

## **CABINET – SPECIAL MEETING**

**22 September 2014**

### Attendance:

Councillor Humby -	<i>Leader (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance &amp; Organisational Development (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Business Services (P)</i>
Councillor Southgate -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Communities &amp; Transport (P)</i>
Councillor Tait -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing Service (P)</i>
Councillor Warwick -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health &amp; Wellbeing (P)</i>

### Other invited Councillors:

J Berry  
Evans (P)  
Hutchison (P)  
Ruffell (P)

### Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Hiscock, Huxstep, Jeffs and Pines

### Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Dibden, Green, Izard, Read and Scott

Mr D Chafe – TACT

---

#### 1. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Humby declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Councillor. Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

#### 2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Evans, Hutchison and Ruffell who had been invited as standing invitees to meetings of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee. In addition, as Councillor J Berry (standing invitee

from the Labour Group) was unable to attend, the Chairman welcomed Councillor Pines to make contributions in her place.

The Chairman also welcomed approximately forty members of the public, parish councils, local interest groups and developers. He explained that comments would be taken at the relevant section of CAB2615 or Chapter of Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2).

### 3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Twelve members of the public addressed the meeting and their comments are summarised under the minute in relation to CAB2615 below (minuted at the time of discussion on the particular section of the Report or LPP2).

### 4. **DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – PUBLICATION AND CONSULTATION**

(Report CAB2615 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Draft Policies Maps (appended to LPP2) had not been made available for publication within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration, to allow Cabinet to consider and comment on the content before consideration at a Special Council meeting on 2 October 2014.

Councillor Weston introduced the Report and emphasised that over the previous 20 months, the Council had been working with Parish Councils, communities and other organisations to determine the specific development needs of the larger settlements, as established by the relevant policies of Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1). This work had included a series of workshops and consultation events across the District, including Winchester Town. Councillor Weston continued that the Report now sought agreement for the publication for a further period of formal consultation on LPP2 from 24 October to 5 December 2014. It was intended that the Pre-submission version of the Plan would be published in June 2015 with independent examination starting on submission of the Plan in November 2015 and formal adoption in July 2016.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that Officers had worked to take on board comments received in consulting with local communities on proposals for the draft LPP2. However, inevitably it was not possible to achieve consensus in all situations, partly due to the sometimes competing interests involved. The next stage was the formal consultation on the draft LPP2 proposals.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that Denmead was producing its own Neighbourhood Plan and it was hoped to start consultation on this the following week (from 29 September).

Cabinet noted that the Report also sought approval of two key documents: the draft High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document and the updated Open Space Strategy.

### General & Chapter 1

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that one of the purposes of LPP2 was to accommodate the housing number requirements which had been determined in LPP1 and could not be changed at LPP2 stage.

During public participation, Mr J Beveridge (Winchester 2020 Group) welcomed the consultation that had been carried out to date. However, he stated that sometimes the information available on the Council's website differed to that made available at consultation meetings which caused confusion. The City of Winchester Trust and WinACC had arranged a consultation meeting on 11 November 2014 to which the Head of Strategic Planning had been invited. He queried whether consultation on the Tibbalds Station Approach report would occur concurrently. In general, Mr Beveridge requested that dates of consultation events be published as soon as available and that comments received during consultation were made publically available.

Councillor Weston clarified that the Tibbalds Station Approach Report was an evidence document and not a consultation document as such. However, their recommendations could be commented upon as part of the proposed consultation on LPP2. The Head of Strategic Planning noted the other comments made and confirmed that a separate public consultation event would be held in Winchester Town, in addition to the one referred to by Mr Beveridge.

Councillor Hutchison emphasised the importance of the Sustainability Appraisal referred to in Paragraph 1.10 of LPP2 and requested that this be subject of separate discussion at Cabinet and Council and suggested that WinACC would want to examine it. He expressed concern that the Sustainability Appraisal was not rigorous enough.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that there would be opportunity to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal and emphasised that its purpose was a specific appraisal of emerging policies of LPP2 and not a general appraisal of sustainability issues in the District.

### Chapter 2 – Meeting Development Needs

In response to questions regarding the housing number requirements in the larger villages in the Southern Parishes, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the numbers were as set out in LPP1 and had not changed. With regard to the level of affordable housing expected, he explained that the Council's policy was to require 40%, but it recognised that this would be subject to viability on an individual scheme basis.

One Member queried how the numbers of windfall developments in the wider rural area would be taken into account as these could have a significant effect on the numbers of new houses provided. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that such windfall numbers might result in the Market Towns and Rural Area exceeding the number of houses required, but advised that in effect, windfall housing numbers of this type would provide a flexibility allowance, which was something that the Local Plan Inspector may expect.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Council's evidence to the LPP1 Examination included an estimation of affordable housing provision and this would have recognised that it would not be possible for every site to provide 40% affordable housing in practice. The Inspector had found that the Plan made appropriate provision for affordable housing but increased the overall housing numbers required in order to meet the affordable housing requirements more quickly.

During public participation, Mr P Bulkeley emphasised the importance of proper consideration of site allocation. He believed the SHLAA was unachievable and the windfall figures quoted were not realistic as Winchester Town became increasingly developed. He considered that on occasions, a well-placed site allocation outside the development boundary would be a preferable option and suggested that the edges of Winnall offered such opportunities.

### Chapter 3 – Winchester Town

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock highlighted the significance of the proposals regarding the Cattle Market car park and agreed with suggestions that its future use should be predominantly for employment. However, the Tibbalds report did not address a number of important issues such as the interface between any new development and existing nearby residents. He expressed concern that even if there was no net loss of parking, increased use of parking spaces for employers could reduce those available for nearby residents. In addition, he was concerned about the idea of a gateway and how this would relate across Andover Road and/or Worthy Lane. Finally, he highlighted that the building currently situated on the Cattle Market was used as a workspace already.

Four members of the public spoke regarding this Chapter and their comments are summarised below. It was also noted that written representations had been received from Mr and Mrs Harbourne and circulated to relevant officers and Cabinet Members prior to the meeting.

Dr N Dennis, Mrs C Dennis and Ms I Dawson all spoke as residents of Worthy Lane. In summary they raised the following concerns:

- Had agreements been reached already with existing tenants regarding future development of the car park?
- Whether there was a requirement for additional office space within Winchester when there were vacant offices in other parts of the town?

- The Tibbalds report treated Station Approach and the Cattle Market as two distinct areas and it would be better to postpone development of the latter due to the other large developments in progress within the town.
- Concern regarding the scale and height of any buildings facing Worthy Lane.
- A belief that the Tibbalds report promoted employment requirements above those of pedestrians and cyclists.
- A belief that attention had focussed on Andover Road to the detriment of Worthy Lane.
- Concern that local residents should be regarded as stakeholders and should have been consulted by Tibbalds.
- Concern regarding loss of parking spaces as there were 60 households with no on-street parking available.

The Chairman thanked residents for their comments but clarified that the Tibbalds report on the Station Approach area was background evidence commissioned by the Council and therefore it was not appropriate for it to be consulted upon during its preparation. However, consultation on LPP2 would include these proposals and would include a public consultation event for Winchester Town.

Mr A Welch (a resident of Weeke who owned land along Harestock Road) expressed concern about omissions in the Open Space Strategy in relation to provision in St Barnabas and Harestock. He believed that the SHLAA sites within the Town were overstated and windfall numbers were being overestimated. Consequently, the number of houses estimated would not in fact be provided. Greenfield sites such as his should be allocated to enable provision of affordable housing and open space.

The Head of Strategic Planning circulated information regarding Winchester Town Housing Supply (as attached as an appendix to the minutes) which provided an update in relation to larger planning permissions granted and other sources of housing supply. He emphasised that this did not seek to cover every potential site, but even focusing only on larger sites suggested there was a high degree of certainty over delivery of housing numbers. In discussion, it was noted that the Police Headquarters site was expected to provide 40% affordable housing. The figures in relation to SHLAA and windfall housing were regularly updated and were considered to be sound. Overall, even focussing mainly on larger sites, the Head of Strategic Planning considered there was a high prospect of substantially more than the required 4,000 dwellings being developed during the Plan period, which gave considerable flexibility to deal with any shortfall in provision from particular sources of supply.

With regard to comments made in relation to the Cattle Market, the Corporate Director emphasised that LPP2 contained a policy regarding land use and no planning application (or planning brief) had yet been made. Any office development would require pre-letting to proceed, but this had not yet taken place as the Council was not yet at that stage. Comments regarding height, volume and massing of any development would all be matters for any future

detailed planning consideration and not a policy consideration. At this stage, the question was whether the principles of this type of development in this area were acceptable.

Some Members expressed concern that the affordable housing requirement of 40% would not be met for town developments and that this should be considered carefully during the consultation period.

In response to queries, the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) agreed to re-consider the wording of Policies Win6 and Win7 to make it clear that the policy would be to maintain broadly the same amount of car parking provision across the northern and station quarters of the City, as set out in the District Car Parking Strategy.

The Corporate Director clarified that the Policy Win7 did not rule out the possible development of a hotel on the Cattle Market site. In addition, the wording of Policy Win8 was sufficiently flexible to acknowledge the requirement to ensure permeability of Stanmore.

Councillor Hutchison expressed concern about the deliverability of affordable housing and the lack of public consultation to date regarding proposals for the Station Approach and Cattle Market sites. He emphasised that within St Paul's Ward there was strong public opinion in favour of retention of the Registry Office building. He requested that Policy Win5 be amended to recognise the importance of "buildings of character" in addition to important trees, etc.

The Chairman and Councillor Weston did not agree that there had been insufficient public consultation to date and emphasised that the next stage involved further formal consultation on the proposals within LPP2. The Chairman suggested this could include a meeting with key Members. The Chief Executive confirmed that the Council had not yet taken any decisions regarding the future use of the Cattle Market or Carfax sites. Before this was to happen, a proper process would be gone through, including further public consultation.

Whilst supporting Policy Win10, Councillor Evans queried why it would only be restricted to Stanmore as she believed issues with houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) occurred in other parts of the town. The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that Win10 applied to all of Winchester Town, but at this stage it was only proposed to make the necessary Article 4 Direction in relation to Stanmore. Any extension of this would be a matter for Cabinet, having regard to evidence of any problems being caused at the time.

The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the proposed Policies would not prevent the option of a new leisure centre being provided on a different site, if this was the favoured Council option.

Councillor Pines queried whether Queen Elizabeth Court should be included in the list of Winchester Key Historic Features and whether the whole High Street

and St Giles Hill should be included. It was noted the list was contained within Policy Win3 which specifically related to views and roofscape.

#### Chapter 4 – Market Towns and Rural Areas

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Huxstep highlighted that the Report CAB2615 incorrectly referred to 3 housing sites in Waltham Chase, when in fact there were 4 (or 5 if the mixed site was included). The Head of Strategic Planning noted this correction.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the reference to the Jefferies Yard site as a potential Travellers' Site was made in the context of the earlier consultation and that this was no longer a proposal in the Plan. The City Council had commissioned consultants to examine all potential travellers' sites and it was hoped that their report would be ready for publication and consultation alongside LPP2.

During public participation, Mr N Lander-Brinkley (Denmead Parish Council), Mr R Shields, Mrs M Hills, Mr N Holmes and Mr R Fowler spoke and their comments are summarised below.

Mr N Lander-Brinkley (Denmead Parish Council) updated Members on the progress and next steps involved in production of the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan. He highlighted that only a few other parishes across the county had undertaken to produce a Plan. A referendum on the Plan would be held in Denmead in February/March 2015. He offered to answer any questions Members might have on the process.

Mr R Shields (Bishops Waltham Parish Council) thanked the Head of Strategic Planning and Team for their assistance with the consultation that had been carried out to date which had resulted in the proposals being agreed by the Bishops Waltham Development Plan Steering Group (of which he was a member).

Mrs M Hills (Colden Common Parish Council) also thanked the Head of Strategic Planning and Team for their work with the village during the previous consultation which had also resulted in a proposal which was accepted by the Parish Council.

Councillor Weston thanked both Colden Common and Bishops Waltham Parish Councils for their consultation work and cooperation with the City Council.

Mr N Holmes (speaking on behalf of Drew Smith) spoke in opposition to exclusion of the "Top Field" site in relation to Kings Worthy and expressed concern about the selection process as the shortlisting of sites had occurred before the landscape sensitivity appraisal. In addition, selection had not taken proper consideration of the Local Plan Part 1 policy on gaps, and in relation to the South Downs National Park. It had also not properly addressed the shortfall of affordable housing (Drew Smith had offered to provide more than

40% affordable housing on their site). Consultation had been undertaken on a development of 25 dwellings and consequentially there was no mandate for a development of 50 dwellings.

In response to Mr Holmes, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the landscape appraisal had been carried out before, and was discussed at, the site selection workshop and the Council's Landscape Officer did not believe any further assessment was required before a decision was reached. All sites being proposed for development were expected to provide 40% affordable housing and the Council could not insist on more than this. The LPP1 Inspector had advised that the Council must review settlement and gap boundaries in LPP2 as necessary to meet development needs and this had been undertaken in a number of areas, including Kings Worthy. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that he considered the selection of sites had been undertaken fairly following a careful process to ensure all sites were put forward on the same basis.

Mr R Fowler (Sun Hill Action Group but also representing some Titchfield Down and Nursery Road residents) spoke in opposition to the proposed site in Alresford. Although the proposals were favoured by New Alresford Town Council, he believed the majority of local residents did not support it. He believed that there was an alternative and better location for development which could be outlined at a later date. The main issue related to traffic access but he also believed the proposed residential home proposed for The Dean site was better located outside of the town.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Jeffs also believed that the proposal for New Alresford was not supported by the wider community. Local residents did not consider they had been adequately consulted by New Alresford Town Council nor had their views been taken into account. A group had been established to put forward alternative proposals but this might not be in a position to report until mid-January 2015, after the end of the LPP2 consultation.

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that the New Alresford site was controversial, but highlighted the amount of consultation which had taken place, including four public meetings. At the last of these, the timetable for LPP2 had been advised so the group examining alternatives would have been aware of the proposed deadlines for comments. He considered that all sites had been properly and objectively assessed, with no pre-selection of the Sun Hill site, and that the conclusion reached was supported by the Town Council.

Councillor Evans reiterated her belief that the allocation of 250 homes in Wickham was too many and LPP1 should have set the level at a maximum of 100. She believed there was local opposition against the southern site and this would come out in the consultation process. She requested that the Council continue to be very firm on insisting on 40% affordable housing provision as she believed this was the only way Wickham residents could accept the proposals. In addition, she requested that the new development be phased and that concerns over access and traffic be addressed.



The Head of Strategic Planning noted these comments and emphasised that the Council would continue to take a firm stance on its 40% affordable housing requirement. The Council were not able to dictate the precise timing of the development but the relevant policies do require production of a phasing plan.

In response to comments regarding the impact of proposed developments within other local authorities near the boundaries of the Winchester District, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that there was a duty to cooperate and discuss with neighbouring local authorities. However, inevitably there was not always agreement, for example regarding proposals for the Botley Bypass.

#### Chapter 5 – South Hampshire Urban Areas

In response to questions, the Corporate Director advised that the Council would continue to push for 40% affordable housing provision at the North of Whiteley MDA. However, as with all decisions, it would be subject to viability issues.

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that if the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) altered its requirements, this could impact on the Council's requirements and the Plan referred to the need to monitor progress of the PUSH Strategy Update.

#### Chapter 6 – Development Management

The Head of Strategic Planning drew Cabinet's attention to the proposed policies in this Chapter, including new Policy DM2 on Dwelling Sizes which sought to control the trend towards the provision of overly large two or three bedroomed dwellings.

One Cabinet Member commented that the proposal to compile a list of buildings of significance would not be particularly helpful as it would inevitably involve subjective judgments and might lead to the public perception that such buildings would be protected.

#### Appendix 2 – Recommended Draft High Quality Places

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that if adopted, the guidance would be a Supplementary Planning Document and so would form a non-statutory level of planning policy. The Corporate Director explained that its purpose included giving a clear direction to future developers about the standards expected by the Council and gave more power to the Planning Committee to insist on a certain quality of materials and/or design.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that the possibility of including landscape and trees had been considered with the Landscape and Historic Environment Teams. However, it had been decided to restrict the guidance to urban design at this stage and further guidance documents could be developed and adopted in the future if needed.

Councillor Pines queried whether there had been adequate provision regarding the future maintenance of trees and whether 'animal highways' should be mentioned.

The Chairman noted these comments for possible future consideration following the proposed consultation.

During public participation, Mr P Bulkeley spoke as a local designer and architect and welcomed the document's support of the work of local architects. In general, he asked that the Council give more consideration to the procurement of local architects in relation to its own development sites.

Mr S Welch believed that LPP2 was not sound and the open space provision was inadequate, particularly in St Barnabas Ward. He considered that public consultation had not been adequate. He suggested that a full boundary review was required in Winchester Town, as had been undertaken in other areas such as Kings Worthy and Alresford.

### Appendix 3 – Recommended Open Space Strategy

The Head of Landscape and Open Spaces advised that the types of open space covered by the Strategy had been extended (full list set out in Paragraph 4.13 of CAB2615) and explained that each category had an equal weighting.

Councillor Pines queried whether the Strategy should include consideration of adequate provision for the future management of open space sites. This suggestion was noted for possible future consideration following consultation.

Cabinet noted the comments made by Mr S and A Welch during public participation regarding open space provision. The Head of Landscape and Open Spaces advised that it was not always practically possible to ensure every Town Ward had sufficient amounts of open space and the focus would therefore be on improving the quality of provision. He also highlighted the current move away from equipped children's play areas to provision of more natural landscapes.

In response to comments, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that the open space standards were set primarily in relation to new developments and could appear to be overly high if applied to existing developments. This was especially the case given the increase in the standard that had been introduced through Local Plan Part 1 policy CP7.

Cabinet requested that an introductory paragraph be added to the Strategy explaining these changes in categories and standards.

Following consideration of Report CAB2615 and the three appendices, Cabinet agreed to the recommendations as set out in the Report, subject to the following changes:

- a) Clarification of wording in Win 6 and Win 7 to avoid duplication of the requirement for no overall loss of car parking provision;
- b) Additional paragraph in the Open Space Strategy to explain the impact of the recent changes in categories and requirements;
- c) Checking of key historic features listed;
- d) Addition of delegated authority being granted to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment, to make minor alterations to the High Quality Places document prior to its publication.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT THE PUBLICATION FOR CONSULTATION OF THE DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS (ATTACHED AT APPENDIX 1) BE AUTHORISED.**

**2. THAT AUTHORITY BE DELEGATED TO THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT, TO MAKE ANY MINOR EDITING CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PRIOR TO PUBLICATION.**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment, to make arrangements to publish the Plan and organise consultation on it, including associated events and publicity, as referred to in this report and required by the relevant Development Plan Regulations.

2. That the Draft High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (attached at Appendix 2) be agreed and published for public consultation alongside the Local Plan, subject to any minor amendments to be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment.

3. That the Open Space Strategy (attached at Appendix 3) be agreed and that delegated authority be given to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment, to edit and complete the document and publish it as a background document to the Local Plan.

4. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment, to complete Appendix E of the draft Local Plan and the background documents referred to in section 4 of this report, and to publish these alongside the draft Local Plan.

5. That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director (Environment) to progress an 'Article 4 Direction' to remove permitted development rights that allow a change of use from a dwelling house to a house in multiple occupation for up to six residents in the Stanmore area, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment and Ward Members regarding the details and boundaries.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 2.40pm (with a break between 12.25pm and 12.45pm)

Chairman

**Winchester Town Housing Supply**

<b>Permissions at 31.3.13</b>	<b>3130</b>	<b>Status</b>
Barton Farm	2000	Commencing 2014
Broadway / Friarsgate (Silver Hill)	307	Revised appl (-127)
Police Headquarters	294	Revised appl (-100?)
Pitt Manor	200	Under construction
Francis Gardens	81	Largely complete
Various smaller sites including Peugeot Garage, Chilbolton Ave, Staple Gardens, Queens Road, Laundry site, etc		Many under construction/complete

**Conclusion:** 2882 are on the large sites above, of which approx. 227 may be lost due to revised planning applications. Many smaller (but significant) sites are now complete, under construction or about to start. **High degree of certainty over delivery of at least 2900.**

<b>Significant Permissions since 1.4.13</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Red Cross House, Winnall	20	Permitted development
Sparkford Road	18	
Former Fire Station	16	
Aquitane House, St Clement Street	12	Permitted development
Beaconsfield House, Andover Road	11	
Park House, Park Road	10	
Wolverston, Bereweeke	-37	Net loss of 37 units

**Conclusion:** There is a net gain of 50 dwellings on large sites, and other sites will be included when figures are updated. **High degree of certainty over delivery of at least 50.**

<b>SHLAA Sites within settlement boundary</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>SHLAA Timing</b>
2009 - Conservation Club	54	2018-23
2590 - Chesil Surface car park	50	2013-18
2450 - Carfax, Sussex Street	40	2013-18
2589 - Wilberforce Drive, Stanmore	35	2013-18 & 2018-23
2588 - Cattlemarket site	34	2013-18
1829 - Royal Hants County Hospital (Main building)	34	2018-23
1827 - Royal Hants County Hospital (Outpatients site)	24	2018-23
2556 - Victoria House, Victoria Road	25	2013-18
2586 - New Queens Head, Stanmore	20	2013-18
1801 - 15 Chilbolton Avenue	18	2018-23

**Conclusion:** 334 are on large sites (15 or more) as listed above. Several of these are City Council sites which are being actively brought forward. Even if there is some slippage in the estimated timing, all are likely to be developed within the Plan period (to 2031). **High degree of certainty over delivery of at least 334.**

<b>Planning Frameworks / Assessments</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Stanmore - up to 150 dwellings in long term	95	Excludes 55 SHLAA
Abbots Barton - approx. 37	32	Excludes 5 SHLAA
Station Approach – approx. 150	22	Excludes 128 SHLAA

**Conclusion:** There is potential for approx.149 dwellings in these areas, over and above land already in the SHLAA. Most sites are Council-owned, with some of the Stanmore areas being longer-term possibilities (hence lower Local Plan assumption of 135). **High degree of certainty over delivery of at least 135.**

<b>Windfall Allowance</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Annual provision assumed 2017 - 2031	65	All from existing housing/commercial
Annual average over Plan period 2011 - 2031	46	
Annual provision achieved 2007-2012	118	Mainly during recession
Allowance made for development of gardens, open space and changes of use	0	These sources will contribute

**Conclusion:** The windfall allowance is based on a study of past sources of development and the likely future availability of sites (*Assessment of Windfall Trends & Potential in Winchester*). It makes no allowance for the development of back gardens, open spaces or changes of use, and assumes a much lower rate than achieved in recent (recessionary) years. The projection starts from 2017 to avoid any double-counting with existing consents. **High prospect of delivery of at least 910.**

<b>Total of all sources</b>	<b>Plan (4000 req)</b>	<b>High Prospect</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Completions 2011-13	105	105	Increasing since 2013
Permissions at 31.3.13	3130	2900	Some completed or u/c
Permissions since 1.4.13	48	50	Continuing to increase
SHLAA sites	420	334	Will be reviewed/updated
Planning Frameworks	135	135	Cautious estimate
Windfall allowance	910	910	Cautious allowance
<b>Total</b>	<b>4748</b>	<b>4434</b>	<b>Well over 4000 with high delivery prospect</b>