reference to 'reserve' site is a carry over from the adopted Local Plan. The intention is to allocate the whole of the West of Waterlooville site in the Core Strategy for development. This approach will require a detailed policy to set out the development requirements for the site, to enable any subsequent planning application to be determined. This follows the advice received from PINS to give certainty about the location and the requirements of the allocation.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p>

		To delete reference to 'reserve' site in Policy SH2.
3204; 10453 (PUSH)	<p>Para 6.17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economic growth figures need to be reviewed in light of the economic situation</li> <li>• Table at para 6.17 only relates to 'B' Use Classes and does not represent a balanced and flexible approach to economic development in accordance with SEP RE3 and emerging PPS4</li> <li>• This table should reflect PUSH's employment floorspace policy framework (PUSH)</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose of the Table at para 6.17 is to demonstrate how the District is delivering the floorspace requirements of Policy SH3 of SEP. The table reflects the PUSH Employment Floorspace Policy Framework, which allocates the overall PUSH requirements to Districts.</p> <p>It maybe necessary to update this data following any subsequent work by PUSH and to reflect the emerging national policy guidance as set out in PPS4.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <p>To update paragraph 6.17 if necessary to reflect any subsequent work by PUSH or revised national policy guidance.</p>

Policy SH1 – Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas

**Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:**

This policy is essentially a strategic policy which sets out how the required development in the South Hampshire area will be achieved. It refers to the policies SH2 - 5 which are assessed individually in this SA. When considering the cumulative impact of the elements of this policy, issues are raised over pollution and sustainable transport but when considered with the detail of transport improvements specified in the separate policies it is illustrated that mitigation is possible. Potential adverse impacts on biodiversity generally, and more specifically, on water quality and quantity will need to be resolved through further HRA work. This policy states that habitats of international and national importance will be protected and this must be carried through with further guidance on the potential for

<p>mitigation when the information is available.</p> <p>There is a minor concern over the commercial floorspace which is “(mostly already committed)” and it is recommended that there is a commitment to monitoring the availability of commercial floorspace during the plan period.</p> <p>There will inevitably be adverse impacts of this scale of development which must be balanced against the expressed need for the housing and commercial development required. The need for mitigation must be clearly recognised and this is clearly expressed in the individual development proposal policies and the appraisal of those policies.</p>		
Response no./Organisation	Summary of key issues	WCC officer response and Recommended Approach
<b>Comments on Policy SH1</b>		
<p>4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 86(Environment Agency); 2414; 2985; 10042; 10236; 10453 (PUSH);</p>	<p><u>Support Policy SH1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the policy as this sets out the key requirements to deliver the sub-regional strategy as set out in the SEP</li> <li>• Welcome proposals for 3000 houses north of Whiteley</li> <li>• Welcome recognition of the need to protect important natural assets (Environment Agency)</li> <li>• Support recognition that not all of PUSH is uniform and directing development to the more urbanised fringe</li> <li>• Decision on SDNP has clarified the northern extent of PUSH and will help to retain the rural core of the District</li> <li>• Support allocations as they will reduce need for development in other settlements</li> </ul>	<p>The support is noted</p>

<p>8 (Colden Common PC); 85(Highways Agency); 87 (GOSE); 90 (English Heritage); 140; 1972; 2107; 2116; 2117; 2515; 3071; 3108; 3198; 3199; 3204; 10253; 10255; 10270; 10401; 10407; 10411; 10440 (Winchester Liberal Democrat City Council Group); 10460; 2923; 2926</p>	<p><u>Object to Policy SH1 for following reasons:-</u></p> <p><u>Traffic impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about impact of development on settlements like Colden Common and Twyford from through traffic etc</li> <li>• Development in south Hampshire may cause problems on M27 and A3(M) – further detailed assessments are required and mitigation and delivery mechanisms identified – need joint working with adjacent LAs to determine impacts etc (Highways Agency)</li> <li>• Need to assess impact of PUSH on wider rural area – particularly in terms of traffic impact</li> <li>• Significant highway improvements will be required to avoid impact on road network</li> </ul> <p><u>Flexibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over reliance on limited number of large sites - need to bring forward smaller sites in the market towns</li> <li>• Object to SH1 as makes no reference to a development strategy for the market towns and villages in the southern part of the District as these have a role to play in meeting some of the sub-</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SH1 expresses the overall development strategy for the spatial area of South Hampshire Urban Area, which includes the two strategic allocations within the Winchester District and further large scale developments (two Strategic Development Areas) promoted through the SEP.</p> <p>The traffic implications of these developments are recognised in the SA results which go on to recommend the need for mitigation. The traffic impacts both within and beyond the Winchester boundary are have explored initially through the transport study commissioned by the City Council and through various studies in the process recently commissioned by PUSH and Transport for South Hampshire. These studies will need to identify the cumulative impact and mitigation required for the anticipated levels of traffic growth. The Highways Agency is involved in this work and its progress to ensure that the mitigation measures identified are deliverable.</p> <p>The issue of large strategic sites vs smaller sites is covered elsewhere in this report, which emphasises the benefits presented by larger developments to provide their own infrastructure, particularly the provision of education and community facilities. Smaller scale developments are not of significant critical mass to enable such on-site provision.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>regional growth – policy needs to include a housing target for the market towns and villages in south Hampshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to PUSH vision – the Council should resist additional housing</li> <li>• Specific reference to housing numbers should be replaced by a site area and density requirement to allow the site to maximise its capacity</li> <li>• Should include some modest growth at Knowle as at present it is unsustainable</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SH1 purely covers ‘Urban South Hampshire’ - the urban parts of the District that fall within PUSH. The market towns and smaller settlements are covered within the ‘Market Towns and Rural Area’ spatial area and policies MTRA1, etc. This strategy is in accordance with the SEP which promotes urban focussed growth, with more limited ‘local needs’ growth for smaller settlements including market towns and villages (SEP Policies BE4 and BE5). The Core Strategy will not allocate sites within the market towns sites, as these would not be ‘strategic’ and will be identified through the SHLAA and subsequently allocated through the Development Management and Allocations DPD. This approach is in accordance with the advice in PPS12 which advises Core Strategies to allocate strategic sites that are fundamental to delivering the development strategy for the area. Smaller sites within the market towns are not considered essential for the delivery of the development strategy for the District.</p> <p>It is not accepted that it would be appropriate to replace dwelling numbers with a site area/density. It is important to identify the number of houses being proposed rather than to rely on identifying development parcels and setting average densities. This would make it difficult to assess the potential environmental impacts which are dwelling/population based or to calculate the infrastructure required to</p>
--	--	---

	<p><u>Specific comments on Policy SH1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern SH1 makes no reference to protection/enhancement of the historic environment (English Heritage)</li> <li>• Needs to be a firm commitment to reducing carbon – all development within the Winchester District should meet the Winchester targets as a minimum</li> <li>• The requirement for 40% of the dwellings to be affordable is too prescriptive, the target should be lowered to 35% in line with the SE Plan and more flexibility allowed</li> <li>• Need to refer to sports facilities/provision in the</li> </ul>	<p>support the new community and to mitigate its impacts.</p> <p>Significant growth at Knowle was considered at the Issues and Options stage which looked at spreading the major levels of growth required for the PUSH part of the District between Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Knowle. This option was not supported by the local communities, especially in view of the proposed Fareham SDA which will be close to Knowle. Links with the SDA may provide opportunities to improve Knowle’s sustainability, subject to the requirement to retain undeveloped areas between the SDA and Knowle. On the other hand, growth at North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville received support and would be in more sustainable locations.</p> <p>The comments on SH1 will need to be considered when the policy is redrafted to take account of the PINS advice on ‘what, where, when and how’ and the need to be more locally specific.</p> <p>It is considered reasonable to set a target of 40% in respect of the percentage of affordable housing in line with other strategic sites, but it is acknowledged that the policy will need to be reworded to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to take into account viability issues, and any changes in market conditions</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merge SH1 with SS1 to give flexibility – all references to housing numbers should be expressed as ‘about’ - Concerns that the policy is too prescriptive in that it sets a maximum dwelling target of 3,000 dwellings; this should be amended from ‘up to 3,000 dwellings’ to ‘around 3,000 dwellings to allow the exact number of dwellings to be determined through the masterplanning process</li> <li>• Policy needs to be stronger on protecting natural assets</li> <li>• Policy needs to refer to PUSH Green Infrastructure strategy</li> <li>• The Fareham and Hedge End SDAs should specify 40% affordable housing for these sites</li> <li>• Greater priority should be given to providing infrastructure first</li> <li>• Relationship between Eastleigh, Fareham and Winchester LDFs need to be clear given the difficulty of accommodating the SDAs</li> <li>• This policy must also refer to retail provision and the promotion of retail as an economic activity, as do WT1 and MTRA1, given that Whiteley Village is a significant retail centre that has an important role to play in the local community.</li> </ul>	<p>Neither this policy nor those relating specifically to the SDAs at Fareham and Hedge End will specify the amounts of affordable housing anticipated from these developments. There will be separate policies on the strategic allocations and, for the SDAs, this will be expressed in the Area Action Plans/detailed policy guidance for these sites. The role of the Winchester Core Strategy in relation to these is to establish the key development principles in so far as they affect the Winchester District.</p> <p>GOSE have also commented that the figures in the Core Strategy should not be expressed as maximums. It is recommended therefore that the wording in the policy is changed to ‘at least’ with the caveat that the final figure will be determined through the masterplanning process in the light of a full package of mitigation measures to address the environmental constraints on the site.</p> <p>With regard to the references to retail provision in the policy this will need to be taken on board to comply with the PINS/GOSE advice.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u></p> <p>To update Policy SH1 following the PINS advice to be more locally specific and to quantify the different amounts of development expected to be delivered</p>
--	---	---



		through the Core Strategy for this spatial area. This will provide an opportunity to ensure that the Policy fully reflects any local issues and circumstances.
--	--	--

<b>Policy SH2: Strategic Housing Allocation- West of Waterlooville</b>		
<b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b>		
<p>This site is greenfield and of some considerable scale which is bound to have some short term adverse impacts but it is fundamental to meeting the District, and regional, housing requirement which meets social needs. The site does offer a comprehensive range of social, residential and economic development which should help reduce carbon emissions in the long term. Concerns are raised over landscape and biodiversity issues and development proposals should include any mitigation required. The HRA will be important in assessing the level of impact and whether mitigation is possible.</p>		
<b>Response no./Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of key issues</b>	<b>WCC officer response and Recommended Approach</b>
3204; 4; 10423; 10324; 13 (Denmead Parish Council); 2592 (Forestry Commission); 94 Portsmouth Water company; 10253; 10340; 10294; 3133; 2359; 10379; 10359; 10365; 10315; 10352; 2354; 10326; 10349; 10354; 10291; 10304;	<u>Support SH2</u> A large percentage of these respondents while expressing general support for the policy made their support conditional on the provision of a church, and a large community hall for use by existing and new residents	The support is noted. In respect of the provision of a church this was something that was discussed with various faith groups, and it was felt that there was no need for a building to be specifically allocated for church use. However it is agreed that it is essential that a large community centre is provided which can host a range of uses including acting as a focus for faith groups. This facility would be made available for both the existing and new communities.

<p>10293; 3116;  10434; 10371;  10311; 10296;  10111; 10298;  10342; 10378;  10290; 10277;  10112; 10380;  10382; 3107;  10344; 10292;  10343; 10303;  10336; 10288;  10279; 10285;  10363; 10381;  3129; 10103;  10341; 2362;  10383; ; 10322;  10310; 10429;  10110; 10107;  10287; 10323;  10358; 10356;  10295; 10368;  10332; 10364;  10435; 10372;  10283; 10321;  10313; 10301;  10302; 3118;  10318; 10334;  10280; 10333;  3132; 10327;  10305; 10109;</p>		
---	--	--

<p>10306; 10316;          10319; 10337;          10281; 10328;          2360; 10348;          10370; 10357;          10329; 10353;          10369; 10331;          10286; 10385;          10335; 10351;          10360; 10339;          3147; 10433;          110430; 3223;          10104; 10325;          10355; 10338; 841;          10314; 10300;          10312; 10436;          10373; 10347;          2341; 10367; 2324;          3119; 10307;          10307; 10320;          2349; 10350;          10346; 10308;          10431; 10362;          10345; 10366;          10297; 10317;          10428; 10278;          10299; 10429;          10070; 10282;          3224; 10269</p>		
	<p><u>Comments on Policy SH2</u></p>	

<p>10423 (Grainger); 89 (HCC); 86 (Environment Agency); 10388; 2117; 2107; 10411; 10446; 2116; 2116; 2515; 87 (Government Office for the South East); 10253; 10270; 10437; 3204; 3108; 10455; 3071; 84 (South East Regional Assembly); 85 (Highways Agency); 10253; 3198 (WinACC); 10324; 10290; 10278; 10299; 10429; 10070; 10340; 10294; 3133; 2359; 10379; 10359; 10365; 10315; 10352; 10375; 2354; 10326; 10349; 10291; 10304; 10293; 3116; 10434;</p>	<p>General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the capacity of Budds Farm to deal with the waste water</li> <li>• The primary school requirement should be amended to indicate that ‘up to two schools’ might be required</li> <li>• It should be made clearer that the 1,000 reserve is additional to the 2,000 dwellings already approved making it a total of 3,000 dwellings being proposed for the site</li> <li>• Details of the infrastructure requirements is needed together with an indication of their timing</li> <li>• SH2 states that 500 homes are allocated for Havant, Havant’s understanding is that it is 600.</li> <li>• The requirements for the MDA should be combined in one policy not split between SS2, SH1 and SH2 – the policy also needs to specify the supporting uses referred to including what is intended by a ‘modest local centre’</li> </ul>	<p>Outline planning consent has been granted for 2,000 dwellings on this site. Development has commenced on the northern part of the site on land owned by Taylor Wimpey. The adopted Local Plan also identified land for a further 1,000 dwellings to be held in reserve. Policy SH2 is now proposing to bring forward this ‘reserve’ site in addition to the site with planning permission. Therefore, when completed this will result in a development of 3,000 new dwellings in total (in Winchester District and Havant Borough) with supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>With regard to the reference to 500 dwellings in Havant Borough, it is correct that this should refer to 600 and Policy SH2 and its supporting text should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is recognised that the issue of water supply and the treatment of waste water are critical issues to be addressed through the Core Strategy. This will be done through an on-going dialogue with both the developers and the water companies in the context of the wider PUSH water management studies. The outcomes of these discussions will be addressed in the relevant section of the infrastructure delivery plan for the site.</p>
--	--	---

<p>10371; 10311;  10296; 10111;  10298; 10342;  10378; 10277;  10112; 10380;  10382; 3107;  10344; 10292;  10343; 10106;  10303; 10336;  10288; 10279;  10285; 10363;  10381; 3129;  10103; 10341;  2362; 10383;  10322; 10310;  10429; 10110;  10107; 10287;  10323; 10358;  10356; 10282;  10295; 10368;  10332; 10364;  10435; 10372;  10283; 10321;  10301;10302; 3118;  10318; 10334;  10280; 10333;  3132; 10327;  10305; 10109;  10306; 10316;  10319; 10337;</p>	<p>Suitability of the site; housing numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of development proposed will adversely affect the character of the area; it should be more spread around the area</li> </ul>	<p>The infrastructure delivery plan will also need to identify all the social and physical infrastructure required to support the new development and give a firm indication of how and when it will be provided.</p> <p>The policy is worded to reflect the probability that two new primary schools will be required to serve the new community; and as a consequence two sites will need to be identified for school purposes in the masterplan. However, if for whatever reason the second school was not needed, there would be no point in insisting that it is provided and the wording of the policy should be revised to reflect this.</p> <p>With regard to the suggestion to merge SH2 with SH1 and SS2, given the PINS advice to express ‘what, where, when and how’ for each site policy SH2 will require amendments to incorporate elements of SS2, which is proposed to be deleted (see responses to Chapter 4). However Policy SH1 covers the overall spatial strategy for South Hampshire and should be retained but amended to specify the overall quantum of development.</p> <p>The question of whether the amount of development proposed at West of Waterlooville should be significantly reduced and the balance</p>
--	--	---

<p>10281; 10328; 10330; 2360; 10348; 10370; 10357; 10329; 10353; 10369; 10331; 10286; 10335; 10351; 2361; 10309; 10360; 10339; 3147; 10433; 10430; 3223; 10104; 10325; 10355; 10338; 841; 10314; 10300; 10312; 10436; 10373; 10347; 2341; 10367; 3119; 10307; 10320; 2349; 10350; 10346; 10308; 10362; 1034; 10297; 10374; 10317; 10376; 10354; 2324; 10431; 10366; 10324; 10428; 10313; 10385</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The housing allocation at Waterlooville should be reduced and reallocated to the market towns and villages</li> <li>• There should be a reduction in the allocation and a consequent increase at Knowle to address the sustainability of this settlement</li> <li>• Rather than set a housing target suitable areas for development should be identified together with a minimum density of 40 dph</li> <li>• The level of housing should be reduced and a proper plan of development for Leigh Park provided</li> </ul>	<p>located elsewhere was considered in detail as part of the options put forward at the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy. It was rejected partly because West of Waterlooville has been the subject of a Local Plan Inquiry which established that this was a sustainable location for this amount of development, and further investigations did not identify a better site in terms of its sustainability. West of Waterlooville now has planning permission for 2000 dwellings.</p> <p>The option of spreading development around the market towns or villages was rejected, as this would put an unnecessary strain on local infrastructure and would not create the critical mass of development in each location to provide the necessary infrastructure or make good existing shortfalls.</p> <p>There is a Strategic Development Area proposed in Fareham District close to Knowle, so to allocate additional land in the Winchester District in this location would not help to create a more sustainable community at Knowle.</p> <p>It is important to identify the number of houses being proposed rather than to rely on identifying development parcels and setting average densities. This would make it difficult to assess the potential environmental impacts which are</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development should be phased to match the new housing with employment opportunities</li> <li>• The amount of employment floorspace proposed does not represent a balanced and flexible approach to economic development</li> <li>• An up-dated Employment Land Review is required</li> <li>• The requirement to provide ‘at least 30 hectares of employment land’ is inflexible</li> </ul>	<p>dwelling/population based or to calculate the infrastructure required to support the new community and to mitigate its impacts. In any event if the Council identified a parcel of land of, say, 10 hectares and set an average density of 40 dph this would have the same effect as allocating the site for 400 dwellings</p> <p>Leigh Park is not in the Winchester District but the development of the MDA would not preclude proposals to improve this area coming forward at the appropriate time. It is understood that the Havant Core Strategy (which covers Leigh Park) makes such proposals.</p> <p>While it would be desirable in principle to try to link the phasing of development of the housing to the provision of new employment floorspace, in practice this would be impossible to do as employment uses tend to lag behind housing provision. To try and link the two would hold back the development and slow down the provision of other necessary infrastructure, such as the schools, and delay the provision of much-needed affordable housing. However, ways are being explored to ensure that all the housing is not built out before the employment uses are even started. This will be a requirement of the policy.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence will be required that 3,000 dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated within the context of the wider highways network</li> <li>• Full transport impacts will need to be assessed and mitigation measures agreed with the Highways Authority</li> <li>• No assessment of the traffic impacts has been made</li> <li>• There are indications that there could be problems at one or more of the junctions along the A3M, mitigation measures will be required to address this issue, including their funding and phasing</li> </ul> <p>Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be important to ensure full integration with Waterloo Town Centre</li> <li>• The GI supporting the new development will</li> </ul>	<p>The Council is currently reviewing the amount and type of employment that might be required to support the new development to ensure a high degree of self-containment offering the widest possible opportunity to live and work in or immediately adjoining the new development. This is being undertaken in the context of the 'refresh' of the PUSH Economic Development Strategy. The outcome of these studies will be reflected in the pre-submission draft of policy SH2</p> <p>Extensive Transport assessment work was undertaken in 2005/06 to support the planning applications. This included an assessment of the potential impact of 3,000 new dwellings on the highways network in this location, and is still relatively up to date, and further work has been undertaken for the Council by the transport consultants MVA. Additional work is being commissioned which will inform the Council's infrastructure delivery strategy. This will help clarify what interventions would be needed and when and how they might be provided.</p> <p>The MDA has always been seen as an urban extension to Waterloo, therefore integration is recognised as a critical factor in its success. The</p>
--	---	---

	<p>need to be integrated with the adjoining woodlands and open spaces</p> <p>Map accompanying SH2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The map implies that the MDA will be developed with matching infrastructure; there is a need to reserve space within the MDA to meet infrastructure shortfalls within neighbouring settlements as these are expected to expand without any additional infrastructure provision.</li> </ul>	<p>wording of policy SH2 will reflect this, but the land adjoining the town centre which is crucial for integration to succeed is both outside the MDA and not in the Winchester District.</p> <p>The policy will require the production of a GI strategy which is consistent with the emerging PUSH and WCC GI strategies and clearly demonstrates how the GI proposed for the new community supports and links with the surrounding countryside</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of objectors raised this issue that the MDA needs to over provide infrastructure to meet potential shortfalls that may exist in neighbouring settlements, as these are expected to expand without the supporting infrastructure. It is not entirely clear as to what deficiencies in infrastructure they are referring to or how the MDA might make up for any shortfalls. Nor is it clear how this can be deduced from the accompanying map.</p> <p>However, much of the proposed infrastructure to support the new development will provide a resource for both the new and wider community including the open space, sports and recreation facilities. It is expected that the development will provide a cemetery, household waste recycling</p>
--	---	---

		<p>facility and make a financial contribution towards improving local facilities at the Waterloo Leisure centre, all of which will benefit the wider community. Any proposals for development within neighbouring settlements will be expected to provide the necessary infrastructure to serve that growth.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:-</u></p> <p>To update and amend Policy SH2 as necessary to take into account the comments made by PINS and the results of the sustainability appraisal, and specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• delete reference to ‘reserve’ within the policy;</li> <li>• ensure that the policy addresses the integration issue, given it is an urban extension to Waterloo;</li> <li>• establish more detailed GI requirements to support the new community and links with the surrounding countryside;</li> <li>• undertake the necessary research to establish a detailed delivery and implementation plan for the site given its scale, to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion in line with the new development.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Policy SH3: Strategic Housing Allocation- North Whiteley</b>		
<b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b>		
<p>The site will contribute to the community, housing and employment objectives of the plan and is also well placed to encourage less car dependency. However the appraisal has identified the potential for adverse impact on the water, landscape and biodiversity objectives given the proximity of the site to biodiversity designations. Where the designations are of European importance they will be considered through the parallel HRA process.</p>		
<b>Response no./Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of key issues</b>	<b>WCC officer response and Recommended Approach</b>
10270; 2273; 4 (Bishops Waltham Parish Council); 10438; 86 (Environment Agency); 2923	<p><u>Support for SH3</u></p> <p>General support for the policy and strategic allocation of the site with concerns in respect of the policy being too prescriptive in places. Support for the site boundary as shown in policy SH3</p>	The support is noted
	<u>Comments/Objections to Policy SH3</u>	
2106; 12 (Curdrige Parish Council); 85 (Highways Agency); 10270; 89 (HCC); 31 (Shedfield Parish Council); 10447; 10238; 10444; 2116; 2515;	<p>General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council should work closely with Fareham Borough Council to ensure proposals for Whiteley are robust, credible, and deliverable</li> <li>• The development should not be planned for while the impact of the Hedge End SDA is not clear</li> <li>• Land at Fairthorne Grange should be included</li> </ul>	<p>The Council is already working closely with Fareham on a range of issues regarding the development at North Whiteley, including transport and masterplanning; and it will continue to do so. A Forum has just been agreed for North Whiteley which will enable more formalised liaison with various key stakeholders.</p>

<p>10377; 87 (GOSE); 86 (Environment Agency); 90 (English Heritage); 91 (Natural England); 10405; 3108; 77 (Fareham Borough Council); 36 (Swanmore Parish Council); 3071; 84 (South East Regional Assembly); 85 (Highways Agency); 3135 (Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust); 3199 (Sport England); 3198 (WinACC); 2592 (Forestry Commission); 10460; 10061 (Eastleigh BC); 2647; 10233; 10249; 10250 ; National Trust; 2923 (North Whiteley Consortium)</p>	<p>in the allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention in the policy of remodelling/improving the existing district centre</li> <li>• Developers are unlikely to pick up the tab for past failures of infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Strategic road network is critical to the success of Whiteley town centre to ensure that it is not isolated from surrounding settlements</li> <li>• Need to consider installing a rail station along the north east boundary to reduce reliance on the car</li> <li>• Object to the allocation of North Whiteley given its impact on the Hamble valley and impact on infrastructure etc</li> </ul>	<p>While there is a potential link to the SDA at Hedge End via the proposed Botley bypass, the two schemes are in no way dependant on each other and are fulfilling different roles in the sub-region; the SDA having a wider economic development role to play. It would therefore not be appropriate to delay the proposals at North Whitley while greater clarity is sought at Hedge End.</p> <p>At this stage it is believed that there is more than sufficient land to deliver the 3,000 dwellings and supporting infrastructure including Whiteley Way, so there are no compelling reasons to extend the site and include Fairthorne Grange. However, further studies are proposed which will help to confirm whether the land proposed in the Preferred Option is adequate and appropriate, as expected, or whether additional/alternative land is needed.</p> <p>The proposals for the redevelopment of the district centre are currently the subject of a planning application which will be determined well in advance of the Core Strategy being submitted to the Secretary of State; there is therefore nothing useful which could be added to the policy on the development of North Whiteley in respect of the existing district centre</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Scale of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation of this site has not been fully justified, and there is no contingency should this site not come forward</li> <li>• It would be more appropriate and flexible to allocate a number of sites</li> <li>• Fareham is planning further development east of Whiteley</li> <li>• There are no details on why Whiteley has to be so large</li> <li>• The extent of land allocated is too small to accommodate 3,000 dwellings</li> <li>• The scale of development should be reduced and reallocated to Knowle to help with improving the sustainability of this settlement</li> <li>• The number of houses required should be</li> </ul>	<p>The site has been allocated following a detailed assessment of the alternatives, including the possibility of allocating a number of smaller sites; and it has been the subject of an assessment of its potential environmental impacts. It is considered to be a sound option for meeting the housing requirements in this area. It is of sufficient scale to fully mitigate all its potential impacts, and to provide the necessary social and physical infrastructure.</p> <p>The site is required to meet the district housing allocations in the South East Plan, and no suitable alternative exists. However it will be expedient for the council to consider what contingencies it will put in place if for whatever reason the site does not come forward for development</p> <p>The site is considered large enough to accommodate 3,000 dwellings even after all the constraints are taken into account, and it would serve no good purpose to arbitrarily reduce its capacity, which would only create pressure to find additional sites elsewhere</p>
--	---	--

	<p>replaced by identifying site areas accompanied by average densities of 40dph</p> <p>Green Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site includes or adjoins sites with significant nature conservation interest including SSSIs</li> </ul>	<p>Any housing allocated in the Fareham district would be to meet their own housing requirements and are quite separate from meeting Winchester's housing targets, however close liaison will ensure that any new development will be properly coordinated and the necessary infrastructure put in place in a timely fashion</p> <p>There is a Strategic Development Area proposed in the Fareham district close to Knowle, so to allocate additional land in the Winchester district in this location would not help to create a more sustainable community at Knowle</p> <p>It is important to identify the number of houses being proposed rather than as suggested to identify development parcels and set average densities, otherwise it would be difficult to assess the potential environmental impacts which are population based or to calculate the infrastructure required to support the new community and to mitigate its impacts. In any event, if the council identified a parcel of land of say 10 hectares and set an average density of 40 dph this would have the same effect as allocating the site for 400 dwellings</p> <p>The environmental sensitivity of both the site itself and adjoining areas is fully understood and</p>
--	--	---

	<p>and a Ramsar site which will make it extremely difficult to deliver the 3,000 dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to such a large development close to the River Hamble, which will erode the character of the area</li> <li>• The area proposed has high nature conservation interest</li> <li>• More regard should be had on the potential impact of the development on the historic environment</li> <li>• Development of this scale will have a significant impact on designated sites and protected species and measures to mitigate them will be inadequate to overcome the constraints.</li> <li>• New SINC information has emerged</li> <li>• The site adjoins Whiteley Pastures which is ancient woodland and SSSIs this needs recognising in the plan together with the potential this offers for providing GI and enhanced recreational facilities. It will be important to enhance biodiversity on this land and provide greater linkages with the surrounding landscape</li> <li>• Greater clarification is required in respect of the future role and function of the adjoining woodlands</li> <li>• Statement is required concerning energy saving measures; houses should include solar panels</li> <li>• Greater clarity is required on how the various environmental impacts are going to be</li> </ul>	<p>has played a crucial role in establishing the site's capacity. The need to create proper buffers to keep the development away from sensitive areas, and to avoid the areas identified as being at risk of flooding has been at the forefront of determining the suitability of this site for development. This has resulted in a significantly lower developable area than might otherwise be the case for a site of this size.</p> <p>The potential for developing on this site has been the subject of detailed and on-going discussions with Natural England, the Environment Agency, and the Forestry Commission (who manage the nearby ancient woodland). Policy SH 3 should be reworded to strengthen the need to take full account of all the potential environmental constraints in preparing a masterplan for the development, and requiring that all the relevant government agencies and other key parties are fully engaged in the process to ensure that there is no threat to the sites of acknowledged nature conservation interest and that the development results in improvements to the area's biodiversity.</p> <p>The development of this site will need to consider and be fully consistent with the PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy and the GI strategy being developed for Winchester District. Any future</p>
--	--	--



	<p>assessed, particularly the ‘in combination effects’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>Transport (including Whiteley Way)</p>	<p>planning application would be expected to be accompanied by its own GI strategy which looks at how the development meets its own requirements and makes a positive contribution towards meeting the sub-regional GI needs.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Preferred Option put forward requirements relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Council has commissioned consultants to test the various options for meeting the Council’s policies on renewable energy and will assess them against a number of scenarios that will test viability. Any amendments to the policies on renewable energy will, if necessary, be reflected in changes to SH3. Any scheme on this site would be expected to meet the prevailing policy requirements and act as an exemplar. The possibility of developing zero carbon homes would be thoroughly explored, together with the use of renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Further Habitats Regulations Assessment work will be required before the policy can be finalised; this together with the results of on-going discussion with the Environment Agency and Natural England will need to be incorporated into policy revisions</p> <p>There will need to be a degree of certainty in</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the timing of the necessary transport mitigation measures due to the current uncertainty in respect of the timing of wider studies. Suggest that the S106 agreement has a series of triggers by which time viable transport solutions have to be delivered at appropriate stages of the development as part of a phased strategy</li> <li>• Suggested rewording in respect of the requirement to complete Whiteley Way to allow for more flexibility; ‘the development should provide for vehicular connections onto Botley Road at an early stage of the development, in an environmentally sensitive manner which does not cause severance for the new community or encourage traffic from adjoining areas to use the new route to gain access to/form the strategic highways network’.</li> <li>• The completion of Whiteley Way is needed now/ at the earliest possible time</li> <li>• It is important that Whiteley Way does not attract through traffic and acts as a ‘rat-run’</li> <li>• Details of the status and impact of Whiteley Way are required</li> <li>• Whiteley Way should be designed as a district distributor road to attract traffic from adjoining areas seeking to gain access to the strategic highways network</li> <li>• The policy should require the Botley bypass to be completed at an early stage</li> </ul>	<p>respect of the appropriate transport measures before permission can be granted, this will be necessary to gain the support of the Highways Agency and the County Council as highways authority, but there will need to be flexibility over the phasing of such provision and this will need to be reflected in the wording of the necessary infrastructure delivery plan</p> <p>Resolving transport issues and mitigating the potential impacts on the strategic highways network is going to be crucial to the successful development of this site. The early completion of Whiteley Way is seen as a key element in producing a sustainable transport strategy for the site. It is also important that the new road should not act as a rat run and attract through traffic seeking to access, or bypass, the motorway.</p> <p>It is expected that the new road will eventually be linked to the proposed Botley bypass, but its completion is not dependant on the Botley bypass being in place. While it would not be desirable, the design and function of the new Whiteley Way should make provision for the possibility that the Botley bypass might not be developed.</p> <p>Further transport assessment of the strategic allocations, including Whiteley, has been</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future traffic levels may result in extensive problems at J9 of the motorway; innovative measures will be needed to reduce car use. Other mitigation measures will also need to be identified</li> <li>• Measures to minimise car use and measures to accommodate the extra traffic need to be spelt out, particularly measures to reduce the impact on J9 need to be spelt out in the policy</li> <li>• Better access to Botley Station is required</li> <li>• The needs of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders need to be taken into account</li> <li>• The Highways Authority wish to continue to be involved in assessing impacts and developing sustainable transport solutions</li> <li>• There is no indication as to how transport improvements will be funded</li> <li>• Traffic impacts on the surrounding area need to be properly assessed</li> <li>• More specific transport aims are required in the policy, the current wording is meaningless</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to creating a new rail halt at Whiteley</li> </ul>	<p>undertaken for the council by consultants, to assess the potential impact of the development on the strategic highways network particularly J9 of the motorway and to consider what is required by way of mitigation. Further work has also been commissioned for the wider M27 Corridor which will look at the cumulative traffic impacts and mitigation.</p> <p>This will lead to a greater understanding of the potential impacts on the strategic highway network and the measures required in mitigation, including a package of 'smarter choices' to encourage more sustainable modes of transport and reduce the reliance on the private car which is prevalent in Whiteley. However, fully detailed transport and mitigation measures will only be provided through a full transport assessment undertaken as part of a planning application.</p> <p>A brief has been agreed by the Highway Authority and Transport for South Hampshire for the further work to assess the potential impacts of the development and agree a full package of mitigation measures. Discussions have also been held with the Highways Agency to agree a strategy for dealing with these issues.</p> <p>It would be expected that the new development would provide a network of cycle and pedestrian</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small start up units are required</li> </ul>	<p>links to exiting facilities in the adjoining area, including the district centre, employment land, railway stations, and the wider countryside.</p> <p>Due to the limited capacity of the line and the close proximity of Botley station it is unlikely to be possible to create a new rail halt in this locality. However, the possibility should be considered through the wider transport assessment, along with measures such as creating better links to Botley Station.</p> <p>Policy SH3 will need to be amended to take into account the above concerns and to make it clear that the new proposals will need to identify the potential impacts of the development on both the local and strategic highways networks and be clear on how they will be delivered and through which agencies.</p> <p>Given the significant amount of business floorspace in the locality, no further large-scale business floorspace is envisaged in this development, but in order to both support the local economy and to meet the aims of self containment, consideration should be given to the provision of small scale employment uses in the local centres, including exploring the possibility of providing starter units.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Infrastructure (including schools)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be clearer what infrastructure is required</li> <li>• The county council as education authority would seek an early dialogue in respect of the education requirements</li> <li>• The policy is too precise at this stage in respect of the number of primary schools required and the commitment to provide a secondary school; additional policy wording is requested - There needs to be a degree of flexibility in respect of the education requirements, it is suggested that the policy is reworded from 'provide' to 'deliver' school facilities</li> <li>• One of the primary schools should be built early on in the development</li> <li>• The provision of a secondary school should take place early on in the development to avoid having to travel long distances to the nearest available secondary school</li> <li>• The secondary school and at least one primary school should be located to serve the wider community</li> <li>• It should be made clear in the policy that new sports facilities will be needed as part of the development</li> <li>• Greater clarity is needed in respect of what supporting uses might be required, including the</li> </ul>	<p>It is intended that an infrastructure delivery strategy will be prepared for North Whiteley, this will accompany the Core Strategy and set out in broad terms, the physical and social infrastructure required to support the new community, together with its phasing and delivery mechanism.</p> <p>On-going discussions with Hampshire County Council as Education Authority have indicated that two new primary schools will be required and the current thinking is that a secondary school will also be needed. There is at present a shortage of primary school places in Whiteley which has led to pupils having to find places outside of the area. Therefore great care will be required over the siting and phasing of the first primary school to make sure it is provided at the earliest opportunity to redress this current shortfall in places while being 'on-hand' to meet the needs of the new community</p> <p>The situation is similar in respect of secondary education and the timely provision of the secondary school will be an essential requirement of the new development. The development will be expected to provide a range of facilities including sports and recreation, which</p>
--	--	---

	<p>quantum of any retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration needs to be given on the constraints in respect of waste water treatment facilities at Peel Common; steps should be taken to reduce waste water flows</li> </ul>	<p>will need to be spelt out in more detail in the policy. It will be necessary for the development consortium to deliver the sites for primary and secondary education facilities and make a financial contribution, but it will be the County Council that provides them</p> <p>Likewise it would be expected that there would be two local centres to serve the new community, this will result in a limited amount of retail. It is agreed that the policy will need to be more explicit regarding the level of retail that might be appropriate</p> <p>The infrastructure delivery plan will need to give more detail on the issues of water supply and waste water treatment. Furthermore, the requirement to meet relevant Code for Sustainable Homes levels will require stringent water conservation measures, including metering.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach :-</u>          To update and amend Policy SH3 as necessary to take into account advice from PINS, the comments made and the results of the sustainability appraisal, and specifically:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To progress with an infrastructure delivery plan for the site given its location and the environmental constraints that exist;</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To assess the traffic impacts of the site in conjunction with other developments in this part of the M27 corridor and develop mitigation measures as necessary.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**Policy SH4 : North/North East Hedge End SDA**

**Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:**

The policy as written recognises the need for joint working with the adjacent authority to meet the South East Plan’s requirements for a new settlement at Hedge End. The policy is limited in its extent but seeks to protect the integrity of Winchester District’s existing settlements and the landscape in line with the Core Strategy Vision and Spatial Planning Objectives. The policy will potentially have a positive impact in protecting key assets in the District, however with limited definition there is uncertainty as to how key SA objectives will be progressed as result of implementation.

	Comments on para 6.24- 6.25	
<p>2048; 10061 (Eastleigh BC); 66 (Fair Oak and Horton Heath PC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SDA will ruin a beautiful area enjoyed by many</li> <li>It is inappropriate for the City Council to be so prescriptive as to the location of built development in advance of the various studies being planned to assess the feasibility of the development of the site</li> <li>Object to the statement that ‘land within Eastleigh Borough appear more suitable for development and less sensitive’.</li> </ul>	<p>The published version of the Core Strategy Preferred Option was not prescriptive about the location of development and did not indicate a proposed development area. However, its failure to do this was of concern to PINS, GOSE and the Sustainability Appraisal (see response to comments on Policy SH4 below).</p> <p>However, some sustainability assessment work has been carried out, covering issues such as landscape sensitivity, biodiversity, agricultural</p>

		<p>land quality, infrastructure provision, etc (see LDF Evidence Base on WCC web site). This highlights the sensitivity of land within Winchester District in the area of search for the SDA, in terms of landscape, biodiversity, etc. These studies also considered some land within Eastleigh Borough where information was available and the Preferred Option is correct in saying that land in Eastleigh appears less sensitive, on the basis of the information currently available.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Option, PUSH has appointed Project Officers for each SDA. The Hedge End SDA Project Officer is working to progress various 'feasibility studies' which will help to determine which areas are suitable for development. These will enable consistent conclusions to be drawn about land in both local authority areas.</p> <p>The Publication version of the Core Strategy will need to include a more definitive Hedge End SDA policy (see response to comments on Policy SH4 below), taking account of the results of the feasibility work. It is recommended that the next version of the Core Strategy should include a revised policy and explanatory text which takes account of the conclusions of the various feasibility studies, but as these studies are not</p>
--	--	--



		yet complete it is not possible to be more specific at this stage.
4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 86 (Environment Agency) ; 94 (Portsmouth Water)	<p>Comments on Policy SH4:- <u>Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support in principle – must be a gap between Denhams Corner and Durley</li> <li>• Support and welcome recognition that land in Winchester has potential to provide green infrastructure</li> <li>• Peel Common WWTW is priority for SEP allocations and LAs need to support Southern Waters business plans for metering and infiltration reduction</li> <li>• Portsmouth Water has a large main running through the site and a direct supply could be considered but would require approval from Ofwat</li> </ul>	<p>The support in principle is noted and the need to maintain gaps between the SDA and existing settlements is recognised in Policy SH4 and the South East Plan (Policy SH2).</p> <p>The comments from the water companies on water supply and waste water treatment are helpful and will be followed up through the feasibility studies on the SDA and the Core Strategy's infrastructure delivery plan.</p>
12 (Curdrige PC); 38(Twyford PC); 2414; 85(Highways Agency); 87(GOSE); 2042; 2044; 2048; 2515; 2740; 2988; 3071; 3198; 10061 (Eastleigh BC); 10245; 10265; 10439	<p>Comments on Policy SH4 :- <u>object</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must maintain the gap between the SDA and Curdrige, impact of traffic etc will change the character of the settlement</li> <li>• Object - Will result in additional traffic on B3335</li> <li>• Object – but welcome work in progress and recognition that land in Eastleigh is less sensitive</li> <li>• Policy should include a requirement to protect communities</li> <li>• The AAP referred to should determine funding</li> </ul>	<p>The Hedge End SDA is a requirement of the South East Plan, which has been statutorily adopted since the publication of the Preferred Option. It is a legal requirement of Core Strategies that they 'conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy'. In order to progress the Core Strategy it must be assumed that the South East Plan will remain in place and that the Core Strategy will be required to conform to it. Therefore, it is not an option for the Core</p>

	<p>sources for the M27 access and public transport measures to minimise the need to travel – any development of this scale should provide significant public transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should be updated to reflect the SEP and should express how much of the SDA will be located in Winchester; how the LPAs will work together and how the SDA is to be planned and when it will come forward, need also to consider contingency planning for an alternative site(s), as feasibility studies are referred to</li> <li>• Object – impact on countryside and existing settlements and communities – should be no built development within Winchester District</li> <li>• SDA is in wrong location – development west of Hedge End would be able to use the River Itchen and would have easier access to Southampton and Eastleigh</li> <li>• Object to SDA this will increase urban sprawl</li> <li>• Policy lacks certainty and fails to comply with SEP – boundary of SDA should be included and the policy more specific as to how much and what type of development goes where</li> <li>• Need to include details of infrastructure and timing of development</li> <li>• Must have further discussions with local communities before development proceeds</li> <li>• It is inappropriate for the City Council to be so prescriptive as to the location of built development in advance of the various studies</li> </ul>	<p>Strategy to reject the principle of the SDA, or its location ‘to the north and north-east of Hedge End’.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector who carried out an advisory visit felt that the Preferred Option’s Policy SH4 is unsound as it fails to answer the key questions: ‘what, where, when and how’. He identified this as a major flaw which could be so fundamental as to render the whole Core Strategy unsound. However, the Inspector also advised that the Core Strategy could include contingency options for the SDA, provided one of these was based on the provision of the SDA in accordance with the South East Plan’s requirements.</p> <p>The Government Office for the South East (GOSE) assumes that the Policy would be updated and expects any future version to indicate where the SDA is proposed (including how much is in Winchester and how much in Eastleigh), how Winchester and Eastleigh would work together, which LDF documents would deal with the SDA, and its programme.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (see extract above) also highlights the limited detail within Policy SH4, which leads to uncertainty over whether key sustainability objectives are addressed.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>being planned to assess the feasibility of the development of the site – need to delete ‘of Durley and Curdrige’ in the final line of the policy.</p>	<p>Therefore, whilst Eastleigh Borough Council’s comment objects to the level of detail included in the Policy (or more particularly its explanatory text), it is clear that the Publication Core Strategy will need to include a more detailed policy if it is to be found ‘sound’.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the feasibility studies currently being undertaken will need to be completed in order to inform any revised policy. The timing of this work fits well with the revised programme for the Core Strategy which has been agreed and will enable a more detailed revised policy to be drafted for consideration in Autumn 2010. The studies include transport matters, which it is agreed are a key matter, along with other infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The need to respect the separate identities of existing settlements is acknowledged with Policy SH4 and within the South East Plan’s Policy SH2. The extent of the areas of open land to be maintained between the SDA and existing settlements (gaps) will need to be defined and the revised SDA policy will need to require their protection. Work is also currently underway on a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the District which will look at the requirements and opportunities for Green Infrastructure provision in conjunction with the SDA.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Prior to the publication of the Preferred Option document it had been proposed that the details of the SDA would be developed in a joint Area Action Plan (AAP) produced by Eastleigh and Winchester Councils. Each authority has now revised its Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Eastleigh Borough Council now proposes to include the details of the SDA within its Core Strategy, whereas Winchester will include a 'strategic allocation' in its Core Strategy, with a more detailed policy in its Development Management and Allocations document. Subject to Winchester's revised LDS being approved, the next version of the Core Strategy should include these arrangements.</p> <p><u>Recommended approach :-</u></p> <p>To complete the feasibility studies currently being undertaken in order to enable a more detailed policy and explanatory text regarding the SDA to be included in the next version of the Core Strategy. This should establish the key principles for the SDA and answer the 'what, where, when and how' questions by indicating the extent of the SDA on a map base, along with an indication of the broad land use types, programme/phasing and process. Depending on the outcome of the feasibility studies and potential changes to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>regional planning guidance, it may be that the policy will need to cover various contingencies.</p> <p>That work on detailed land allocations and development requirements, if needed in Winchester District, should follow in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p>
--	--	---

Policy SH5 : North Fareham SDA		
<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</b></p> <p>The policy recognises the need for cross boundary working with the adjacent authority to meet the South East Plan’s requirements but seeks to protect the integrity of existing settlements and the landscape. The policy will have a positive impact.</p>		
	Comments on paras 6.26 – 6.28	
10231; 10439; 2293; 2647	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support statement that none of the built part of the SDA will be in Winchester District</li> <li>• Object to open space, green infrastructure being within Winchester District – SEP requires the SDA to be within Fareham</li> </ul>	<p>The Fareham SDA is a requirement of the South East Plan, which has been statutorily adopted since the publication of the Preferred Option. Policy SH2 of the South East Plan refers to the SDA being ‘within Fareham Borough to the north of the M27’. Policy SH2 defines the main components of the SDAs but the areas of open land to be maintained between the SDA and existing settlements (gaps) are clearly intended to be ‘between’ the SDA and the settlements and can therefore include land within Winchester.</p>

		<p>The District boundary is not always such a firm feature on the ground as to be a constraint to some open space or green infrastructure being provided within Winchester District. Work is also currently underway on a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the District which will look at the requirements and opportunities for Green Infrastructure provision in conjunction with the SDA. This should help to clarify what Green Infrastructure, if any, could be accommodated within Winchester whilst maintaining the open rural character of the land, as required by Policy SH5. There will also need to be close liaison with Fareham Borough Council and this should enable the next version of the Core Strategy to be more definitive about the type and extent of Green Infrastructure that may be accepted within Winchester.</p>
3108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should allow for the expansion of Knowle including masterplanning and for areas of open space</li> </ul>	<p>The explanatory text to policy SH5 allows for the possibility of some open space within Winchester and, as noted above, the next version of the Core Strategy may be able to be more specific. However, the respondent's argument that modest expansion of Knowle would improve its sustainability are not credible when a new SDA will be developed almost adjoining Knowle. The relationship between Knowle and the SDA will indeed need careful consideration in the</p>

		<p>masterplanning process. It is likely that this can help to improve the sustainability of Knowle through careful planning of development, facilities and links. However, there is no merit in expanding Knowle separately from the development of an adjoining SDA.</p>
	Comments on Policy SH5	
94(Portsmouth Water); 96(Southern Water); 10214; 10231	<p>Support:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site lies within Portsmouth Water's area and the site can be supplied with suitable network modifications</li> <li>• Southern Water is considering energy from waste plant in Fareham Borough which may be close to the SDA</li> <li>• Support the gap between the SDA and Wickham</li> </ul>	<p>The comments from the water companies on water supply and waste matters are helpful and will be followed up through further work on the SDA and the Core Strategy's infrastructure delivery plan.</p> <p>The support in principle is noted and the need to maintain gaps between the SDA and existing settlements is recognised in Policy SH5 and the South East Plan (Policy SH2). However, as noted above in relation to comments on the explanatory text, it may be possible for some open space or green infrastructure to be provided within Winchester District. Work currently underway will help to clarify what, if any, open space could be accommodated within Winchester.</p>
4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 31 (Shedfield PC); 42 (Wickham PC); 87 (GOSE); 140;	<p>Object :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the impact of increased traffic on Bishops Waltham, Wickham and other local roads</li> </ul>	<p>The Fareham SDA is a requirement of the South East Plan and it is a legal requirement of Core Strategies that they 'conform generally to the</p>

3108; 10069; 10445	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to 'upto 10000'dwellings does not reflect the SEP</li> <li>• Should not rely on such large sites and release smaller sites in the market towns at the earliest opportunity – 6 settlements could readily 2000 dwellings</li> <li>• Role of Knowle should be explored through the SDA</li> <li>• Should be a buffer between SDA and Wickham</li> <li>• a gap between the SDA and the settlements in Winchester District – this should not be used for formal open space only as amenity land or for conservation</li> </ul>	<p>Regional Spatial Strategy'. In order to progress the Core Strategy it must be assumed that the South East Plan will remain in place and that the Core Strategy will be required to conform to it. Therefore, it is not an option for the Core Strategy to reject the principle of the SDA, to reallocate it between other settlements, or to change its location 'within Fareham Borough to the north of the M27 motorway'. Concerns of nearby areas and residents are understood, the SDA is currently a requirement of the South East Plan and is being taken forward through the Fareham Borough Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the South East Plan referred to 'up to' 10,000 dwellings, the adopted SEP Plan has however, deleted the words 'up to'.</p> <p>It is agreed that the role of Knowle will need to be considered (see response to comments on the explanatory text above). The Preferred Option proposes a 'buffer' between the SDA and Wickham.</p>
77 (Fareham BC); 91 (Natural England); 86 (Highways Agency); 2273; 3198; 2293;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policy and supporting text need to be consistent – the policy should be amended to allow for green infrastructure and open space in accordance with SEP – policy must provide clear guidance and the boundary for the extent</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the policy and explanatory text should be consistent and that there need to be joint working on the nature and extent of the areas (these matters were also raised by the Planning Inspector in discussion during his</p>



	<p>of the green infrastructure this cannot be left to an SPD as inferred – policy should also refer to joint working to determined the extent and exact nature of these areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to maintain long term gaps by limiting any development north of M27</li> <li>• a major requirement of the SDA is that it meets its requirements under the Habitat Regulations, green infrastructure may be required on land in Winchester District to achieve this.</li> <li>• the AAP referred to should determine the funding sources for access and public transport</li> </ul>	<p>advisory visit). Work on a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the District (referred to above) should enable the next version of the Core Strategy to include more detail about the type and extent of Green Infrastructure that may be accepted within Winchester.</p> <p>The South East Plan requires areas of open land to be maintained between the SDA and existing settlements (gaps) and Policy SH5 seeks to retain these (although these cannot limit ‘any’ development north of the M27 as the SDA is required to be north of the M27). Work is also currently underway to look at the requirements and opportunities for Green Infrastructure provision in conjunction with the SDA.</p> <p>The Area Action Plan (AAP) will be produced by Fareham Borough Council to cover land within its Borough, although the City Council would wish to work with Fareham to plan the SDA, as made clear at paragraph 6.28 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate’s advisory letter suggests that the Core Strategy map should show more of the context of the open space surrounding the SDA and what is to happen in the open area. Several of the comments above also seek clarification or more detail about what, if any, open space or Green Infrastructure could</p>
--	--	--

		<p>be accommodated in Winchester District. Work is currently underway which will help provide this detail.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach</u> :-</p> <p>That Policy SH5 be retained generally in its current form, but with further clarification of the open areas proposed within the District and a better indication of how these relate to the SDA itself (within Fareham Borough).</p> <p>To update the Policy and explanatory text, if necessary taking account of Fareham Borough Council's progress on its Core Strategy and Area Action Plan (AAP).</p>
--	--	---

Youth Democracy Event October 2009Results of questions relating to spatial planning :-Question A:

*If you were planning a new development of 2000 – 3000 houses which of the following do you think are the most important ?*

*You have 3 choices - please place a tick in 3 boxes only*

Providing a range of house types such as :-  Small houses Larger houses Flats	<b>19</b>
Providing transport opportunities to avoid using a car :-  Bus service; Cycle routes; Footpaths;	<b>27</b>
Ensuring all the buildings are 'eco-friendly' :-  Use renewable energy; Include recycling facilities; Minimise carbon emissions and water consumption	<b>19</b>
Provision of facilities such as :- Schools; leisure/recreation; shops; community halls; health facilities	<b>28</b>
Include places to work  Purpose built business units; Homes that you can run a business from	<b>12</b>

<p>Designing the site to include:-</p> <p>Formal play space (pitches and playgrounds);          Informal areas for sitting, walking or playing</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p>
<p>Anything else?</p>	<p>Add your suggestion here.....</p> <p>More cycle lanes</p> <p>Church / other religious building</p> <p>Sunday and evening bus services</p> <p>Good design – nice to look at</p> <p>Limits on carbon emissions</p> <p>Community spirit</p>

Question B:

*Our aim is to create communities where young people, families and older people all live close together.*

*How do you think we can make this happen?*

	Here's our suggestion – what's yours?	If you agree with a suggestion already made tick here  (no of ticks)
1	A village green	7
2	Village shop	8
3	pub	7
4	Café/coffee shop	8
5	Adult socials	5
6	Kids clubs and places to chill	3
7	Local village hall	6
8	A local quiz (weekly)	1
9	sports	6
10	Skate park	3
11	Job opportunities for U18's	3
12	More than park or recreation ground	1
13	Shows and concerts	2
14	Sports/leisure facility (sports teams etc)	4
15	Community centre	1
16	New recycling centre	3
17	Youth club	
18	A common cause/interest	

KEEPAD questions and answers

KEEPAD = series of questions presenting on screen. Each participant is given a 'KEEPAD' and can chose an answer from those listed on the screen, young people and adults participating had different 'KEEPADS' hence the different responses listed below. Participants could chose whether to answer a question or not (N.b not all participants could respond to each question due to a range of technical matters of KEEPAD operation).

red type = responses from young people present

blue type = responses from adults present

**11.) What's the biggest challenge facing the Winchester District over the next 20-30 years:**

	Responses			
	(percent)		(count)	
Cost of housing	26.83%	25.0%	11	6
Lack of a range of job opportunities	34.15%	16.67%	14	4
An increasing population aged over 60	2.44%	8.33%	1	2
Climate change	19.51%	37.5%	8	9
Too much commuting	2.44%	4.17%	1	1
How to remain an attractive place to live	14.63%	8.33%	6	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

**12.) If you moved to a new development on the edge of an existing town what would be the most important to you?**

	Responses			
	(percent)		(count)	
A large garden	28.21%	8.33%	11	2
A school/college near by	20.51%	8.33%	8	2
Green space/sports field near by	12.82%	16.67%	5	4
Shops near by that you can walk to	12.82%	8.33%	5	2
Safe foot paths and cycle paths to town	10.26%	16.67%	4	4
On-site renewable energy	15.38%	41.67%	6	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		