

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

10 NOVEMBER 2011

CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO 'PLANS FOR PLACES' RELATING TO
WINCHESTER TOWN

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Steve Opacic Tel No: 01962 848101

Email: sopacic@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

[CAB 2177\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Publication of Plans for Places after Blueprint – 6 June 2011

[CAB 2148\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework - Feedback on remainder of Blueprint responses - 1 April 2011

[CAB2115\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework - feedback on Blueprint responses and Core Strategy next steps - 23 February 2011

[CAB2091\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Local Development Framework Update - 6 December 2010.

[CAB2060\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Consultation – 6 October 2010

[CAB2040\(LDF\)](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Local Development Framework Update – 22 July 2010

[CAB 1983](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred Option – Feedback on Consultation (Chapters 7-16) – 12 March 2010

[CAB 1944](#) - Winchester District Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred Option – Feedback on Consultation (Chapters 4-6) – 15 December 2009

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Plans for Places....*after Blueprint* was published on 27 June 2011 for a six week consultation period which closed on 8 August. 1027 comments were received from 201 respondents. Plans for Places, did not include detailed policy wording, but included a commentary on the proposed development strategies for the District followed by detailed questions to seek opinions.

The meeting of this Committee on 28 September 2011 considered the responses made to Plans for Places in relation to all areas other than Winchester Town ([CAB 2177\(LDF\)](#) refers). Members noted the responses and agreed the approach to be used in developing the next version of the Core Strategy, including the overall level of development provision and its split between the three spatial areas. This report focuses on the responses relating to Winchester Town, specifically Plans for Places Questions 4a and 4b, which had not been considered in the previous report pending the outcome of the Barton Farm planning appeal. That appeal decision has now been published and is taken into account in considering the responses relating to Winchester.

Plans for Places proposed 4,000 new dwellings for Winchester Town and the last meeting of this Committee agreed that this remained the only evidence-based basis for meeting the needs of Winchester. Plans for Places dealt with the issue of whether this requirement should be met at Barton Farm, or by an alternative strategy of more intensive development within the existing urban areas with smaller-scale greenfield releases. Following the Barton Farm appeal decision, it is now possible to reach a recommendation on this issue.

The Secretary of State dismissed the Cala Homes appeal at Barton Farm, but only on the basis that the City Council should be given the opportunity to complete the process it started with *Blueprint* and reach a conclusion on how to meet development needs through the Core Strategy. There were no fundamental planning objections raised to the Cala scheme by the Secretary of State, indeed the Planning Inspector recommended that the scheme should be approved and both she and the Secretary of State praised its high quality.

Like previous other consultations, the responses to Questions 4a and 4b show no clear consensus on the way forward in terms of the planning strategy for Winchester. Slightly more responses support Question 4a (the 'with Barton Farm' scenario) but there is also significant opposition. The discussion at the 'Where Now for Winchester' debate also reflected the disagreements about the future planning strategy for Winchester and has been taken into account. The likely capacity of the

town to accommodate the level of development needed has been further examined and an approach promoting high density development in certain parts of the town has been considered. It is concluded that these options would not achieve the level of housing needed and would be either undeliverable or particularly harmful to the environment and economy of the town and should not therefore be pursued. It is, therefore, recommended that the planning strategy for Winchester should include a strategic allocation at Barton Farm.

As noted at the last meeting of this Committee, it is important that the Core Strategy is progressed as soon as possible, given the Government's announcements in the draft NPPF about the presumption in favour of sustainable development, particularly where a plan is silent or absent. The Barton Farm decision has necessitated a pause in the process but it remains the intention to seek Cabinet and Council approval for the pre-submission/submission version of the Core Strategy in December 2011. This will be subject to 6 weeks consultation (on the principles of soundness) during January/February 2012, followed by formal submission in April 2012, the examination period thereafter, the Inspector's Report in October/November and formal adoption by end 2012.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the decision of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in relation to the Cala Homes (Barton Farm) appeal be noted;
- 2 That the responses to *Plans for Places...after Blueprint*, in relation to questions 4a and 4b on Winchester Town, be noted and used to inform the preparation of the pre-submission/submission version of the Core Strategy, to be reported and agreed at the next meeting of the Cabinet (LDF) Committee.

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

10 NOVEMBER 2011

CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO 'PLANS FOR PLACES' RELATING TO WINCHESTER TOWN

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

DETAIL:

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Cabinet (LDF) Committee considered a detailed report on comments to the City Council's 'Plans for Places – *After Blueprint*' consultation at its meeting on 28 September 2011 (report [CAB2231\(LDF\)](#) refers). This report included appendices summarising the responses received. Although these appendices included responses on Questions 4a and 4b in relation to Winchester Town, the report did not deal with these questions as they related to Barton Farm, Winchester. This was because the Secretary of State's decision on the appeal by Cala Homes regarding Barton Farm was awaited at that time.
- 1.2 The Secretary of State's decision has now been received and the Secretary of State has dismissed the appeal for the development of 2,000 dwellings and associated infrastructure, etc at Barton Farm.
- 1.3 This report sets out a brief discussion of the decision and its implications and goes on to consider the responses to Plans for Places in relation to development at Winchester (Questions 4a and 4b). It then draws conclusions and makes recommendations for the emerging Core Strategy in relation to Winchester Town.

2 The Secretary of State's Decision

- 2.1 The Secretary of State's decision was published on 28 September 2011 and dismisses the appeal by Cala Homes (South), contrary to the recommendation of the Planning Inspector who held the inquiry into the proposal in February 2011. The key issue for the Secretary of State was whether there was a 'compelling justification' for the release of this strategic reserve site at this time. Although the Inspector felt that there was such a justification, and the Secretary of State agreed with almost all of her conclusions, he felt that a decision by him to allow the appeal at that stage would be *'likely to undermine the process of Blueprint which is clearly an important policy objective for Winchester and which reflects a key planning priority for the Government.'*
- 2.2 The weight attached by the Secretary of State to the Blueprint exercise, and the fact that the Council is now able to conclude this process without a

decision being imposed on it is very much to be welcomed. It is, however, clear that the Secretary of State (and the Inspector) feels there is a housing land supply problem in Winchester and neither have raised any matters which would prevent the allocation of Barton Farm, should the Council conclude this is the correct approach to meeting the locally-derived housing needs it identifies.

- 2.3 In reaching this conclusion, the Secretary of State was clear that the Council had not demonstrated a 5-year land supply and that the appeal scheme offered a balanced, sustainable and high quality development. In her report the Inspector assessed a series of housing options presented by Cala and concluded that 'Scenario A' was the most realistic. Interestingly, this scenario is equivalent to the housing option promoted by the Council in Plans for Places, even though the Inspector's report pre-dated publication of the Housing Technical Paper. Scenario A was supported by the Inspector and produces almost exactly the same District housing requirement (556 dwellings per annum) as Plans for Places (550). The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector's conclusions about Scenario A, adding further to the weight of evidence which already points to 550 dwellings per annum (11,000 over 20 years) being the appropriate level of housing to plan for District-wide.
- 2.4 The Council is, therefore, able to complete the Blueprint/Plans for Places process and reach its own conclusions about development provision and distribution in its Core Strategy for the District. The Secretary of State's decision not only allows this, but is consistent with the conclusions already being reached by the Council on housing needs. The Barton Farm appeal decision neither specifically requires nor prevents Barton Farm from being allocated through the Core Strategy.

3 Responses to Plans for Places

- 3.1 Because of the uncertainty over Barton Farm at the time Plans for Places was published, two possible scenarios were set out. One of these described a scenario if Barton Farm were to be permitted by the Secretary of State and the other set out a possible scenario that did not include Barton Farm. Plans for Places did not comment on the merits or otherwise of the options because the Barton Farm decision was by then out of the Council's hands.
- 3.2 The consultation questions were not, therefore, intended to ask whether people supported Barton Farm or not, although many respondents commented on this anyway. Appendices 4a and 4b reproduce the summaries of comments on Plans for Places Questions 4a and 4b (these are the same as Appendices 4a and 4b in CAB2231 (LDF)) and the sections below seek to draw out the main issues raised.

Plans for Places Question 4a

- 3.3 Question 4a received 84 responses, of which 24 supported the 'with Barton Farm' scenario, 35 opposed it and 25 commented. The key issues raised in response to question 4a were as follows.

Support 'With Barton Farm' Scenario or Suggest More/Additional Sites

- 3.4 Most of the 24 'yes' responses supported Barton Farm without further comment or felt that it would be needed whatever the outcome of the appeal. Some promoted the need for a balanced housing supply, housing for older people, or affordable housing. Some of the other responses felt either that urban capacity had been over-estimated or that more than the 4000 dwellings proposed for Winchester would be needed. As a result, these respondents suggested that additional greenfield sites would be needed, either instead of Barton Farm or in addition to it.

Oppose Barton Farm or Suggest Brownfield Development

- 3.5 Roughly similar numbers of respondents to Question 4a opposed Barton Farm to those that support it or suggest higher housing provision. The most common objections are due to the perceived effect on Winchester's character and landscape setting. Several respondents also raise concerns about the impact of the proposal on infrastructure and services, traffic or flooding. Where those opposing Barton Farm put forward an alternative, most promote retention of the current boundary of the town and the use of brownfield land, car parks, etc, sometimes at higher densities. A small number suggest that the housing requirement for Winchester is too high, or not needed.
- 3.6 A few respondents suggest that the housing requirement should be spread amongst other settlements, but these are balanced by responses opposing Winchester's housing needs being met elsewhere.

Densities

- 3.7 A few responses suggested that if Barton Farm goes ahead it should be developed at a higher density, so as to make it more sustainable. A small number of comments on Question 4a objected to higher density development within the town or the development of car parks.

Employment Issues

- 3.8 There were only a small number of responses raising the employment elements of the 'with Barton Farm' scenario. There were a couple of comments relating to the need to consider employment issues as well as housing. One respondent suggested that the employment bullet point should treat improvement/redevelopment of Winnall and Bar End separately from development at Bushfield as they are not interdependent, a view also expressed by the Town Forum. A small number of responses opposed development of Bushfield Camp, with one in support.

Further Consultation

- 3.9 A few responses suggested that the consultation should either be extended, or repeated, until after the Barton Farm decision or finalisation of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans for Places Question 4b

- 3.10 Question 4b received 88 responses, of which 15 supported the 'without Barton Farm' scenario, 35 opposed it and 38 commented. The key issues raised in response to question 4b were as follows.

Support 'Without Barton Farm' Scenario or Retention of Existing Settlement Boundary

- 3.11 About half of the 15 'yes' responses supported the 'without Barton Farm' scenario without further comment, with some others commented that any shortfall in Winchester should not be redirected to other settlements/areas. A similar number also promoted the retention of Winchester's existing settlement boundary and landscape setting. Although many of these opposed Barton Farm, they did not necessarily support the alternative strategy set out in Question 4b, with some also opposing higher density development within the town and others supporting it.

Oppose Emphasis on High Density Development, Car Park Development, etc

- 3.12 Many of those that opposed the 'without Barton Farm' scenario did so on the basis that it would require an emphasis on housing at high densities and on most sites which came forward, and would require the development of car parks. Opposition to car park development came particularly from surrounding villages, who felt this would deter them from coming to Winchester, or others who felt this emphasis would be harmful to the town's character (due to high density development) and economy (due to loss of car parks and emphasis on housing). Although there was also some support for higher density development or the use of car parks, this was from a relatively small number of respondents.
- 3.13 The City of Winchester Trust and WinAcc hosted a meeting in early August 2011 to hear a presentation of a possible strategy developed by a group of Winchester architects. This proposed high density residential or commercial development in three particular locations in Winchester, which could potentially accommodate around 2000 dwellings. The emphasis was on accommodating this development within walking distance of the town centre and on sites which have scope for visual improvement, as opposed to a large greenfield site. A few respondents referred to and supported this presentation or promoted the need for development to be within walking distance of the town centre.

Housing Allocation for Winchester

- 3.14 A significant number of responses suggested the proposed housing requirement for Winchester (4000 dwellings over 20 years) was too high or was based on outdated assumptions, some promoting a strategy of dispersing development around nearby villages. A similar number either opposed re-distribution to other locations, supported the 4000 dwelling requirement

regardless of the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal, or said that the figure was too low. The Town Forum expressed concerns about the evidence on housing, retail and employment needs.

- 3.15 Some respondents said that another large greenfield site would need to be allocated if Barton Farm does not proceed, with an equal number suggesting small greenfield sites rather than one large site. A few people promoted the development of small sites within the town but an equal number suggested that large sites should be developed rather than small ones.

Other Components of the Scenario

- 3.16 There were only a small number of responses raising the employment elements of the 'without Barton Farm' scenario. A couple of responses supported development of Bushfield Camp, but these were outweighed by those opposing it, which tended to favour employment development within the town. A few respondents specifically supported the transport elements of the 'without Barton Farm' scenario and there was mention by individual respondents of the '10 Principles' developed by the City of Winchester Trust and WinAcc, concern about the effect of this scenario on greenspace provision/protection, the benefits of reusing offices for housing and the need to give priority to local affordable housing needs.

Further Consultation

- 3.17 One response suggested that the consultation should either be extended until after the Barton Farm decision.

4 Conclusions on Questions 4a and 4b

Housing Requirement and Distribution

- 4.1 Although covered mainly by Question 1 of Plans for Places, the level of housing provision and its distribution between the three spatial areas has featured in the responses to Questions 4a and 4b. More people promoted a higher housing requirement for Winchester in response to Question 4a, whereas in response to Question 4b more suggested a lower requirement. Overall the numbers on each side were similar, with slightly more in favour of a higher requirement.
- 4.2 The overall District-wide housing requirement of 11,000 has been dealt with in response to comments on Plans for Places Question 1 – see report CAB2231(LDF). This reported back on the results of further work to test the assumptions behind the requirement, which confirmed that it remains appropriate. As noted above, the Barton Farm appeal Inspector's Report has since endorsed a housing scenario which is equivalent to the housing option promoted by the Council in Plans for Places and produces almost exactly the same District housing requirement as Plans for Places. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector's conclusions, adding further to the weight of evidence which already points to a requirement of 11,000 dwellings over 20 years as the appropriate level of housing to plan for District-wide.

- 4.3 The distribution of housing between the spatial areas was also considered in report CAB2231(LDF), where it was concluded that the requirement for Winchester Town (4,000 dwellings over 20 years) was appropriate. This represents Winchester's 'share' of the District total, based on its population and dwelling stock. Given Winchester's sustainability credentials, a strategy which sought to re-distribute Winchester's housing need to other spatial areas (as suggested by some respondents but also opposed by similar numbers) could not be justified as a sustainable solution.
- 4.4 Therefore, the only basis for accepting a lower housing requirement for Winchester Town would seem to be that accommodating 4000 dwellings would result in clear and demonstrable harm to the town. While some argue that this is the case, the Barton Farm appeal decision clarifies that it is possible to accommodate the proposed level of housing without undue harm. The Inspector was clear in her view that the need for the development was overriding and the Secretary of State's main reason for dismissing the appeal was that the decision on the planning strategy for Winchester should be made locally through the LDF process. The Secretary of State did not suggest that this decision, which the Council now needs to make, should not include Barton Farm. Indeed, he agreed with the Inspector's conclusion that the proposal '*would deliver a balanced and sustainable community with an energy efficient, high quality and socially inclusive design that meets the needs of its local area*'.
- 4.5 In view of this conclusion, it is not possible to sustain a case that Winchester cannot or should not provide its share of housing need. The evidence is, therefore, clear that Winchester should meet its housing requirements and that it can do this through the allocation of land at Barton Farm.

Retention of Settlement Boundary/Promotion of Higher Densities

- 4.6 Apart from reducing the housing requirement for Winchester or re-distributing it to other areas (as discussed above), the only way to accommodate the required level of development is to concentrate development in the town and to make provision for smaller greenfield allocations as necessary to cover the shortfall in capacity within the existing settlement boundary. Some respondents assert that there is more capacity in the town than suggested by Plans for Places, but at least as many oppose higher density development or loss of car parks. The figures in Table 6 of Plans for Places have been updated to reflect the latest position in relation to planning permissions and the updated SHLAA (see report CAB2244(LDF) also on this agenda), which produces a similar result. Table 6 already included assessments of the effect of increasing densities on SHLAA sites and developing car parks, measures to which there was substantial opposition.
- 4.7 An exercise has been undertaken in order to test the absolute maximum capacity of public surface car parks in Winchester. Even if all constraints were ignored (flood risk areas, listed buildings, conservation area, etc) and every public surface car park were developed at 150 dwellings per hectare for car parks outside the town centre and 200 dwellings per hectare for car parks

within the town centre, their total capacity would be less than 900 dwellings. Looking at vacant office accommodation, a recent assessment of town centre floorspace suggested some 6,021 – 6,808 square metres are vacant (see report CAB2179(LDF) Appendix A), which might accommodate approximately 100-120 dwellings through conversion. Therefore, even if it were considered that every public surface car park and every vacant office in the town centre could be developed at high densities for housing, their capacity would not exceed 1000 dwellings.

- 4.8 The acceptability, deliverability and realism of such an approach is highly questionable, given the impact on the economy of the town, the type of dwellings that would be produced and the lack of other facilities and open space that could be provided. While some higher density development within and around the town centre will be needed to deliver the required housing, even with the allocation of Barton Farm, the suggestions that vacant office buildings, car parks, etc could provide the level of housing required to form an alternative strategy is not credible, even before consideration of whether it is a realistic, reasonable or preferable option.
- 4.9 The only specific suggestion about how the capacity of the town could be increased was contained in a presentation at an event organised by the City of Winchester Trust and WinAcc in early August 2011. A presentation on behalf of a group of local architects proposed high density residential or commercial development in three particular locations in Winchester, which could potentially accommodate around 2000 dwellings – land at Andover Road, Winnall and Bar End. The emphasis was on accommodating this development within walking distance of the town centre and on sites which have scope for visual improvement, as opposed to a large greenfield site.
- 4.10 Clarification has been sought of the status of this suggestion, resulting in the conclusion that it is a potential long-term solution which would need considerable further working up and consultation before it could be considered as part of an alternative means of accommodating Winchester's housing requirement. It is very useful in bringing some new and radical thinking to the issue of development needs and has received some support through the responses to Plans for Places and elsewhere. However, it is not promoted as an alternative to Barton Farm or any other specific development, and is not sufficiently worked up to be capable of such promotion at this stage.
- 4.11 Even if it were being promoted as an alternative strategy, the presentation has several gaps or shortcomings which would prevent it from forming part of the Core Strategy, including:
- Deliverability/viability has not been investigated and it is not clear whether the variety of landowners that would need to be involved are aware of the proposal, let alone committed to its development. Each of the three areas considered covers multiple ownerships, including various commercial premises, especially at Winnall and Bar End;

- Constraints of various types appear to affect some of the sites. In the Andover Road area, parts are in the Conservation Area, subject to Tree Preservation Orders or may have an indirect impact on listed buildings. At Winnall, the areas suggested for development extend beyond the current settlement boundary and into the South Downs National Park, and adjoin flood risk areas and the River Itchen SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest). At Bar End, the area is affected by a flood risk area and Tree Preservation Orders and is close to the National Park and SSSIs. The effect of development on the River Itchen SAC (Special Area of Conservation) would need to be assessed (individually and cumulatively) as this is an internationally designated area;
 - The displacement of uses would need to be considered as most of the three areas are in active use. There would be a considerable loss of commercial and employment land, car parking and recreation land, as well as some intrusion into greenfield land beyond the current Winchester settlement boundary. Although the existing uses may not all need to be relocated, many would. This approach may also generate other needs such as for education provision, open space and community facilities. Accommodating these may add to the impact of such an approach on greenfield land around Winchester;
 - The impact on Winchester's landscape setting could be substantial. While this approach appears to use less greenfield land than Barton Farm, it would result in high density, medium-rise development close to the urban edge at Winnall and Bar End. This would be potentially intrusive in views to/from the South Downs National Park, which these areas adjoin;
 - The type of development that would be needed to achieve the housing numbers proposed would require high density, medium-rise development (6-7 storeys), with a high proportion of flats. Development of this form at this scale is not characteristic of Winchester and does not appear to meet the need identified through Blueprint for smaller family units, accommodation for the elderly and affordable housing. In the absence of further testing it is not possible to be sure that this option could deliver a net gain of 2000 dwellings.
- 4.12 Although the option of developing three areas of the town at high density has some attractions, it is not possible to conclude at this stage that it is either deliverable, acceptable in terms of the constraints applying, or even a more appropriate solution than Barton Farm. Barton Farm is a relatively unconstrained area of land which is some distance from the key constraints of the National Park, Itchen SAC, Conservation Area or listed buildings. It includes sufficient land to provide recreational, social and educational facilities on-site and will secure further 'mitigation land' to the east of the railway line. The recent appeal decision has confirmed that there are no overriding constraints to the development of Barton Farm and that it would form a sustainable community.

- 4.13 The high density option on the other hand would adjoin the National Park (and even intrude into it at Winnall) and potentially impact on the Conservation Area, flood risk areas and SSSIs. It would displace uses which may need to be relocated and is unlikely to accommodate all of the uses needed to serve it. These would need to be provided/relocated elsewhere, possibly on less suitable land outside the settlement boundary.
- 4.14 In conclusion, therefore, the high density development option cannot be viewed as a 'reasonable alternative' at this stage as it is not sufficiently developed to be deliverable or to show that it is preferable to Barton Farm. It does not achieve the aim of retaining the existing settlement boundary, which some respondents promote, and raises the prospect of a form of development which may be very harmful to the character and setting of the town, which would be a matter of concern to many respondents.

Employment and Other Uses

- 4.15 There were very few comments on non-housing elements of the scenarios for Winchester, with the main area of comment being in relation to Bushfield Camp. The numbers were quite small but, on balance, there was more opposition than support for the prospect of employment development at Bushfield. When taken with responses to Questions 2 and 3 of Plans for Places, it is clear that respondents generally favoured development and regeneration within the town centre over greenfield development outside the town. The component of the high density development option relating to Andover Road received some support and parts could be achieved on sites which have clear potential for commercial use, such as the Carfax site and Cattle Market car park.
- 4.16 The 'Preferred Option' version of the Core Strategy made a provisional allocation of Bushfield Camp for a 'knowledge park', subject to further studies relating to its sustainability and viability. A viability study was undertaken in 2009 and updated in 2010. The latest study suggests that the likely land value and profitability are insufficient to make the project commercially viable. There are, therefore, very real doubts about whether such a development could be delivered, even in more favourable economic conditions. The recent economic study update (see report CAB2233(LDF), 28 September 2011) does not identify an economic 'need' for development of this scale but acknowledges that the knowledge park proposal was concerned with changing the employment profile rather than simply generating job growth.
- 4.17 More particularly, not all of the other studies have been completed, so it is not possible at this stage to show that a knowledge park allocation would be acceptable in transport or environmental terms. For example, the Highway Authority would need to be satisfied about the ability of the nearby junction of the M3 to accommodate traffic generation, the impact on the Itchen SAC (Special Area of Conservation) would need to be assessed, and it would need to be shown that the visual impact on the setting of Winchester and the nearby National Park would be acceptable.

- 4.18 Accordingly, it is not proposed that Bushfield Camp be allocated for a knowledge park or other specific development. Nevertheless, this is a site which has long been recognised as needing a positive planning solution. Various development proposals and studies have been produced since it was vacated by the Army in the 1970s, which also recognise the constraints of the site and its sensitivity. The special characteristics of the site may make part of it suitable for certain forms of development, if these can respect its unique character. It is, therefore, considered that Bushfield Camp is unique in the opportunity it offers and should be identified as an 'opportunity site' in the Core Strategy.
- 4.19 The site would be subject to a specific policy which would allow for a comprehensive, conservation-led approach that may include modest and appropriate development, where this requires a unique site of this type and would conserve its key characteristics. It would need to be shown that such development is needed and could not be accommodated within the town or on a 'normal' site allocation. Therefore, the site would not be suitable for a 'standard' housing or commercial development and any special form of development that was justified would need to be part of a comprehensive scheme which could secure the majority of the site for recreation or other sensitive uses. The policy would set out these requirements, against which any future planning application or study would be assessed.
- 4.20 With regard to other uses, few were mentioned in response to Questions 4a and 4b. Education uses were the main 'omissions' raised in response to Question 3, particularly primary education, with health provision also being referred to. The Barton Farm planning application included a new primary school and local centre which would contain a range of community facilities, including provision for a health centre. An allocation of land at Barton Farm is, therefore, capable of meeting some of the other needs raised in response to Plans for Places, as well as housing. Any smaller site allocations that may be needed for education, health or other uses would not be of a 'strategic' nature and therefore would not be allocations in the Core Strategy.

5 The 'Where Now for Winchester?' Debate

- 5.1 Following the Barton Farm appeal decision and the clear indication that the City Council should have the opportunity to determine its own planning approach for Winchester through the Core Strategy, the 'Where Now for Winchester' event was organised and held at the Theatre Royal on 27 October 2011. Plans for Places has given the opportunity for anyone to express their views on the development options for Winchester and the 27 October event enabled a public and 'political' discussion of the issues prior to the next version of the Core Strategy being drafted.
- 5.2 The event was aimed at airing and discussing the issues, but did not seek to reach conclusions or decisions for the Core Strategy. There was some agreement at the 'political' level about the need for economic growth / prosperity and that there was a substantial evidence base behind the

projected levels of housing. There also seemed to be acceptance of the need to make a decision on the way forward and the dangers of further delays.

- 5.3 The issue of affordable housing provision was frequently raised, although there was no consensus on how it should be resolved. While there was support for full use of brownfield sites and for higher densities to be developed where acceptable, there were concerns about the potential scale or form of development, issues of 'garden grabbing' and the relative merits of developing these sites compared to greenfield land outside the current boundary.
- 5.4 It was clear that many people remain strongly opposed to the development of Barton Farm and this is probably the main issue which prevents any consensus being reached on the way forward for Winchester. However, there also appeared to be many who either accepted the need for growth to provide housing, especially if provided a sustainable urban extension, or would be concerned about high density development concentrated within the existing boundary.

6 Conclusions for the Winchester Strategy

- 6.1 The responses to the Plans for Places consultation and the 'Where Now for Winchester' event have reaffirmed the lack of consensus about the way forward for Winchester Town that has characterised discussions over many years, both through the Blueprint process and previous Core Strategy consultations. While there was more support for Question 4a (with Barton Farm scenario) than for Question 4 b (without Barton Farm) this does not amount to a consensus view.
- 6.2 On the other hand, no viable or preferable alternative means of meeting Winchester's housing and other needs has been put forward. Those who promote a strategy which would retain Winchester's existing settlement boundary generally promote a lower housing requirement but, apart from failing respond to the evidence of housing needs, these comments are offset by those promoting a higher housing requirement.
- 6.3 The other alternative to greenfield development which is promoted is through the development of car parks or other sites at higher densities, which was also subject to substantial opposition. Nevertheless, Plans for Places had tested whether the housing requirement could be met by the use of car parks and/or higher densities (Table 6) and concluded that the capacity of the town was about 1500-2500 dwellings. Updating of this work suggests that the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on sites with planning permission and in the SHLAA has remained of the same order.
- 6.4 Further work has also been done to test higher density development of car parks but, even at densities of 150 dwellings per hectare (dph) outside the town centre and 200 dph within the town centre, the capacity of all the surface car parks is less than 900 dwellings. This ignores constraints such as flood risk and does not consider the desirability or practicality of developing at these densities, or of losing all surface car parks in and around the town centre.

Even with this theoretical capacity, and adding in the conversion of all vacant offices to housing, all existing planning permissions/SHLAA sites and a significant allowance for small/unidentified sites, it would be impossible to demonstrate how the capacity of the town could be increased beyond a maximum of 3,000 dwellings.

- 6.5 The proposal presented at the City of Winchester Trust and WinAcc event in August 2011, for high density development at three locations around the town, is claimed to achieve about 2000 dwellings. As noted above, this option has not been formally put forward for consideration and would need much further testing. At present, it cannot be shown to be deliverable, even if it were felt to be acceptable. The proposal, or aspects of it, may have potential for the longer term but cannot be treated as a reasonable alternative to Barton Farm, which the recent Secretary of State decision shows to be both acceptable in planning terms and deliverable.
- 6.6 Accordingly, having considered all the potential alternatives, it is concluded that the Core Strategy's planning strategy for Winchester Town should provide for the development of 4000 dwellings to meet the town's housing and economic needs and that a strategic allocation of 2000 dwellings should be made at Barton Farm. This would also include provision for the necessary physical and social infrastructure, including primary education provision, community facilities, improvements to secondary education, etc.
- 6.7 The strategy should not include a specific allocation of Bushfield Camp for a knowledge park or other form of development allocation, but should identify it as an 'opportunity site'. This would recognise the unique nature of the site and allow for future proposals which reflect this to be developed. No other 'strategic allocations' need be identified around Winchester in the Core Strategy: the Development Management and Allocations DPD would provide the detail on how the remainder of the housing and other requirements for the town would be met. This would be in accordance with the 'brownfield first' presumption that the Core Strategy will apply across the District, but not ruling out smaller greenfield allocations if needed.

7 Implications for the Core Strategy Programme

- 7.1 The programme for the Core Strategy envisages approval of the 'Pre-Submission' version in December 2011 and this is still achievable. It had been intended that the full Core Strategy would be considered at this meeting but the Secretary of State's decision and the need to consider its implications has rendered this unrealistic. A further meeting of the Committee has now been arranged for 28 November 2011 when the draft Pre-Submission Core Strategy will be presented.
- 7.2 Also, since the publication of Plans for Places, the Government has consulted on a draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Government had intended that this would be finalised by the end of 2011, but this is not now likely to be until April 2012. The question of whether the Core Strategy should be delayed to await the final NPPF has been considered, along with the

option of combining the Core Strategy and Development Management and Allocations DPDs into a new 'Local Plan'. Neither are considered preferable to progressing the Core Strategy through to adoption (to provide the certainty that a statutorily-adopted document would offer) within the shortest possible time.

- 7.3 It is concluded that there are very high risks in the Council delaying the Core Strategy and that it should work towards adoption of the Core Strategy as quickly as possible. The risks relate particularly to the lack of a 5-year housing land supply (as noted by the Secretary of State in the Barton Farm decision) and the proposed introduction of a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' in the absence of up to date plans (as proposed in the draft NPPF). Although the Government has talked about 'transitional arrangements' which could delay the effect of the 'presumption in favour', it is not yet clear whether or when these will be introduced and how precisely they may affect the situation in Winchester. The indications are that the Government will not allow this to be used as a reason to delay core strategies/local plans.
- 7.4 In addition, the 5-year land supply situation (which the draft NPPF proposes should be 5 years supply + 20%) still needs to be addressed. Progressing the Core Strategy will help by showing that the Council is taking action to allocate strategic sites which can contribute to land supply and adjusting the overall housing target and phasing arrangements. The land availability issue is relevant now and there is a risk of increased planning applications and appeals on sites which are not in accordance with current policy.
- 7.5 The Core Strategy would be progressed on the basis that it will be in general accordance with the NPPF. This is likely to be tested by the Inspector during the examination process, which is expected to be after the NPPF is finalised. If found sound, the resultant Core Strategy would be NPPF-compliant. If there are substantial unforeseen changes to the NPPF it may be that the Inspector can recommend changes to deal with these. If any changes are so major that the plan had to be withdrawn and amended, this would delay the process, regardless of the stage the Council had reached. It is, therefore, concluded that there are very strong reasons to progress the Core Strategy as quickly as possible, retaining the planned adoption date of December 2012.
- 7.6 As noted above, the NPPF refers consistently to 'local plans' rather than Core Strategies or other development plan documents (DPDs). On the other hand, the legislation and draft Local Planning Regulations (July 2011) continue to refer to DPDs. However, in order to bring the terminology for Winchester's LDF into line with that of the NPPF, and to help avoid confusion, it is recommended that the Core Strategy should be re-titled the *'Winchester District Local Plan – Part 1'*. This would still effectively be a Core Strategy and all of the evidence and consultation which has taken place would still be relevant.
- 7.7 As discussed above, the option of combining the Development Management and Allocations DPD with the Core Strategy would result in considerable

delays due to the need for further technical work and public involvement. This is not, therefore, recommended as the way forward and instead any future DPDs could be badged as *Local Plan – Part 2*, etc, as necessary.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

8 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CHANGE PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):

- 8.1 As part of progressing effective spatial planning of the District, the Core Strategy is one of the key implementation mechanisms for the Council's Community Strategy. To this extent, the Core Strategy reflects the outcomes of the Community Strategy, and the emerging strategic planning policies will be expressed to cover these matters where there is a land use planning requirement for their delivery. It is envisaged that, even with the revised planning regime and the emphasis now on localism, this element will continue to be a core requirement of any local plan/core strategy.

9 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 9.1 The key resources for undertaking work on the LDF were approved as part of the budget process. The nature and scale of the LDF will continue to require shared resources in terms of utilising skills and expertise from other Teams within the Council. This is now even more critical given the emphasis on localism.
- 9.2 The LDF Reserve was established to provide for future major costs, such as the public examination stage, but contributions to the Reserve have been reduced over recent years. Based on current forecasts of expenditure on the LDF, this is likely to result in a significant budget shortfall from 2013/14 onwards and this would need to be reviewed in due course to assess whether additional funding is required to enable the LDF to progress.
- 9.3 The precise timing of the abolition of Regional Strategies is still unknown, so it is likely that the Core Strategy will be required to demonstrate compliance with the South East Plan, in addition to the emerging NPPF. There is also a requirement to demonstrate a 5 year supply of available housing land and this could be increased through the NPPF by an additional 20%. It is, therefore, necessary to ensure that the Core Strategy is progressed and that the appropriate skills and resources are available to support this.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 10.1 The Localism Bill reaffirms Government's intention to retain LDFs and their constituent development plan documents, albeit re-named as local plans. The National Planning Policy Framework and revised Local Planning Regulations, both published for consultation, also reaffirm the format and content of development plan documents and the broad process LDFs will be required to follow.

- 10.2 A particular risk to the Council in the short term is the issue of an ageing Local Plan and the lack of a recently-adopted Core Strategy/Local Plan. This could result in challenges regarding not only housing supply but also the emerging presumption in favour of sustainable development which requires applications to be considered favourably if the local plan is silent or absent, etc.
- 10.3 The risks of failing to progress the Core Strategy in a timely manner are discussed within the main part of this report. These include putting the Council more at risk of dealing with development proposals through the appeal process.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 4a : Summary of Responses to Question 4a

Appendix 4b : Summary of Responses to Question 4b

Appendix 4a

The Secretary of State for Communities is expected to decide in August whether to grant planning permission for 2000 dwellings and associated development at Barton Farm, the north of Winchester

Question 4a: If Barton Farm gets planning permission do you agree with the additional components of the development strategy for Winchester Town that will also need to be implemented? If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
	Chambers	Yes	N/A
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt	Yes	N/A
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree with the distribution which should include 4000 dwellings at Winchester whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	N/A
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	This looks reasonable but if there is a shortfall it should not be redistributed to other areas of the District.
	Hallett	Yes	Barton Farm development is necessary for the sustainability of Winchester as a balanced community. At present there is a lack of housing for the younger population and families so that this encourages excessive commuting into Winchester of essential workers. There also needs to be the additional components
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	In broad agreement, particularly with the provision of infrastructure to deal with the increased pressure. In disagreement with the proposed application in its current form.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Holmes	Yes	Agree with the elements provided they include accessible green infrastructure, which should include land to the east of the railway to reduce impacts on the Itchen SAC.
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	Yes	We agree subject to the following wording adjustment: The third bullet point of the employment opportunities section needs to be split into two: improvement and redevelopment at Winnall and Bar End are a separate option from releasing a greenfield site for knowledge industries. The two components do not have to go hand-in-hand and should be separated out.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Comprehensive cycle paths linking to the town centre should form part of any plans
	Kerr	Yes	But if the 4000-6000 figure is not achieved in Winchester it should not be redistributed to other locations. Each spatial area should address any shortfalls itself.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	N/A
	Parker	Yes	N/A
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
	Sealey	Yes	The scale and intensity of Barton Farm would be damaging to the characteristics described in the opening sentence of para 5.3.
	Simmonds	Yes	In agreement at present, but recommends further discussion on providing for the needs of an ageing population, particularly in light of budget cuts.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	In agreement, but opposed to the unsustainable developer transport strategy.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner	Yes	N/A
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		No	The option of spreading Winchesters needs around the villages has been dismissed, overlooking the possibility of increasing employment and services in the towns and villages to improve their sustainability. Many people in the rural towns and villages do not rely on Winchester and sustainable growth should be supported in these areas.
	Aiken	No	Opposed to the Barton farm development on the grounds of increased congestion, damage to the character of the city, pressures on secondary schools and the hospital, lack of parking in the Weeke retail area, and loss of biodiversity and leisure space. Suggests more emphasis be put on housing in the city centre.
	Brinkman	No	Office or high technology employment should be provided. New cycle lanes throughout the city should connect to new developments. Integratio measures should be taken to avoide the 'add-on' effect of Barton Farm.
	Charrett	No	The evidence based assessments are likely to change or be wrong. The Council should not accept what other bodies instruct it to do. Winchester has a special character which demands unique treatment and the City Council should argue that this demands special treatment and exemption from government rules.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Orchard Homes	c/o agent	No	Even with Barton Farm, greenfield sites around Winchester will be needed. There is no allowance for flexibility and the urban capacity of Winchester is over-estimated. At least 4400 dwellings should be planned for, requiring 900-1400 on additional greenfield sites. Adequate land supply is needed from the outset and the Pitt Manor reserve site can meet the immediate shortfall.
	Day	No	If Barton Farm is approved it is still essential to stop over-development. There are no employment opportunities for the houses at Barton Farm and most will be bought by commuters. There is no need for more shops when many in Winchester are already closing down.
CALA Homes	Emett	No	The question is flawed and misleading as the scenarios are presented as mutually exclusive. It is not the case that an alternative has to be found if Barton Farm is dismissed. The site can be allocated in the Core Strategy even if the appeal is dismissed, as was proposed at the Preferred Option stage. The site should not be excluded from consideration if the appeal is dismissed as Barton Farm remains an option and there remains a need to plan for 4000 dwellings on the Council's figures. Barton Farm remains the best location to meet this requirement.
	English	No	In disagreement. Winchester's historic centre should be protected for tourism, and against urban sprawl. Countryside wedges around the city should be protected.
	Forbes	No	Object to the reliance on high densities, which will harm the character of the town, and use of car parks and employment sites. The target within Winchester should be reduced by 1325 dwellings, which should be reallocated to greenfield sites on the edge of Winchester. Question why the strategies with/without Barton Farm are different for non-housing uses - they should be consistent and clarify how developer contributions will be sought.
	Garfath	No	Barton Farm should not be built and would become a ghetto with inadequate transport and services and a lot of commuting.
	Garfath	No	The figure for Winchester is too high and does not take account of the recession, public sector cuts or the National Park. Barton Farm would destroy farmland, lead to flooding, create transport and service problems and effect tourism and the economy.
	Gillham	No	The question is woolly and disagree with some aspects such as the knowledge park but support others such as distributed health centres.
	Goodwin	No	Object to developemnt at Barton farm which does not protect the landscape setting of Wincehster, preserve the historic heritage and protect green areas. There are inadequate facilities/infrastructure, traffic problems, flooding issues, loss of farmland and visual intrusion.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The consultation should be kept open for 1 month after the Barton Farm decision.
	Hare	No	Even if Barton Farm is approved the proposed densities and take up rates in the SHLAA are unrealistic. Small and large greenfield sites are needed beyond the town boundary and there should be a realistic balance between the housing numbers for Winchester and the market towns.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Harvey	No	Object to the reliance on high densities, which will harm the character of the town, and use of car parks and employment sites. The target for Winchester should be reduced by 1325 dwellings, which should be reallocated to surrounding villages. Question why the strategies with/ without Barton Farm are different for non-housing uses - they should be consistent and clarify how developer contributions will be sought.
	Hayter	No	Agree items in para 5.30 but only with the addition of on-site employment. Overall Winchester allocation should be greater than 4000 through combination with items in para 5.31. Required to be consistent with PPS1 & PPS3 as detailed in response to Q.1
	Holliday	No	Further development should be within the settlement boundary, avoiding over-development within the City. Barton Farm would be a major loss and threaten other greenfield sites.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	No	Question the need for additional retail facilities and park and ride given existing/planned provision. Question the number of houses required and feel there is ample time to consider where housing should be located after the Barton Farm appeal decision.
	Howland	No	Must protect Winchester's landscape setting, preserve green wedges and retain the existing boundary.
	Howland	No	Must retain a strategic gap between Winchester and Headbourne Worthy. Too many houses, too much traffic and pollution, inadequate trains and object to diverting Andover Road.
Freelance	Kessler	No	There needs to be a clear vision, particularly for open space. Winchester already has a lot of open spaces, and strategies need to focus more upon good pedestrian and cycle routes which join up well, and for the allocation of appropriate private open space.
	Leighton Davis	No	Barton Farm will not provide the services needed or benefit Winchester. The affordable housing-led projections by Cala bear no relation to reality. Winchester's landscape setting and historic heritage need to be protected by limiting development. The City should be kept within its current boundary to retain a walkable City. Housing for local needs should be provided, along with smaller retail units.
	Macintosh	No	Agrees with the uses but Barton Farm scheme is too low a density - should be at least 60 dph with reduced car-parking to supply a reserve of land to cope with demand in the future, and space in the meantime for communal play and allotments.
	Marriott	No	Barton Farm should not go ahead due to traffic problems, loss of farmland, flooding, infrastructure and effect on Winchester's character. If it is permitted it should be deferred and only a minimum number of houses built, to meet current residents' needs.
	McManus	No	Disagree with any Barton Farm scenario. There is a responsibility to protect Winchester and its landscape setting. The consultation is premature until the Barton Farm decision is known and the National Planning Policy Framework is ratified.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	O Donoghue	No	Barton Farm is an area of natural beauty. Development of green belt is not necessary and would result in more traffic/pollution. Winchester should not expand beyond its current boundaries and the housing would be for commuters, not local needs.
	Porter	No	Do not support the need to develop Barton Farm and there is no solution to the problem of traffic and cycle access into the town.
	Retter	No	Barton Farm would produce greater strain on Winchester than a series of brownfield sites.
	Riddell	No	Object to the development of Barton Farm. Not against development but must be a balance to preserve Winchester's heritage by limiting development and maximising space. Keep development within the City boundary, provide for small shops, protect green wedges of countryside.
	Slattery	No	Barton Farm is unsuitable for development due to flooding and loss of farmland. Silver Hill would be much better and is within walking distance of the town centre.
	Stebbing	No	Object to Barton Farm, which is key to Winchester's landscape setting. Development should be kept within Winchester's boundary, avoid over-development and retain a walkable City.
Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	No	The option of spreading Winchesters needs around the villages has been dismissed, overlooking the possibility of increasing employment and services in the towns and villages to improve their sustainability. The development strategy does not allow sufficient development in the towns and villages and may harm the historic character of Winchester. Dispersal should be promoted whether or not Barton Farm is allowed.
City of Winchester Trust		No	If Barton Farm is allowed attempts should be made to achieve higher densities and greater sustainability to reduce the land-take, allow for more housing, or enable mixed use development. Opportunities within the town should be pursued whatever the outcome of the appeal, including higher densities in the town centre, intensification of employment sites and possibly employment at Barton Farm. There should be no greenfield employment allocation as this would not be viable and land within the boundary should be developed first. Reductions in the public sector are likely to make more land/buildings available for employment use.
Persimmon Homes		No	The Barton Farm appeal decision will have major implications and there should be an opportunity to submit further representations in the light of the decision.
Bargate Homes			Even if Barton Farm is allowed, the over-estimate of urban capacity means that other small and large greenfield sites will be needed beyond the settlement boundary. The balance between Winchester and the market towns should be reconsidered and the figure for the Market Towns and Rural Areas increased.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			Barton Farm is high quality farmland and important landscape which should be protected. There are alternatives within Winchester including reuse of vacant buildings and rundown areas.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
WCBP Ltd and The Church Commissioners			Agree that a site beyond the settlement boundary is needed for employment and open space, whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal. This could be achieved by a knowledge park and Bushfield Camp offers an opportunity for a strategic employment development and open space for the City.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Even if Barton Farm goes ahead it will be necessary to consider the reuse of employment sites and buildings.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		If Barton Farm is allowed, Royal Mail should be consulted at an early stage to ensure adequate capacity is in place to serve the development.
CALA Homes	Emett		The criteria listed in paragraph 5.30 would be an appropriate development strategy for Winchester and development at Barton Farm is an essential component. Other land will also need to be identified to meet development requirements.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		Rural communities are already affected by vehicular access past the site and new development will require considerable modification of the road network.
Winchester Action On Climate Change	Hutchison		Welcome mention of measure such as priority for pedestrians and cyclists, improved public transport and introduction of 20mph limits. Stress the importance of increasing housing density to limit sprawl into surrounding areas, with at least 60 dwellings per hectare recommended for all new developments. Support development of housing and business on surplus car parks near the station. Car clubs should be required as a planning condition.
	Jezeeph		If Barton Farm is allowed there will still be a need for other housing sites and for the other uses mentioned in paragraph 5.30.
	Long		The employment point doesn't seem to make sense, there is not enough information on how open space will be provided, and other housing sites will be needed even if Barton Farm is allowed. In particular, small sites should be released for housing in the period before Barton Farm comes on-stream.
Highways Agency	Mendoza		Barton Farm is close to M3 junction 9 which experiences congestion. Mitigation measures have been agreed with the developers to address the potential transport impacts should development go ahead..
	Nicholson		Barton Farm should be kept to a minimum and provide the required infrastructure. Concerned about inadequate access roads.
	Nobles		Barton Farm is close to transport networks and should go ahead. If not allowed a similar site would need to be found in Winchester.
	Paskins		If the Barton Farm development is imposed by government development elsewhere in the city should be limited to very small-scale projects.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.

Appendix 4a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Save Barton Farm Group	Slattery		Plans for Places is premature before the Barton Farm appeal decision and the consultation should be extended. There is a responsibility to protect Winchester's character, heritage and setting. Winchester should remain a walkable City with a well-defined edge.
	Slattery		The Localism Bill imposes a duty to work with the community. Whatever the Barton Farm appeal decision, it should not be built. The CWT 10 Principles should be followed and the Town Vision refreshed. The City has a finite size and excessive development must be resisted.
	Smith		No comment.
Winchester City Residents Association	Thomas		Opposed to developmet of Barton Farm. The Core Strategy has a responsibility to protect Winchester's landscape setting. The trend of infilling in suburbs will continue and avoid the need for Barton Farm, which would be occupied by commuters.
	Welch		The employment point doesn't seem to make sense, there is not enough information on how open space will be provided, and other housing sites will be needed even if Barton Farm is allowed. In particular, small sites should be released for housing in the period before Barton Farm comes on-stream.
	Welch Family		The employment point doesn't seem to make sense, there is not enough information on how open space will be provided, and other housing sites will be needed even if Barton Farm is allowed. In particular, small sites should be released for housing in the period before Barton Farm comes on-stream.
	White		The priority should be to protect Winchester's heritage, character anmd landscape setting so Barton Farm should be resisted. The housing figure should be reduced to match Winchester's capacity without destroying its character.
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			Even if Barton Farm is allowed there will be a need to look at housing sites for at least another 2000 dwellings. There should be a presumption in favour of reusing all suitable sites for housing to help meet this requirement.
City of Winchester Trust			Welcome mention of measure such as priority for pedestrians and cyclists, improved public transport and introduction of 20mph limits. Stress the importance of increasing housing density to limit sprawl into surrounding areas, with at least 60 dwellings per hectare recommended for all new developments. Support development of housing and business on surplus car parks near the station. Car clubs should be required as a planning condition.
Orchard Homes			Even if Barton Farm is allowed, the over-estimate of urban capacity means that other small and large greenfield sites will be needed beyond the settlement boundary. The balance between Winchester and the market towns should be reconsidered and the figure for the Market Towns and Rural Areas increased.

Appendix 4b

The Secretary of State for Communities is expected to decide in August whether to grant planning permission for 2000 dwellings and associated development at Barton Farm, the the north of Winchester.

Question 4b: If Barton Farm does not get planning permission do you agree with the alternative development strategy for Winchester Town? If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree with the distribution which should include 4000 dwellings at Winchester whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	N/A
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	This looks reasonable but if there is a shortfall it should not be redistributed to other areas of the District.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	In broad agreement, but does not agree with the allocation of 4000 dwellings within Winchester. Disagrees that 'all' sites would need to be developed, and that they should all be developed at the highest possible densities - in order to preserve Winchester's sense of place. Agrees that retail development at local centres is a good idea.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Not an ideal solution
	Kerr	Yes	But if the 4000-6000 figure is not achieved in Winchester it should not be redistributed to other locations. Each spatial area should address any shortfalls itself.
	Macintosh	Yes	In favour of the development of existing inner-city car-park sites to create higher density housing supply. Recommends the redevelopment of car parking space around Winchester railway station, making use of the good transport links.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Parker	Yes	N/A

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	A much larger Park and Ride Scheme than the one proposed at Barton Farm, on the lines of Bar End etc, would reduce the need for central car parks and encourage pedestrian and cycle access. Barton Farm, on the north side of the city, would be ideal for access from the A34 and A272.
	Simmonds	Yes	But, as recorded in the last response, the word "Care" should perhaps be brought into the Para dealing with "Community"
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		No	The option of spreading Winchesters needs around the villages has been dismissed, overlooking the possibility of increasing employment and services in the towns and villages to improve their sustainability. Many people in the rural towns and villages do not rely on Winchester and sustainable growth should be supported in these areas.
	Brinkman	No	Concern over density and infill. Car parks should not be developed unless they are replaced, ie. Building over the car park or pushing the car park underground. Concern over the popularity of park and ride schemes. Focus needs to be upon improvement of the bus system to alleviate pressure on parking. High density development must be a mix of flats and town houses on derelict sites in the city, before turning to greenfield land. Greenfeild should be prioritised for open space. Out of town retail should be discouraged.
	Chambers	No	Infrastructure is insufficient for the new housing we have in this area already!
	Charrett	No	The evidence based assessments are likely to change or be wrong. The Council should not accept what other bodies instruct it to do. Winchester has a special character which demands unique treatment and the City Council should argue that this demands special treatment and exemption from government rules.
Orchard Homes	c/o agent	No	There is no allowance for flexibility and the urban capacity of Winchester is over-estimated. At least 4400 dwellings should be planned for, so if Barton Farm is dismissed greenfield sites for 2900-3400 dwellings will be needed around Winchester. Adequate land supply is needed from the outset and the Pitt Manor reserve site can meet the immediate shortfall.
	Day	No	If Barton Farm is not approved it will still be essential to safeguard Winchester's landscape setting. It is important to maintain the character of the City and avoid increases in traffic, pollution and strain on services.
	Embrey	No	Winchester's green wedges must be protected and development kept within the settlement boundary. Provide housing in the District to met local needs only and provide small retail units to maintain distinctiveness.
	English	No	In disagreement. Winchester's historic centre should be protected for tourism, and against urban sprawl. Countryside wedges around the city should be protected.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Forbes	No	Object to the reliance on high densities, which will harm the character of the town, and use of car parks and employment sites. The target for Winchester should be reduced by 1325 dwellings, which should be reallocated to surrounding villages. Question why the strategies with/ without Barton Farm are different for non-housing uses - they should be consistent and clarify how developer contributions will be sought.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	No	Small sites do not offer the economies of scale for infrastructure etc. It is better to develop an alternative large site.
	Garfath	No	Most of the measures are ambiguous or based in erroneous assumptions.
	Gillham	No	Question 4b then rests on all the unrealistic assumptions of Questions 1 and 2 and the answer is a firm No. Think again or at least defer thinking about it until post-2008 economic trends are clearer and you will know how wrong you are at the moment.
	Goodwin	No	The approach to development should be based on protecting the landscape setting of Winchester, preserving the historic heritage and protecting green areas. Developments should only be within the settlement boundary, avoid over-development, minimise traffic increases, provide housing for local people and promote small retail units.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The consultation should be kept open for 1 month after the Barton Farm decision.
	Harvey	No	It is not clear how much housing is required in the 'without Barton Farm' scenario. This should be 4000 but the urban capacity figure should be reduced to remove reliance on high densities and use of car parks and employment sites. The urban should be reduced by 1325 dwellings, which should be added to the requirement for Greenfield site allocations (3,325). These should be allocated on a range of large and small sites and the western side of Winchester should be investigated as an alternative location for growth and has the benefits of a good range of nearby facilities.
	Hayter	No	If it is not approved under the current Local Plan it does not follow that the reasons for refusal cannot be rectified or that, in whole, part or even larger, and particularly as an eco-city, it could not form part of a sound LDF. Conversely it is not too likely that the solution in para 5.31 would be seen as a sound LDF.
	Holliday	No	Affordable housing for local people should be the priority and doesn't need massive developments like Braton Farm or other greenfield sites. Need to preserve Winchester's heritage and maintain amenities, retain the character of Winchester, and protect agricultural land and green wedges.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	No	Question the number of houses required and feel there is ample time to consider where housing should be located after the Barton Farm appeal decision. Support the strategy not to spread Winchester's housing needs around the settlements. Request involvement in the decision process and that Village Design statements and Conservation Area appraisals are taken into consideration.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Holmes	No	With dispersed infill it would be harder to achieve a consolidated increase in green infrastructure, but may support this option if it resulted in a net increase in greenspace which was large, open to dogs, and well located and managed.
	Horn & Son	No	If Barton Farm is not permitted the housing numbers for Winchester should be more flexible with phasing or allowance for small sites in the Market Towns and Rural Areas to make up some of the shortfall. Major sites are now more difficult to deliver and there should be a contingency of smaller sites to maintain development.
	Howland	No	Must protect Winchester's landscape setting, preserve green wedges and retain the existing boundary.
	Howland	No	Must retain a strategic gap between Winchester and Headbourne Worthy. Too many houses, too much traffic and pollution, inadequate trains and object to diverting Andover Road.
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	No	Concerned about high density development of car parks and other sites. This would require an affordable bus network, additional open space, new infrastructure, etc. Development at Bushfield would be preferable and provide the necessary infrastructure. Quality of life needs to be considered.
Freelance	Kessler	No	In agreement with car park development. A vision and framework is required to ensure that with smaller developments the area becomes more cohesive. Development should be mixed, develop clear neighbourhoods and work to reduce carbon footprints. Greenfield development should be last resort.
	Leighton Davis	No	In broad agreement, but objects to use of greenfield sites for housing or employment development. On-site health education and community facilities are not essential, but need to be within reach of residents and the Council could forward plan for such facilities with this principle in mind. Employment provisions could be the same as those listed if the Barton Farm development goes ahead. Disagreement that "piecemeal" development will reduce opportunities to be ecologically sound. Open space would be preserved at Barton Farm and could be further ensured if there was no building on greenfield sites. Traffic issues would be much less significant in this scenario. The character of Winchester would not be harmed more by a number of smaller developments.
	O Donoghue	No	Avoid using green belt land or changing the identity of Winchester, which would harm the local economy. Use of car parks or surplus commercial land needs to complement the City's heritage, with strict limits on high density development.
	Porter	No	There is no need to allocate an alternative large greenfield site if Barton Farm is turned down. The setting of Winchester should be protected rather than urbanisation.
	Riddell	No	Not against development but must be a balance to preserve Winchester's heritage by limiting development and maximising space. Keep development within the City boundary, provide for small shops, protect green wedges of countryside.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Sealey	No	Reliance on greenfield sites would recreate planning issues associated with Barton Farm. The use of small sites would be more costly but this may be a price worth paying in terms of preserving the characteristics of Winchester as described in para. 5.3.
	Slattery	No	Cannot afford the losses and costs Barton Farm would bring. Should develop within walking distance of the City centre, at Bar End, Winnall and Andover Road.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	No	To minimize impact on climate change, the Barton Farm site is the best greenfield site in Winchester for housing from a transport perspective and could be exemplary. If planning permission is not granted then the City Council, should review the reasons why and develop an alternative form of housing development on the site to respond to those reasons.
Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	No	The option of spreading Winchesters needs around the villages has been dismissed, overlooking the possibility of increasing employment and services in the towns and villages to improve their sustainability. The development strategy does not allow sufficient development in the towns and villages and may harm the historic character of Winchester. Dispersal should be promoted whether or not Barton Farm is allowed.
Bewley Homes		No	If Barton Farm is dismissed other sustainable settlements should make up the shortfall, in accordance with the overall development strategy. The current strategy risks Winchester becoming overheated with high density development and inadequate services and facilities.
City of Winchester Trust		No	Opportunities within the boundary should be taken and densities maximised so far as possible without town cramming. The merits of looking for another large greenfield site will need to be carefully weighed and smaller greenfield sites also assessed. Do not support release of a large greenfield site for employment or removal of employment from the town centre. The Winchester Access Plan's actions should be implemented whatever the outcome of Barton Farm, with measures to reduce traffic impact and speeds and a long-term aim of a traffic-free area within the historic walls. It is important that Winchester's character is enhanced, including the setting of the town, retention of green spaces and high quality infrastructure.
Southcott Homes		No	If Barton Farm is dismissed other sustainable settlements should make up the shortfall, in accordance with the overall development strategy. The current strategy risks Winchester becoming overheated with high density development and inadequate services and facilities.
Bargate Homes			Even if Barton Farm is allowed, the over-estimate of urban capacity means that other small and large greenfield sites will be needed beyond the settlement boundary. The balance between Winchester and the market towns should be reconsidered and the figure for the Market Towns and Rural Areas increased.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			There are alternatives within Winchester including reuse of vacant buildings and rundown areas, which would enable development to be kept within the settlement boundary. Winchester's heritage and landscape are central to its economy and should be protected.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
WCBP Ltd and The Church Commissioners			Agree that a site beyond the settlement boundary is needed for employment and open space, whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal. This could be achieved by a knowledge park and Bushfield Camp offers an opportunity for a strategic employment development and open space for the City.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		The County Council's 'Hampshire Workstyle' initiative will reduce office accommodation and some buildings may be appropriate for other uses. Therefore support the presumption in favour of residential reuse and the Hampshire Workstyle initiative should be recognised as an alternative strategy for Winchester.
	Baxter		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
	Caspari		Concerned about a presumption in favour of using all available sites for housing if Barton Farm is dismissed. This could prevent other development needs being met and there would be a need to assess development locations and promote mixed uses where appropriate.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Alternative sites need to be indicated to provide opportunities for discussion at an early stage.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		If Barton Farm is refused, operational Royal Mail sites should not be identified as alternative development locations and sites surrounding them need to be sensitive to operational needs.
Itchen Valley Parish Council	Darley		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
Kingsworthy Parish Council	Fairbrother		If car parks in Winchester are developed where will Kings Worthy residents park when visiting in the evening?
Chilcomb Parish Meeting	Fordyce		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
	Garfath		This does not constitute housing strategy. Need to use brownfield sites, reclaimed commercial sites, smaller developments and some car parks.
	Gottlieb		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
	Hare		possibility of
Northington Parish Council	Hatchley		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		High density housing would be regrettable but if it is the only alternative proper provision should be made for open spaces.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Winchester Action On Climate Change	Hutchison		Welcome mention of measure such as priority for pedestrians and cyclists, improved public transport and introduction of 20mph limits. Stress the importance of increasing housing density to limit sprawl into surrounding areas, with at least 60 dwellings per hectare recommended for all new developments. Support development of housing and business on surplus car parks near the station. Car clubs should be required as a planning condition.
	Jezeff		If Barton Farm is dismissed there will need to be a major review of the strategy, looking at all the alternative greenfield sites around the town.
Itchen Stoke and Ovington Parish Council	Kavanagh		Concerned about the availability of car parking being reduced. Park and ride is not suitable for the villages as journeys are often short and unplanned. Reducing parking may lead villagers to shop elsewhere.
	Long		The housing element needs to be more specific and should promote smaller greenfield sites. The presumption in favour of housing development and high densities will lead to town-cramming and loss of commercial land. Businesses are not likely to want a greenfield knowledge park site. There is too much expected from developer contributions.
	Marriott		The character and facilities of Winchester should not be harmed by excessive development. Retail development should concentrate on specialist 'high end' shops. Do not agree that all housing should be high density.
	McManus		Winchester should be retained as a walkable City with higher density development within its existing boundary. The CWT/WinAcc ideas are compelling and widely supported.
Highways Agency	Mendoza		If Barton Farm does not go ahead and other developments are proposed the impacts on M3 junctions 9, 10 and 11 will need to be considered. The Highways Agency would find it unacceptable for developments (individually or combined) to create further congestion at these junctions and mitigation measures and funding would need to be identified. 4000 additional dwellings will undoubtedly place transport challenges on the strategic road network and measures will be needed to avoid additional stress on the network.
	Nicholson		Should do most of these things before building anything, but need to keep some surface car parks. Conserve Winchester's history.
	Nobles		If Barton Farm is not allowed a similar site would need to be found in Winchester.
	Paskins		If Barton Farm is saved this level of development cannot be accommodated without enormous loss of amenity.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.
	Retter		The settlement boundary should be retained and a series of infill sites should be developed. It is misleading to say these do not benefit from economies of scale.

Appendix 4b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Save Barton Farm Group	Slattery		Agree with many of the opportunities in the settlement boundary but not with a greenfield site for knowledge industries. The CWT/WinAcc ideas are compelling and widely supported. There should be development at higher densities and within the City boundary in small developments, not large greenfield suburbs.
	Slattery		The Localism Bill imposes a duty to work with the community. Whatever the Barton Farm appeal decision, it should not be built. The CWT 10 Principles should be followed and the Town Vision refreshed. The City has a finite size and excessive development must be resisted.
	Smith		No comment.
Southern Water	Solbra		If Barrton Farm is dismissed the LDF should allocate sites for development to inform Southern Water's development programme. Strategic infratstructure can be provided by S Water so long as there is planning certainty but local enhancements to serve development should be developer funded. Look to the planning authority to help ensure developers connect to the nearset point of adequate capacity.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Barton Farm is the only solution and alternatives for the site would need to be developed.
	Welch		The housing element needs to be more specific and should promote smaller greefield sites. The presumption in favour of housing development and high densities will lead to town-cramming and loss of commercial land. Businesses are not likely to want a greenfield knowledge park site. There is too much expected from developer contributions.
	Welch Family		The housing element needs to be more specific and should promote smaller greefield sites. The presumption in favour of housing development and high densities will lead to town-cramming and loss of commercial land. Businesses are not likely to want a greenfield knowledge park site. There is too much expected from developer contributions.
	White		The priority should be to protect Winchester's heritage, character anmd landscape setting so Barton Farm should be resisted. The housing figure should be reduced to match Winchester's capacity without destroying its character.
City of Winchester Trust			Welcome mention of measure such as priority for pedestrians and cyclists, improved public transport and introduction of 20mph limits. Stress the importance of increasing housing density to limit sprawl into surrounding areas, with at least 60 dwellings per hectare recommended for all new developments. Support development of housing and business on surplus car parks near the station. Car clubs should be required as a planning condition.
Orchard Homes			Even if Barton Farm is allowed, the over-estimate of urban capacity means that other small and large greenfield sites will be needed beyond the settlement boundary. The balance between Winchester and the market towns should be reconsidered and the figure for the Market Towns and Rural Areas increased.