

CABINET

13 MARCH 2013

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JOINT CORE STRATEGY:
INSPECTOR'S REPORT AND ADOPTION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Steve Opacic Tel No: 01962 848101 sopacic@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

[Minutes of Council Meeting held 8 December 2011](#)

CL73 – Extract from Minutes from Cabinet 7 December 2011 re CAB2258(LDF) – 8 December 2011

[CAB 2258\(LDF\)](#) – Publication of Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy – 28 November 2011

[CAB 2243\(LDF\)](#) – Consideration of Responses to Plans for Places Relating to Winchester Town – 10 November 2011

[CAB 2231\(LDF\)](#) – Consideration of Responses to Plans for Places After Blueprint – 28 September 2011

[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:

The Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (now known as Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy) has been produced over several years and this process has included the production of various evidence studies and completion of several public engagement exercises. These included various non-statutory ‘frontloading’, consultation and sustainability appraisal processes.

The Local Plan Part 1 will replace various policies from the 2006 Winchester District Local Plan Review, with effect from the date of adoption – the remaining policies in the 2006 Local Plan will be reviewed and updated as necessary as part of the process of developing Local Plan Part 2. Local Plan Part 1 will, therefore, become part of the statutory Development Plan from the date of adoption by full Council, subject to any subsequent legal challenge. However, the fact that its policies have already been given endorsement by the Inspector makes them a material consideration with substantial weight with immediate effect and this will need to be taken into account in any planning decisions, alongside other material considerations and the saved policies of the 2006 Local Plan. Planning Development Control Committee will be advised of the relative weight that should be attached to the various policies as necessary.

The Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy was approved by Cabinet and full Council for publication in December 2011 and was published in January 2012. Following a slight delay while the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework were considered and taken into account, the Plan was submitted for examination in June 2012.

The independent Inspector appointed to examine the soundness of the Plan held a series of hearings during October and November 2012 and has now submitted his report to the Council. The Inspector’s Report (see Appendix A) concludes that the Plan’s overall development strategy is sound but that various detailed modifications are needed to make the Plan as a whole sound. The Inspector feels able to recommend such changes, most of which were modifications agreed and consulted on by the Council, without significantly changing the Plan’s strategy or requiring further sustainability appraisal or strategic environmental assessment.

The key changes recommended by the Inspector relate to the level of housing provision and the proposal for Bushfield Camp, Winchester. He recommends increasing the level of housing provision to 12,500 dwellings over the Plan period and also that Bushfield Camp be made an employment allocation. Most other recommendations accept the Council’s Further Modifications and support the Plan’s

policies. In particular, all of the 'topic' policies are found to be sound, including those on affordable housing, sustainable construction, gaps, etc.

This report summarises the Inspector's recommended 'Main Modifications' and recommends that these all be accepted, which would enable the Local Plan to be adopted. There is no need for further consultation following the Inspector's Report as the Council's Further Modifications have already been consulted on and any other recommendations are binding, assuming the Council wants to proceed to adopt the Plan, as they relate to matters of soundness.

Adoption of the Plan (with these modifications) would achieve an up to date Local Plan Part 1, which is both sound and National Planning Policy Framework-compliant, within the 1 year 'transition period' allowed by the NPPF. Adoption of the Plan at the earliest opportunity is important, given the need to put in place up to date statutory planning policies, the emphasis on this by Government, and the time and expense that has been expended on progressing the Plan to this stage.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

- 1 That the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy, as submitted to the Secretary of State in June 2012 and modified in accordance with the Inspector's recommended Main Modifications and the Council's Further Modifications published (see modified policies set out at Appendix C), be adopted and that formal notices be published to complete the process of statutory adoption.
- 2 That those policies of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 which are superseded by Local Plan Part 1 or no longer necessary, as listed at Appendix B of the report, be no longer 'saved' and that the earlier 'Interim Policy Aspirations' (agreed in January 2011) be withdrawn.
- 3 That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Economic Development, to make minor amendments in order to incorporate the various Modifications and consequential changes to the text, and to correct errors and format text, without altering the policy intentions of the Plan.

RECOMMENDED (TO CABINET):

- 4 That the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) be revoked, as these supplement policies of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 which it is proposed be no longer saved:
 - Implementation of Infilling Policy (H4) SPD;
 - Implementation of Local (Housing) Reserve Sites Policy SPD
- 5 That the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) be revised and updated in order to supplement relevant Local Plan Part 1 policies and a report on the proposed revisions be brought to the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee.

CABINET

13 MARCH 2013

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JOINT CORE STRATEGY: INSPECTOR'S REPORT AND ADOPTION

DETAIL:

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Council has been developing its Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (originally titled the Winchester District Development Framework Core Strategy) for several years, during which time there have been numerous evidence studies and public engagement exercises. Preparation commenced in 2006 with initial work on the Core Strategy and during early 2007 the 'Live for the Future' campaign was launched. The outcomes fed into the 'Issues and Options' version of the Plan in early 2008 and the Core Strategy 'Preferred Option' was published in 2009. The Council considered the responses and agreed a way forward and an advisory visit by the Planning Inspectorate was held in summer of 2009.
- 1.2 The new Coalition Government announced its 'localism' agenda in 2010 and this was followed by a number of statements in relation to the status of Regional Strategies and proposed changes to the spatial planning system. In response, the Council developed and launched its 'Blueprint' consultation to engage local communities in a proactive debate as to the amount of growth and change that should be planned for. 'Plans for Places ...after Blueprint' was published for consultation during 2011 and incorporated the views and aspirations revealed during Blueprint, together with updated technical evidence, including locally-derived housing and population projections.
- 1.3 Comments on Plans for Places were taken into account in developing the Pre-submission version of the Core Strategy, which was approved and subsequently published for formal consultation on its 'soundness' in January 2012. This was the start of the statutory process leading to submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State in June 2012 and subsequent examination by a Government Inspector.
- 1.4 Prior to submission of the Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and the opportunity was taken to receive an advisory visit from the Planning Inspectorate. Various modifications were made prior to submission to take account of comments and advice received, so improving the Plan's compliance with the NPPF. These modifications were listed in a document entitled "Schedule of Proposed Modifications June 2012" which was formally submitted to the Secretary of State in June 2012 together with the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy, which had been published for consultation as to its soundness in January 2012.
- 1.5 The South Downs National Park Authority is now the planning authority for that part of the District within the South Downs National Park. The Authority is developing its own Local Plan but, in order to get an up to date Plan in place

as soon as possible, it has jointly approved the Local Plan Part 1 to allow the Plan to apply to that part of the District within the Park, until such time as their own Local Plan is produced. Therefore, the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 is a 'Joint Core Strategy' produced with the Park Authority. The Park Authority is currently undertaking a comparable exercise to that being undertaken by the City Council, to formally adopt the Plan for the National Park area.

2. Examination of the Plan and Inspector's Report

- 2.1 An independent Government Inspector, Nigel Payne, was appointed to examine the 'soundness' of the Plan following its submission to the Secretary of State. The examination process started on appointment of the Inspector and a Pre-Hearing Meeting was held in September 2012, followed by a series of hearings from 30 October to 8 November 2012. Prior to the start of these hearings, a Schedule of Proposed Modifications was published on 28 September 2012. These modifications, together with the submitted form of the Plan, were then examined at the hearings.
- 2.2 During the hearings, officers agreed that the Inspector should be able to make binding recommendations where they involved the soundness of the Plan, as this would enable the Inspector to correct any 'soundness' matters (the alternative would be for him to find it 'not sound' and the process would have to have re-started).
- 2.3 At the close of the hearing sessions, the Council produced a series of 'Further Modifications' (Schedule of Further Modifications – 12 November 2012), including all the changes proposed to the submitted Plan as a result of points raised during the examination process, in accordance with the authority delegated to officers and the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Economic Development. The Further Modifications were subject to a 6-week consultation period, with comments sent to the Inspector. The Inspector considered these, along with all the matters raised in evidence, representations made on the Plan and matters discussed at the hearings, and he has now submitted his report to the Council.
- 2.4 The Inspector concludes that the Plan's overall development strategy is sound, but that various detailed modifications are needed before the Plan as a whole can be considered sound, and adopted. The Inspector feels able to recommend such changes, most of which were modifications agreed and consulted on by the Council, without significantly changing the Plan's strategy or requiring further sustainability appraisal or strategic environmental assessment.
- 2.5 The Inspector recommends a series of 'Main Modifications' which he concludes are needed to make the Plan sound. The majority of these endorse various Further Modifications proposed by the Council, although a few other significant changes are proposed, as discussed below. The Inspector recommends that these be incorporated into the Plan and, because they go to the soundness of the Plan, these recommendations have to be accepted if the Council wishes to adopt the Plan.
- 2.6 The Inspector's Report is attached at Appendix A, along with the list of Main Modifications. There are some 30 Main Modifications (MMs) recommended in

total, most of which are relatively minor and reflect Further Modifications proposed by the Council. The most significant points arising from the Inspector's recommendations are discussed below.

3. Strategy, Vision, Sustainability

- 3.1 There were many challenges to the Plan's overall strategy, particularly in relation to housing provision (dealt with below), but also regarding the splitting of the District into 3 spatial areas and the development strategy for each area. Nevertheless, the Inspector concludes that the overall strategy of the Plan is sound, including the allocation of the three strategic sites (North Winchester, West of Waterlooville and North Whiteley).

4. Economy, Employment, Retail

- 4.1 The key recommendation in this section relates to the Plan's proposals for Bushfield Camp, Winchester (policy WT3). The submitted Plan identifies this area as an 'opportunity site' for commercial or other uses which may be needed and could not be accommodated within the town. The Inspector concludes that a more positive approach is needed to this site and the local economy generally and recommends a firm allocation of Bushfield Camp for employment use.
- 4.2 He feels that this would be more consistent with the NPPF and address a need to change the City's economic profile, respond to commuting issues and boost the local economy. The existing criteria of Policy WT3 are retained, including requirements for assessments of transport, landscape, etc and to make available over half the area as public open space. Consequential changes are made to the District target for employment land provision which is increased to 20 hectares. This can be achieved at Bushfield Camp and other allocated or committed sites.

5. Housing (General)

- 5.1 The overall level of housing provision that should be planned for was inevitably the main issue at the examination. Various participants argued strongly on this topic, some looking for an increased number, others a decrease and some supporting the Plan's figure. Although the Inspector supported the overall development strategy and housing distribution, he does recommend an increase in housing provision, from 11,000 dwellings over the Plan period to 12,500.
- 5.2 This reflects the NPPF's requirement to meet 'objectively assessed needs' in full and the Inspector's conclusion that the Plan did not achieve this, especially in relation to affordable housing. He also felt a more pro-active approach to housing development was required to meet the NPPF's requirement for positive planning and identified that there was flexibility in the Plan's strategy to achieve an increase of this scale. The Inspector was also required to ensure the Plan was in conformity with the South East Plan, which was in place for the time being, and felt his recommendation would better achieve this. He did, however, firmly reject a strong challenge from participants that promoted much higher figures based on an economically-led approach.

- 5.3 The Secretary of State has recently announced that an order to revoke the South East Plan (except for 2 particular policies) is about to be laid before Parliament, probably in late February. However, the Government's intention to revoke the SE plan is not new and is taken into account in the Inspector's Report. Neither this announcement nor the revocation of the SE Plan (when this is actually effected) alters the need to accept the Inspector's recommendations in adopting the Plan.
- 5.4 The Plan included sufficient flexibility to enable the Inspector to resolve the shortfall in housing that he identified, without needing to suspend the examination or find the Plan unsound, as has happened to several recent plans. He did this by changing the policy for the main rural settlements (Policy MTRA2) from a housing range (150-250 dwellings or 400-500 dwellings) to a specific target (of 250 or 500 dwellings respectively) based on the top of the range. His recommendations on this matter are thus consistent with the evidence about local need which emerged from the Council's own 'Blueprint' exercise, rather than a further imposition of additional houses. He also increased the scale of the North Whiteley strategic allocation from 3,000 to 3,500 dwellings, reflecting evidence from the site promoters about its capacity and viability issues, which the Council did not dispute.
- 5.5 Whilst the recommendations on housing numbers will inevitably be unwelcome and controversial in some quarters, they are perhaps not unsurprising given the emphasis on housing growth contained in the NPPF, Plan for Growth and other recent government pronouncements. The Council's own approach had allowed for some flexibility on local provision, and the Inspector was able to use this flexibility to achieve the increase he recommended within the Plan's strategy and in ways that do not dramatically change the approach in the Plan. They can also be accommodated without further sustainability appraisal or strategic environmental assessment (SA/SEA).
- 5.6 This is important, as many other authorities are finding that Inspectors are suspending examinations for long periods to enable authorities to revise housing provision (upwards) and make consequent changes to their plans. Not only does this delay plans and involve considerable cost, there is still no guarantee that these plans will be found sound or that new issues or policies will not arise. The fact that, in the Council's case, the Inspector feels the Plan can be made sound, means that it can be adopted without further delay, which is of huge importance and benefit.

6. Housing Policies

- 6.1 The Inspector supports all of the Plan's general housing and other policies in this section, including the Further Modifications proposed. These cover housing mix, affordable housing, exception sites, gypsy and traveller policy, retention of facilities and open space provision. Of particular note is the conclusion that the affordable housing requirements (40% of dwellings on all sites, with no lower threshold) are generally viable, despite opposition from development interests.

7. Strategic Allocations

- 7.1 The Inspector's report deals with the three strategic allocations separately (West of Waterlooville, North Whiteley and North Winchester). Apart from increasing the scale of the North Whiteley allocation (from 3,000 dwellings to 3,500), as noted above, the Inspector supports all the strategic allocation policies and associated Further Modifications. He proposes a minor amendment to the text accompanying the North Whiteley policy, to remove reference to aligning housing provision with existing employment opportunities. He accepts that Botley Bypass should continue to be reserved (as a 'saved' 2006 Local Plan policy) rather than being a requirement or allocation of this Plan.
- 7.2 Land to the north of the Barton Farm strategic allocation was promoted by objectors to the Plan, who proposed additional housing and employment provision (500 dwellings and 20 hectares of employment). The Inspector agreed with the Council's arguments that this was not needed, appropriate or deliverable in terms of this Plan.

8. Market Towns and Rural Areas

- 8.1 The Inspector was supportive of the settlement hierarchy for the rural area and the Plan's approach to the National Park. As noted above, he increased the housing requirement for this sub-area of the District from 1,500 dwellings to 2,500. This was done by fixing the requirement for the 8 largest settlements at the top end of the range suggested by the submitted Plan. The Inspector concludes that this approach to accommodating much of the increase in housing provision that he recommends would help meet local needs, support existing facilities and economic growth, and retain a balanced population.
- 8.2 Initial work (being undertaken for Local Plan Part 2) to identify where in the housing range provision should be made, supports the argument that several of the settlements would have needed to plan for the top end of the range to meet their needs. Like the Inspector, the Council's own evidence concludes that this is needed to maintain a balanced population, local facilities and provide for affordable housing. Specifying a single target figure will also give certainty about future provision and help avoid ongoing debate about what is the appropriate level of provision.
- 8.3 Related to this, it is important to note that the Inspector has agreed that any future site allocations or settlement boundary revisions needed should be made through Local Plan Part 2 rather than Local Plan Part 1. This also supports the approach in the Plan, that any such changes should be subject to a proper plan-led approach, not 'first come first served' applications and appeals.
- 8.4 The approach to the smaller rural settlements (MTRA3) and the countryside (MTRA4) was also supported. The Inspector agrees that there is no assumption that the settlement boundaries of these smaller settlements will need to be reviewed (in Local Plan Part 2), unless supported by the local community. The Inspector also supports the Plan's approach to the reuse of rural buildings which, although felt to be more restrictive than the NPPF (by

resisting market housing use), he concludes is justified by local circumstances.

9. Environment (Policies CP11 – CP20)

9.1 These policies deal with a range of environmental issues including sustainable construction, renewable energy development, design, density, green infrastructure, biodiversity, flooding, settlement gaps, the South Downs National Park, heritage and landscape. The Inspector has fully supported this group of policies, including the Further Modifications suggested by the Council.

9.2 Of most significance, given the strong opposition by development interests, is the Inspector's support for Policies CP11 (sustainable construction) and CP18 (settlement gaps). The Inspector concluded that CP11 is reasonable, realistic and generally consistent with the NPPF. In the case of settlement gaps, he accepted that these would not preclude otherwise acceptable rural development if appropriately applied and that the detailed boundaries of the gaps should be reviewed as necessary in Local Plan Part 2 to take account of development needs.

10. Transport

10.1 The Inspector accepted that Policy CP10 (transport) was appropriate for a strategic plan and consistent with the Local Transport Plan. Subject to some additional explanatory text suggested by the Council, he supports the policy.

11. Infrastructure, Deliverability, etc

11.1 Delivery of the Plan's policies, particularly in relation to new development, is an increasingly important factor in examinations. The Inspector concludes that the Plan's strategy is deliverable, including the strategic allocations, and that the essential infrastructure requirements have been identified. Subject to some detailed modifications, as proposed in the Council's Further Modifications, the Inspector supports this policy.

12. Adoption of the Plan

12.1 There is no need for further consultation following the Inspector's Report as the Council's Further Modifications were consulted on and any other recommendations are in effect binding. Therefore, assuming the Council wishes to proceed to adopt the Plan in order to have an up to date adopted Local Plan Part 1, there is no option but to accept the Inspector's recommendations. There is no provision for consultation on, or amendment of, the Inspector's Main Modifications, as these relate to matters of soundness.

12.2 The Local Plan is adopted by resolution of the adopting authorities, Winchester City Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. It becomes part of the statutory Development Plan with immediate effect, although an adoption statement and copies of the adopted Plan must be made available as soon as practical. There is provision for Plans to be challenged through the Courts within 6 weeks, on limited procedural grounds, under Section 113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Given that the public examination included consideration by the Inspector of

the various legal requirements, it is not anticipated that there would be any reasonable grounds for challenge.

- 12.3 The Local Plan Part 1 will, therefore, become part of the statutory Plan from the date of adoption by full Council. However, the fact that its policies have already been given endorsement by the Inspector gives them substantial weight, as the Inspector's Report is a material consideration now that it is published. This will need to be taken into account in any planning decisions, alongside other material planning considerations and the saved policies of the 2006 Local Plan. Officer reports to Planning Development Control Committee will advise on the relative weight that should be attached to the various policies where there is any conflict or uncertainty.
- 12.4 A list of the Plan's policies, as modified and recommended for adoption, is set out at Appendix C. The Plan's explanatory text will require some editing, especially in the introductory sections, to reflect its adopted status. There may also be a need to correct errors and make other minor changes to ensure consistency, especially where some sections have been subject to modifications. Delegated authority is sought to make these changes and to publish the necessary notices to complete the adoption process.

13. Superseded Policies

- 13.1 The Local Plan Part 1 will replace various policies from the 2006 Winchester District Local Plan Review, with effect from the date of adoption. The remaining policies in the 2006 Local Plan will be reviewed and updated, as necessary, as part of the process of developing Local Plan Part 2. The policies from the 2006 Local Plan which would either be replaced or continue to be saved were listed in the Local Plan Part 1 and have not changed as a result of the Inspector's Report. This list is set out at Appendix B of this report and has been updated to continue to save policies CE1 and CE2 of the 2006 Local Plan (strategic and local gaps), as the Inspector agreed that the boundaries of these gaps should remain until such time as Local Plan Part 2 reviewed them. It is recommended that Council resolves to no longer save those policies which will be replaced by the Local Plan Part 1.
- 13.2 The WDLPR 2006 policies which will continue to be saved have been assessed in terms of their compliance with the NPPF and it is concluded that almost all are fully NPPF-compliant, with just a handful of saved policies being only partially NPPF-compliant. None of the saved policies are clearly non-compliant. The partially-compliant policies either do not cover all of the matters relevant to that topic that are identified in the NPPF, or they have an approach that is slightly different or outdated in some respects. In practice, any partially-compliant aspects will carry less weight than Local Plan Part 1 or the NPPF and all the saved policies will be reviewed as part of Local Plan Part 2.
- 13.3 The weight to be attached to the Core Strategy policies which are recommended for adoption by the Inspector now exceeds that of the earlier 'Interim Policy Aspirations', adopted by the Council in January 2011. The 'Interim Policy Aspirations' are, therefore, in effect superseded. Also, the fact that certain 'parent policies' from the 2006 Local Plan are no longer saved removes the basis for certain Supplementary Planning Documents, as follows:

- Implementation of Infilling Policy (H4) SPD (2006);
- Implementation of Local (Housing) Reserve Sites Policy SPD (2006);
- Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

- 13.4 It is recommended that the Implementation of Infilling Policy (H4) SPD be revoked with immediate effect, as the Local Plan Part 1 Policy MTRA3 replaces the previous policy H4 from adoption of the new Plan. Similarly, the Implementation of Local Reserve Sites Policy SPD should be revoked as the previous policy H2 is not saved and all of the Local Reserve Sites have now been released.
- 13.5 The Affordable Housing SPD supplements policy H5 of the 2006 Local Plan Review, which will be superseded by Local Plan Part 1 (Policy CP3). Nevertheless, much of the guidance in the SPD will remain relevant, for example in relation to the importance of achieving a mix of units, integration with market housing, provision of land, etc. However, as the new policy will seek physical provision or a financial contribution for affordable housing from all sites, the SPD needs updating to set out the procedures and policy for achieving this. Therefore, it is recommended that this SPD be updated rather than revoked. This would follow the normal processes for consultation and adoption of SPD.
- 13.6 Most other Supplementary Planning Documents (including Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements) remain valid, as their 'parent policies' in the 2006 Local Plan continue to be saved. There are some older VDSs/NDSs and other SPDs which supplement the previous (1998) Local Plan. Although these are now out of date and should be reviewed, the nature of the areas covered is unlikely to have changed greatly and the relevant design policies are also largely unchanged. These SPDs may, therefore, continue to be relevant material planning considerations.

14. Conclusion

- 14.1 The Inspector's report into the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy has been received and sets out recommendations as to how the Plan can be made sound and adopted. This is very much to be welcomed, given the time that it has taken to reach this stage of the process and the pressure for local authorities to have up to date plans if they wish to retain control of planning decisions in their area.
- 14.2 The vast majority of the Inspector's 'Main Modifications' support the Plan and endorse the Further Modifications published by the Council at the end of the public hearings. These include endorsement of the Plan's overall development strategy, the three spatial planning areas, the strategic allocations, the settlement hierarchy, affordable housing policies, sustainable construction requirements and settlement gaps. In fact there are only perceived to be two areas where significant changes are recommended – housing numbers and Bushfield Camp, Winchester.
- 14.3 The recommendations on housing numbers are at first sight substantial, but the Inspector was able to recommend a means to achieve the increase he felt was needed within the Plan's strategy and in ways that do not dramatically

change the approach in the Plan. They are also consistent with the evidence gathered to support the suggested local 'ranges'. Because of the approach the Council took, these recommendations can be accommodated without further sustainability appraisal or strategic environmental assessment (SA/SEA). The changes regarding Bushfield Camp are significant but do not undermine the approach taken by the Council and retain the various requirements and criteria regarding the site.

- 14.4 There are now two options for taking matters forward. The Inspector's recommendations must be accepted in order to adopt the Plan, as they relate to matters of 'soundness'. If the Council was to reject these recommendations, the only option would be to decide not to adopt the Plan. The advantages of proceeding to adoption of the Plan are very clear, taking account of the time and resources expended so far on the process, the benefits of having a sound and up to date planning policy framework and the very clear expectation of Government that authorities need to progress their plans if they wish to retain control of planning strategy for their areas. These far outweigh any perceived attractions of 'rejecting' the Inspector's recommendations by not adopting the Plan, especially as the Plan would retain intact the Council's overall planning strategy. There is, moreover, no indication that a further round of consultation and evidence gathering would point to any different conclusions to those reached by the evidence the Council currently has, which has guided the Inspector's recommendations.
- 14.5 It is estimated that resolving not to adopt the Plan now would be likely to delay adoption by 2 years or more, involve considerable cost in terms of consultancy work and new Planning Inspectorate fees, and give no certainty of a different conclusion or of a revised plan being sound. Without an up to date plan, the Council could not bring forward its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, or progress Local Plan Part 2. In addition, there may be other changes which could further delay the process and the extensive evidence base on which the Plan is founded could also become out of date in various respects. In essence, by not adopting the Council would risk losing control of development across the District.
- 14.6 Therefore, it is recommended that the Council welcomes the Inspector's overall conclusions about the soundness of the Plan's development strategy and grasps the opportunity that it has to adopt the Local Plan. This will put in place the Council's original spatial planning strategy, along with a raft of other important and up to date policies, to ensure that it delivers sustainable development across the District.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

15. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CHANGE PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):

- 15.1 As part of progressing effective spatial planning of the District, the Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy is one of the key implementation mechanisms for the Council's Community Strategy. To this extent, the Plan reflects the outcomes of the Community Strategy, as confirmed by the Inspector, and the policies cover those matters where there is a land use planning requirement for their delivery.

- 15.2 The requirements for production of Development Plan Documents require Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment and these processes have been followed.
16. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:
- 16.1 The key resources for undertaking work on the LDF have been approved as part of the budget process. Following a budget virement (CAB 2376(LDF) of £71,400 in 2012/13 there are now sufficient funds to cover the cost of adopting Local Plan Part 1, as well as progressing CIL and Local Plan Part 2.
- 16.2 A decision not to adopt the Local Plan at this stage would increase the need for resources, in terms of staff, finance and time. Work on CIL and Local Plan Part 2 would need to be put on hold and, while this may enable resources to be diverted to Local Plan Part 1, there would be a shortfall when work resumed on these other policies.
17. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES
- 17.1 The Government has reaffirmed its commitment to a plan-led system through the National Planning Policy Framework and revised Local Planning Regulations. However, it has also stressed the importance of putting sound, up to date plans in place quickly. A particular risk to the Council is therefore the issue of an ageing Local Plan (2006) and the lack of a recently-adopted and up to date Local Plan. This could result in challenges regarding not only housing supply but also the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF, which requires applications to be considered favourably if the local plan is silent or absent.
- 17.2 A resolution not to adopt the Plan would involve ongoing delay, uncertainty and increasing loss of control over key planning decisions. The requirements of the NPPF in relation to housing provision and demonstrating a 5-year land supply remain, so it would continue to be necessary to put a plan in place. Further work on housing needs could be costly, financially and in terms of delay, but may not necessarily result in a more palatable 'answer'. The Council would have to re-consult on the results and go back to at least the 'Pre-Submission' stage, before going forward to submission and a new examination.
- 17.3 The risks of failing to progress the Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy to adoption, now that there is the opportunity to do so, are therefore considerable. As well as increased cost and delay (not just to Local Plan Part 1 but other planning policy documents), the Council would be at greater risk of having to deal with development proposals through the planning application and appeal process, rather than in accordance with its own adopted spatial strategy.
18. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:
- 18.1 None.

19. APPENDICES:

- A. Inspector's Report and Appendix of Main Modifications
- B. Schedule of Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006) policies to be retained or replaced on adoption of Local Plan Part 1
- C. List of Local plan Part 1 policies, including Inspector's recommendations.

APPENDIX A**Inspector's Report and Appendix of Main Modifications**

The Planning
Inspectorate

Report to Winchester City Council and South Downs National Park Authority

by Nigel Payne BSc (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI, MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date 11 February 2013

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JOINT CORE STRATEGY

Document submitted for examination on 18 June 2012

Examination hearings held between 30 October and 8 November 2012

File Ref: PINS/L1765/429/5

Abbreviations Used in this Report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AHVA	Affordable Housing Viability Assessment
CS	Core Strategy
HMA	Housing Market Area
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LP	Local Plan
MM	Main Modification
PUSH	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire
RS	Regional Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SDNP(A)	South Downs National Park (Authority)
SES	Strategic Employment Site
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the District over the next 20 years providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan. The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable them to adopt the Plan. Nearly all of the modifications to address this were proposed by the Council and I have recommended their inclusion after full consideration of the representations from other parties on these issues.

The main modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Include a model policy containing a presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Increase the new housing total for the district over the plan period to 12,500 (DS1/CP1), to reflect the capacity identified at North Whiteley (SH3) and in the Market Towns and Rural Area (MTRA 1/2) and achieve general conformity with the South East Plan (RS);
- Clarify the new employment land requirements for the district as about 20 hectares for Winchester in particular (CP8) and allocate Bushfield Camp (WT3) for employment uses, not as an “opportunity site”;
- Clarify retail policy, including for Winchester (WT1) and that Denmead is a Local not a District Centre (3.84) and;
- Revise policies (MTRA2, MTRA3, CP5 and CP12) and supporting text to meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 (WDLP) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate, in recognition that there is no scope to remedy any failure in this regard and then whether the Plan is sound and compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework (para 182) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared; justified; effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for my examination is the submitted draft plan of June 2012, which is essentially the same as the document published for consultation in January 2012.
3. The report deals with the main modifications that are needed to make the Plan sound and legally compliant and they are identified in bold in the report (**MM**). In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should make any modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and thus incapable of being adopted.
4. These main modifications are set out in the Appendix. Those that go to soundness and all the other minor modifications proposed by the Council in the Schedule of Further Modifications – November 2012 have been subject to public consultation and I have taken all the consultation responses into account in writing this report. Therefore, based on the absence of effect on the overall aims, objectives and main elements of the plan as most concern clarity and effectiveness, I am satisfied that a further Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is not necessary in this instance.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

5. Section s20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on them by section 33A of the 2004 Act in relation to the Plan's preparation. It is a requirement that the Council engages constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with the County Council, neighbouring local authorities and a range of other organisations, including the Highways Agency, the Environment Agency and Natural England. In particular, the South Downs National Park Authority has been fully involved throughout and accordingly the document has been submitted jointly. It will therefore also represent their strategic planning policy until a new Local Plan for the Park is adopted in 2014; the work on which has started.
6. In the Duty to Co-operate Statement (SD9) and elsewhere the Council has satisfactorily documented where and when co-operation has taken place, with whom and on what basis, as well as confirming that such positive engagement will continue. This includes with all the authorities in the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) area and particularly with Fareham BC and Havant BC in relation to the strategic land allocations at North of Whiteley and West of Waterlooville, as well as North of Fareham, the importance of which cannot be overstated in terms of new housing

delivery. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, I am satisfied that the duty to co-operate has been met.

Assessment of Soundness

Overview

7. This report takes into account changes to national planning law, policies and guidance that have taken place since the plan was first published. This includes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012), on which all parties had an opportunity to comment on the consequences for this plan and all the responses thereto have also been considered in this report.
8. At the time of writing, the South East Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 (RS) (SE Plan) is extant and forms part of the development plan. Whilst very likely to be abolished soon, it must, for the time being at least, nevertheless still be taken into account by the Council (and everyone else involved). The plan must be in general conformity with its content and have regard to the evidence which supported it, if it is to be found sound. All references in this report to "the Council" should be taken to include the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) as the plan has been submitted jointly.
9. Some criticisms were levelled at the form, nature and extent of the Council's consultation processes during the plan's preparation but the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (January 2007) (CD 4) have been met in full. Moreover, the thoroughness and coverage of the various public consultation exercises was entirely appropriate (and in one element – Blueprint – the recipient of a national planning award) and satisfactory.

Main Issues

10. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, I have identified twelve main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. Representations on the submitted plan have been fully considered insofar as they relate to its soundness but are not reported on individually.

Issue 1 – Strategy, Vision, Sustainability

Policy DS1

11. The plan's spatial vision and objectives are consistent with the SE Plan and the Council's Community Strategy, having evolved alongside the latter since 2007. They take into account the existing characteristics of the district as a whole and define its constituent parts, including in terms of community needs and aspirations, as well as the duties and responsibilities associated with the SDNP. It is essentially common ground that Winchester is the single most sustainable location in the district for growth, with a strong local need for new housing. This has been acknowledged in the recent decision (October 2012) to grant planning permission for largely residential development at Barton Farm, to the north of the city centre, consistent with

policy WT2 of this plan.

12. However, the general balance of distribution of new housing across the district also properly acknowledges the potential of the two other strategic housing land allocations at West of Waterlooville (SH2) and North Whiteley (SH3) as sustainable extensions to existing urban areas. These are in the PUSH growth area to the south of the district along the M27 corridor, with its existing and developing major employment opportunities and proximity to Havant, Portsmouth, Fareham and Southampton.
13. Taken in the round the strategy is capable of achieving general conformity with the SE Plan, although it does not follow a PUSH/non PUSH split as the three spatial areas identified are locally distinctive and compatible with key objectives. This also helps avoid overlaps and potential confusion with the PUSH strategy in clarifying what is required in each part of the district.
14. The amount of new development in Winchester itself is proportionate to its current levels of population, jobs and housing, as well as its district role as a service and retail centre and would help to maintain the latter. The relatively limited scale of new housing envisaged for settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area (MTRA), compared to Winchester and the main strategic sites, confirms that reliance on the plan led approach through LP2 should not have a significant impact on the overall level of delivery across the district, despite the time necessary to complete that process.
15. Together with the concentration of growth into the local service centres in the MTRA, to help protect the landscape and conserve the countryside of the SDNP, the plan provides for a sustainable pattern of new development across the district over the plan period, including in respect of the general distribution of new housing between the three spatial areas. This conclusion is reinforced by the outcome of the ongoing SA/SEA process that has been properly carried out at each stage of the plan's progress to submission, including the realistic consideration of reasonable alternatives.
16. In the case of Winchester, Barton Farm has been consistently found to be the most sustainable location locally for a major new housing scheme, if a peripheral greenfield expansion of the city was deemed necessary. Both the North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville sites have also emerged from various studies over the years as more suitable in principle for development than other potential alternatives in the district, if and when a need arises.
17. In more general terms the final SA/SEA report (SD7) demonstrates that potential negative impacts of the strategy have been taken into account, with necessary changes made as part of an iterative process as the plan has developed, including at the earlier Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages. This also applies in respect of the HRA (SD8) and HRA Addendum (EB223), whereby additional policy safeguards are now included in response to concerns expressed by Natural England, amongst others. The SA/SEA report also reinforces the Council's judgement that a purely jobs/economic growth led strategy for the district would not satisfactorily meet other important plan objectives, with some potentially negative effects on the provision of services and facilities too.
18. The overall development strategy, relating to the three spatial areas of Winchester, the South Hampshire Urban Areas and the MTRA, is therefore essentially sound and positively provides for a sustainable pattern of growth

in accord with national guidance in the NPPF. This would be achieved without reliance on over concentration in just one location, albeit about two thirds of the new housing would be on the three main strategic sites. Nevertheless, as put forward by the Council, various amendments to the wording of parts 1 and 2 of the plan are desirable for clarity. However, as they do not constitute main modifications essential for soundness, in common with many other minor proposed modifications, they are not referred to in any detail in this report.

19. However, in order to fully reflect and comply with the NPPF, the plan needs to have the text of para 1.42 converted into policy, as part of the framework under which all other policies will operate. It should therefore become the first part of policy DS1 (**MM 1**). It is also essential for clarity and the effectiveness of implementation and monitoring that the new housing requirement for each part of the district and thus the total over the plan period is clearly set out in a policy. To that end, an appropriate addition to policy CP1 is essential for soundness (**MM 1**). For reasons dealt with later in this report, the new housing numbers in policies SH1, WT1 and MRTA1/2 also require amendment to properly reflect conclusions on related issues.

Issue 2 – Economy, Employment, Retail

Policies CP8, CP9 and WT3

20. In accord with guidance in the NPPF, notably para 21, the Council now accepts the necessity of specifying in a policy the amount of new employment land likely to be needed in the district over the plan period. The latest version of a series of employment studies (2011) (EB302) advises that only 15.7ha of new land is likely to be necessary by 2031 in the light of the present difficult national economic circumstances and current commitments. This is in contrast to earlier reports in more buoyant times (2007) when the requirement was estimated at around 84ha, nearly all of which (74ha) was identified for B1 office and high tech uses, with 20ha approx. for Winchester itself.
21. Apart from evidencing the difficulties of forecasting, these reports nevertheless have some consistent themes, including that the city itself is, effectively, the most sustainable location in the district for new employment development, rather than all being concentrated in the PUSH area to the south close to the M27 corridor. It is generally acknowledged that the latter area, in common with the MTRA, has differing characteristics and needs in relation to employment, compared to Winchester. There is also the need to improve the balances of commuting in and out of Winchester, as well as provide a wider range of employment opportunities generally, acknowledging the present over reliance on public sector jobs, to help improve the local economy.
22. It is also relevant that there is to be no new employment land at North Whiteley under policy SH3, given existing commitments nearby, such as at the Solent Business Parks. Moreover, the district cannot rely on new job provisions at North Fareham, even though it adjoins the boundary, as there is no specific agreement to this effect with Fareham BC under the duty to co-operate, notwithstanding the joint working in respect of the delivery of this strategic development area.
23. Although a material reduction in the amount of floorspace normally occupied

by each employee has been identified in recent studies, there is no firm evidence to justify the claim that there has been “a permanent loss of economic capacity” in the district as a result of the recent recession. Furthermore, other evidence, albeit earlier (2007/9) (EB 306 and EB 307), suggests that Winchester in particular retains significant potential for economic growth and that this has been constrained by a lack of suitable sites/premises and restrictive planning policies.

24. Both the Council's Community (CD1) (2010) and Economic Strategies (EB303) (2010), as well as the Vision for Winchester, recognise the need to provide new high quality employment in the city, attract private sector investment and take advantage of opportunities for new local jobs in growing sectors such as business services, creative/cultural industries and the knowledge economy.
25. Bearing in mind the relevant national guidance in the NPPF and that the PUSH employment land requirements can essentially be met from existing commitments in this district, the case for new employment land provision in the city is based not only on generating job growth, changing the city's employment profile, positively influencing commuter flows and boosting the local economy, but also on providing for likely medium to longer term needs over the plan period in the generally most sustainable location in the district.
26. This reflects the trend based nature of the latest projections and the strong arguments for allocating more employment floorspace over and above that requirement to ensure that the city and the district are in a better position to respond to emerging opportunities as the economy improves. It should also reduce the risks of some of the other problems identified occurring or getting worse over the plan period, as referred to in para 6.15 of the plan.
27. In the light of all of the above, policy CP8 and para 6.14 need to be modified by altering the amount of new employment sought to “about 20ha”, rather than “at least 15.7 ha” (**MMs 2/19**). This would provide more flexibility and potentially 1,500 to 2,000 new jobs locally, according to the Council's evidence (EB 306), as well as further support for the allocation of Bushfield Camp in Winchester as a new employment site under Policy WT3 (see below). It would also comply with the relevant national guidance in the NPPF in relation to the development needs of business and the economy generally (notably paras 20 and 21). However, as with retail (see below), an early review of the district's requirements for employment land and premises would be desirable, if and when there is a significant improvement in local economic circumstances.

Retail

28. In relation to retail, the Council's evidence base, updated in 2012 (EB301), now indicates that district requirements for new floorspace in the short term at least (up to 2018 or so) would be fully met by existing commitments, notably in Winchester town centre. Nevertheless, despite the inevitable uncertainty involved in longer term predictions, particularly at a time of difficulties in the national economy, it also suggests that some new growth, again especially in Winchester, may well be necessary in the medium to long term.
29. In such circumstances, the Council's intention to conduct an early review (to

be completed by 2020/21 at the latest) represents a pragmatic and sensible approach to a complex and evolving situation. This would also allow the respective impacts of schemes in the pipeline, such as the new town centre at Whiteley and the new supermarket at Bishop's Waltham, as well as in Winchester itself, to be properly assessed.

30. The scale of new retail provision currently underway at Whiteley takes into account the needs of the new housing allocated in this plan, as well as other local commitments. There is therefore no justification for an additional allocation of retail floorspace on a strategic scale at present. With Whiteley as a town centre, the district retail hierarchy in policy DS1 is now consistent with the relevant NPPF guidance and the SE Plan. Any limited retail growth on a non strategic scale in the MTRAs to help meet local needs can and should be considered in the LP2, as the Council intends.
31. Consequently, despite the absence of specific floorspace figures, as advised in the NPPF, taking all of the above into account, it is reasonable to conclude that the plan is generally sound in its policy approach to local retail issues. Notwithstanding, the second main point of policy WT1 requires clarification (**MM 3**) and it would be wise for the Council to carry out an early review of longer term retail floorspace requirements, particularly for Winchester itself and its town centre, as indicated.

Policy WT3 – Bushfield Camp

32. This partly brownfield site of around 43ha in total lies close and is well related to the existing built up area of the city. It also has good road access, including to J11 of the M3 motorway and the nearby Park and Ride (P&R) facility. It largely comprises a former military camp with the remnants of some structures, including large areas of hardstanding, still present in the south central area. There are also numerous groups of trees on and around it, some of which are strong features in the local landscape context. Only the formerly developed central section of around 20ha of the total site is considered suitable, in principle, for redevelopment by the Council.
33. The site is clearly visible from parts of the SDNP to the east, notably the prominent local landmark, with public access, of St. Catherine's Hill. However, much of the city is also seen from this viewpoint, including numerous modern buildings as well as the historic ones, such as the Cathedral. Moreover, the local landform and the backdrop of trees to the west, as well as those on and around the site itself, would help to limit the visual impact of any new buildings here on the historic/landscape setting of this part of Winchester. Policy WT3 properly recognises the importance of ensuring that any new built development respects the local landscape sensitivity of the location close to, but outside, the SDNP and within a local gap, in terms of high quality design, layout and landscaping, as well as new building heights.
34. The majority, but not all, of the site is subject to a current Village Green designation application that is making its way through the courts. However, this is an entirely separate legal process that will be judged on very different criteria compared to whether or not it should be identified as an opportunity site or allocated for new employment development in this plan.
35. Clearly, a full transport assessment of any proposed scheme would be

essential, incorporating likely contributions to necessary road improvements locally, including in respect of J11 of the M3, as well as for improved walking, cycling and public transport services, potentially linked to the nearby P&R facility, as referred to in policy WT3.

36. The various studies undertaken to date indicate that, notwithstanding certain environmental constraints that must be fully addressed in any detailed scheme, not least any effects on the R. Itchen SAC nearby for which a further, project level, HRA will be necessary, the general form of scheme envisaged in the plan is likely to prove deliverable over the plan period. With about 20ha of new development, the scheme is also capable of providing around 23ha as a major new area of public open space at little or no cost to the public purse.
37. The site, and particularly the 20ha to be allocated for development within it, has a relatively low amenity interest, in itself, with those areas of higher environmental value to be precluded from development and protected in perpetuity through public ownership for recreational uses. In such circumstances, it is appropriate that the plan takes a positive approach to the future of the site and makes a formal allocation of 20ha for new employment use, with the remainder as public open space to serve the city.
38. Many other potential new employment sites in and around the city may prove to be suitable, in principle, for other uses, such as housing. With those higher land values for alternative uses, they are therefore less likely to create new local jobs over the plan period. Given that the Council fully endorses the need to broaden and diversify the economy of the city, as referred to in the plan, this site represents the most sustainable, realistic and deliverable option for new employment land provision at present.
39. In the absence of any comparable site in and around the town that is currently available or sequentially preferable in sustainability terms, policy WT3, as amended, would provide an opportunity for a new HQ building for a major company and/or a business cluster of sufficient size to be sustainable, once established. This should help to reduce local reliance on public sector jobs and have a positive impact on the commuting issue, in accord with national policy, given that the NPPF contains numerous references to positively promoting economic growth, including by identifying new development opportunities.
40. In view of the current uncertainty relating to the realistic delivery prospects of a specific "knowledge" or science park type scheme on the developable part of this site, in relation to local/sub-regional need/demand, the site should be allocated principally for employment uses. In the absence of any overriding environmental constraints that cannot be satisfactorily addressed through suitable avoidance/mitigation measures as part of an overall scheme, it is only by positive planning, in the sense of allocating a significant part of the site for new employment related development, as part of a comprehensive scheme, that the longstanding uncertainty over its future seems likely to be resolved.
41. An allocation for employment in the plan should not only increase certainty and help encourage new inward investment, but also address those factors identified in the recent Academy of Urbanism report on Winchester (Sep 2011), such as an imbalanced economy, as well as high commuting flows. In particular, such a comprehensive scheme would secure the provision of

the larger part of the site for recreational use in perpetuity at little or no cost to the Council (or other public bodies) at a time of economic austerity. The realistic prospects for its delivery by other means for the foreseeable future are doubtful at best. This would materially help to address the present shortage of public recreational land in and around the city, also referred to elsewhere in this report.

42. Importantly, the proposals would also make a significant contribution to implementing the plan's overall objectives through positively and proactively encouraging sustainable economic growth by identifying a strategic scale site to meet local needs over the plan period. This would comply with the guidance in para 21 of the NPPF to provide a clear economic vision and strategy for the area, amongst other things.
43. Consequently, taking into account the Council's own proposed modifications to the text of the comprehensive list of relevant criteria to be met by any scheme and the inclusion of the additional para of supporting text at the end, subject only to changing "identified as an Opportunity" to "allocated as an Employment" (**MM 20**), policy WT3 is considered sound in all respects. Consequential changes are also required to the text of paras 3.39 and 3.40 for consistency.

Policy CP9

44. The plan's strategy that only a relatively small increase in new employment floorspace across the district will be required over the plan period relies, at least in part, on the retention of most, if not all, existing employment sites and buildings, rather than their loss to other uses. Although the word "viability" does not appear in the policy wording, it may be clearly implied from everything that is set out, including the word "reasonable", that issues regarding the economics of redevelopment for existing, alternative and mixed uses would always have to be taken into account in relation to any proposals to which policy CP9 would apply.
45. With this in mind, together with the guidance in para 22 of the NPPF, the policy criteria are suitable and appropriate tests that would allow for exceptions, if justified by site specific circumstances and other relevant material considerations, but otherwise help to ensure that sufficient land and premises in sustainable locations remains to properly support the local economy. Accordingly, the policy is sufficiently flexible and no changes are necessary for soundness.
46. In the light of all of the above, the possible allocation of additional employment land in the vicinity of Botley station, whether or not related to the provision of the by-pass, is a non strategic matter for the LP2 to address. This should take into account the local implications of the PUSH area strategy and the delays surrounding the major Eastleigh Riverside employment scheme in the adjoining borough, amongst other things. Elsewhere in the MTRAs, as proposed by the Council, LP2 is also the appropriate vehicle to assess the requirement for any further limited employment allocations in particular settlements to help meet local needs at the non strategic scale.

Issue 3 – Housing General

Policies CP1, WT1 and SH1

47. The extant SE Plan (POL1) (2009) has a requirement of 12,240 new dwellings for the district from 2006 to 2026 to meet housing needs. Notwithstanding the impending revocation, this plan has to remain in general conformity with that expectation, as well as addressing the objectively assessed local need for new housing in accord with the NPPF (para 17). In particular, the Council's most up date figures relating to affordable housing (EB124) (2012) indicate a requirement of around 370 units per year in the district.
48. Albeit somewhat dated, the extensive technical evidence underlying the SE Plan requirements remains relevant and reinforces the conclusion that residential development pressures are only likely to increase in adjoining areas if Winchester district does not fully address its own needs. Providing suitable and available capacity can be identified, without compromising other important objectives of the NPPF, such as the protection of the SDNP, there is no justification for any under-provision of new housing over the plan period.
49. The SE Plan figure is equivalent to 612 new houses per year. Albeit rolled forward 5 years from 2026 to 2031, a district total of 11,000, as submitted, would deliver an average of only 550 annually; effectively a reduction of about 10%. Although 550 a year would be materially greater than the recent average from 2001 to 2011, of about 486, based on the Council's affordable housing requirement figures (EB124) (2012) a total of 11,000 new homes would not provide appropriately for objectively assessed local needs.
50. Fortunately, the Council's work to date has identified potential capacity for at least 2,500 new houses in the MTRA by 2031 (see issue 8 below), rather than just the range of 1,500 to 2,500 units in the submitted plan. The higher figure has also been taken into account in the strategic level SA/SEA through the plan process so far. Given that all the larger settlements to which the main figures in policy MTRA 2 would apply are outside the SDNP, there should be no great difficulty in securing more than sufficient new housing land allocations to readily meet that higher figure over the plan period through the LP2 process to which the Council is committed.
51. Moreover, the Council has acknowledged that the final total capacity of the proposed strategic site at North Whiteley, where a new town centre is nearing completion, is very likely to be more than the 3,000 units referred to in the submitted plan. Importantly, this would be so without needing to extend the site area already identified and assessed. It is also fully endorsed by the assembled consortium of experienced developers that stands ready to deliver the scheme and their professional advisors. Subject to suitable avoidance and mitigation measures being included to secure environmental/nature conservation interests, as required in policy SH3, a higher total of about 3,500 new houses is realistically deliverable by 2031.
52. Significantly, plan modifications to reflect these facts would not directly affect the new housing figure for Winchester itself. Nor would they result in an imbalance in growth between the three spatial areas set out in the plan, bearing in mind the total numbers involved, and that the plan's overall strategy would not be altered to any significant degree. For example, the percentage of new housing in Winchester would only reduce from around 36%, coincidentally almost exactly the same as its current percentage of the district's population, to around 32% or one third of the district total.

Furthermore, all the available evidence indicates that infrastructure provisions would also be adequate or can be made so economically in connection with growth, for these somewhat higher numbers, as would other services, including water supply.

53. A total of 12,500 and an average rate of new housing delivery of 625 over the plan period would represent the positive approach to sustainable development required by the NPPF as it would reflect objectively assessed local needs for affordable housing. Moreover, the additional 2% or so would allow for a limited buffer of new housing land supply, as recommended in the NPPF (para 47). It would also help to take into account the likely upward movement of household growth in the medium to longer term if the economy improves from its present low base. A revised total of 6,000 new units in the two main site allocations outside Winchester (not 5,500) would also be closer to the implied housing target for the PUSH growth area of the district in the most recent South Hampshire Strategy document (OD28) (October 2012).
54. The population projections used by representors to justify higher housing figures for the district (up to about 15,000 by 2031) essentially rely on a specific level of future job growth being required. They are essentially based on the premise that the only way of meeting that job growth over the plan period is through increased in-migration that would require extra housing. In contrast, demographic based projections, largely based on ONS and DCLG methods, as used by Hampshire County Council for the Council, are less dependent on job forecasts and labour force projections that are inherently difficult to produce and affected by many uncertainties in the longer term.
55. This applies not least in respect of the performance of the local and national economy over time, compared to births and deaths, for example. Moreover, new jobs do not necessarily have to be filled by in migrants, given alternative sources such as lower local unemployment, later retirement and increased activity rates, including amongst the elderly/recently retired, as well as improved skills and training.
56. Therefore, a total new dwelling target of 12,500 across the district from 2011 to 2031, with a delivery rate of 625 per year on average, is considered to be realistic, as well as positive in terms of the economic growth of the district. This is so not only in relation to past delivery rates locally, albeit a material "step change" upwards, but also the reasonably assessed capacities of the main three strategic sites allocated in the plan and their realistic implementation prospects, including in respect of economic viability. Moreover, it would be generally consistent with the Council's "stronger housing market" scenario considered in Appendix D of the Housing Background Paper (BP1) (June 2012).
57. Importantly, it should enable an annual affordable housing delivery rate of around 250 units to be achieved. It would also take into account the 100 or so new units per year that the Council presently intends to help deliver using its own resources, as confirmed at the hearings, and the contributions from other small rural schemes in the MTRA under policy MTRA 4.
58. All of the above should be sufficient to meet local affordable housing needs within the first 10 years or so of the full plan period, given the scale of existing and projected demand as well as the current backlog (BP2) (June

2012). The latter is of a magnitude that renders it incapable of realistic resolution within 5 years, taking into account an assessment of the likely resources to be available, the capacity of the local house building industry and the ability to sell the associated market housing in the current economic conditions.

59. It is relevant to note that no neighbouring Councils have raised concerns over the proposed level of new housing under the duty to co-operate, or in other respects, other than in relation to some matters of implementation. The plan, as modified, would not give rise to implications for others to accommodate development that is not being provided for in Winchester. This is borne out by reference to the extensive consultations at earlier plan stages, including in respect of realistic alternative options having been considered.
60. The alternative to make the plan end date 2026 not 2031 but with the same new housing total would fail to acknowledge that the major strategic sites identified may well need up to 20 years to be delivered in full. Moreover, the Council is proposing to review the plan no later than 2020/2021 in any event. Nor is there any need for an additional strategic allocation around Winchester as this could well unbalance the district strategy and ignores the fact that the SHLAA has identified capacity in and around the town to "make up the numbers" of a total of 4,000 new dwellings by 2031, also including current commitments and the likely continuing contribution from "windfalls". The plan as modified would also include effective monitoring of delivery of new housing in each of the spatial areas so that necessary adjustments could be made if required to assist in achieving the necessary delivery rates.
61. No allowance for any new dwellings to be provided in the smaller (MTRA3) settlements or the SDNP is made in the plan. This is consistent with the NPPF and provides additional flexibility in relation to overall new housing delivery, as most villages are likely to accommodate a few new dwellings to meet local needs by 2031, even in the SDNP. It is also relevant that two of the three main strategic sites now have planning permission and that no better or more sustainable alternatives to North Whiteley (SH3) have been put forward by representors or demonstrated by evidence.
62. In relation to the usual debate about how new housing numbers should be defined in the plan, those generally favouring development seek the use of "at least" or "a minimum of", whilst those essentially opposing growth largely favour "up to" or "a maximum of", or variants thereof. Faced with criticism that the submitted plan is not consistent in having various different terms throughout, the Council now proposes to use "about" in all instances.
63. On balance, this provides the limited degree of necessary flexibility in a strategic level plan, not only in relation to the city and the main strategic sites in particular, but also regarding the split between the three constituent spatial areas of the district over the plan period. Accordingly, it is considered to be suitable and satisfactory to assist implementation, in accord with the NPPF's guidance, including in the event of a major difficulty arising in respect of the delivery of one of the main strategic sites (**MMs 1, 15 and 29**).

Issue 4 – Housing Policies

Policy CP2

64. Amongst other evidence, the various iterations of the SHMA (EB124) and the Viability Study (EB117) confirm that a mix of size and type of new dwellings is needed across the district. Nevertheless, the policy should not be over-prescriptive, so as to allow for local circumstances and scheme viability to also be taken into account. Accordingly, and given that a significant percentage of new demand will arise from “newly formed households and people looking to downsize” (LP1 para 5.15), the Council now accepts that the word “family” should be deleted from the third part of the policy (**MM 16**).
65. The provision of a range of new housing across the district should help to meet the needs of the increasingly ageing population and Appendix E relating to infrastructure also refers to the provision of extra care housing. Thus, a separate/additional policy to quantify this need or require the specific allocation of sites to meet it is not necessary in a strategic plan, albeit further consideration can be given in LP2 if particular local difficulties arise.

Policy CP3

66. In accord with the national guidance in the NPPF, policy CP3 on affordable housing is properly qualified in respect of viability so that site specific circumstances and current/local market conditions will be taken into account alongside the 40% target. This figure is supported by the evidence in the AHVA (EB110) (2010) and latest Housing Needs Assessment (EB124) (2012). It has applied to recent permissions granted at Barton Farm (WT2) and West of Waterlooville (SH2). Although all policies must be read together, for clarity the Council now acknowledges the need for greater consistency in relation to affordable housing between this policy and those specifically relating to the strategic allocations, as dealt with elsewhere in this report (**MMs 3/6**).

Policy CP4

67. It is essentially common ground that this policy provides an opportunity to help meet specific local housing needs, especially in the more rural parts of the district and utilising the Council's previous experiences in bringing forward such schemes. Notwithstanding, as proposed by the Council, some minor changes to the wording of the submitted version are necessary for effectiveness, including to better define those circumstances in which tenures other than affordable housing for rent might prove acceptable, depending on the economics of provision. These changes provide the greater clarity now sought by the Council to help increase delivery from the 60 or so units provided last year.

Policy CP5

68. In the light of the government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2012), the Council has amended this policy, including to acknowledge that a new local needs assessment is being undertaken jointly with most other Hampshire authorities. This will inform both LP2 and the South Downs National Park LP, in which pitch/plot targets will be set out and sites to meet those needs allocated. This is clearly less than ideal, given that the Council has been aware of a district need for significant additional provision since at least the preparation of the South East Plan Partial Review (June 2009). Nevertheless, in all the relevant local circumstances, including the date of

the original data on which the Review was based and the longer timescale of this plan, this information is no longer considered to form a robust evidence base.

69. Consequently, rather than delay this plan to await the new needs assessment and delivery of the important strategic housing sites accordingly, the Council's proposed course is the most suitable way forward, given the current unsatisfactory position. Subject to a modification put forward to clarify the need to protect all designated areas (**MM 17**), the criteria set out in policy CP5 are appropriate and provide a reasonable method for assessing relevant proposals before LP 2 is adopted.

Policy CP6

70. Without detracting from the importance of retaining existing local services and facilities, if at all possible and particularly in the more rural parts of the district, it has to be acknowledged that some may need to be reorganised, replaced and/or relocated, if they are to be viably retained, and that some may no longer be needed. Accordingly, all the criteria in policy CP6 to test such proposals are considered appropriate but, as the Council now accepts, it is necessary for soundness to also refer to those situations where a loss forms part of a wider plan that is of greater overall benefit (**MM 18**).

Policy CP7

71. Similar considerations apply in respect of open space, sport and recreation. Therefore, the Council has added a second point, to be taken into account when assessing schemes involving any loss of such facilities, regarding the sum of advantages to the community being weighed against any harm arising.

Issue 5 – West of Waterlooville

Policy SH2

72. Following various permissions, development has commenced on this strategic site. It is therefore reasonable, in principle, to conclude that delivery should proceed in accord with the Council's expectations set out in the Appendix F trajectory, including in respect of affordable housing and the overall total of new dwellings (including those in Havant Borough). Nevertheless, it remains essential for clarity to confirm that "about 3,000" new dwellings are anticipated, in line with the most recent permissions, in policy SH2. It would be confusing to qualify this by also referring to "about 2,350 in Winchester district in the plan period" to reflect those already built or words to that effect (**MM 7**). Additional text has also been proposed by the Council in new paras 3.61 to 3.63 to provide an up-to-date picture on this site.
73. In line with earlier recommendations related to flexibility, particularly to reflect ongoing viability considerations, the 40% affordable housing target should be expressed as an expectation, rather than an absolute requirement in all circumstances. Hence "will" is replaced by "should" in policy SH1 (**MM 6**).
74. The overall objective of completing a sustainable urban extension to Waterlooville, with a viable commercial area, confirms the importance of

making substantial provision of new employment land within the scheme. Nevertheless, given the long timescale of delivery and the difficulty of clearly establishing any particular local needs, including in relation to job numbers, it is realistic to provide some flexibility around the specific amount required. Therefore, "about" should replace "at least" in the third policy point (**MM 7**).

75. Although the number of new dwellings anticipated is likely to generate sufficient extra pupils to need two new, standard sized, primary schools on site, education provision is often flexible in relation to existing capacity nearby, catchment areas, parental choices, local birth rates and so on. Therefore, in circumstances where the County Council as education authority has accepted in a legal agreement that there is some flexibility, it is reasonable to reflect that in the policy. Consequently, the last point should say "primary school places", rather than, specifically, "two primary schools" (**MM 7**). Otherwise, the policies and proposals for this area are sound.

Issue 6 – North Whiteley

Policy SH3

76. This strategic site of just over 200 ha is in a sustainable location close to major employment areas, including the Solent Business Parks, and a soon to be completed town centre also serving the existing housing areas to the south. Importantly, it also provides the opportunity to finally deliver a second road access to the area, by linking Whiteley Way to Botley Road to the north. However, this needs to be to a different design and alternative alignment to that which already has planning permission, to avoid passing through some of the more environmentally sensitive parts of the site.
77. Together with new schools, it is effectively common ground that the new road link to the north should be fully delivered as early as possible in any building programme. This is so that vehicular access, except for buses, is no longer restricted to coming in and out of the area through Junction 9 of the M27, which is congested in both morning and evening peak periods. This situation, together with the relatively high level of car dependency locally and the somewhat restricted nature of the bus services in the area, all confirm the importance of a full Transport Assessment to support any planning application.
78. As the policy says, this must include a comprehensive assessment of the existing access difficulties and proposals for improvements, including to Junction 9, as well as other parts of the road network locally and public transport services (both bus and rail), plus walking and cycling. In recognition of concerns expressed by the Highways Agency (who have no improvement schemes planned for either Junction 9 in particular or this stretch of the M27 in general at present), amongst others, the Council now proposes changes to both the policy and supporting text to ensure that these matters are fully and properly addressed in the context of any planning application (**MM 8**).
79. With these modifications, policy SH3 would be clear, with no further text required, on what is necessary in transport terms to deliver a sustainable urban extension to Whiteley, including a full package of improvement and mitigation measures. Although not all the necessary detailed technical

analysis on transport is as yet fully complete, the work undertaken to date is sufficient to demonstrate a very strong likelihood that all the necessary transport elements of the overall scheme would be practically and economically deliverable. Also taking into account the supporting text, this policy and the proposals for North Whiteley would be appropriate and justified, in general terms, to demonstrate that a strategic land allocation is suitable and satisfactory, in principle.

80. Providing the road link to the north would inevitably increase vehicle movements on the already constrained A334 route through Botley village, including a narrow section at Mill Hill for example, as well as having a negative effect on local air quality. There is already an identified potential by-pass route for the village, which has been safeguarded for around 20 years and is estimated to cost about £30m to build at current prices.
81. However, Hampshire County Council as highway authority does not currently consider that the effects of the increased traffic from the North Whiteley scheme on Botley would be sufficient to justify implementation of the by-pass for transport and/or environmental reasons. In particular, the main route destinations for journeys by new residents and others are likely to be to the south, east and west, including to the main centres of Portsmouth, Fareham and Southampton, rather than the north/north west. Consequently, there is no reasonable expectation that the developers of the site should make a contribution towards by-pass construction, albeit other transport mitigation measures for Botley are likely to be required as part of the overall project.
82. In such circumstances, and in the absence of any firm technical evidence to the contrary, it seems wise for the Council to retain the safeguarding of the intended route (under saved policy T12 of their former Local Plan), as proposed, pending the final outcome of the full transport assessment required under this policy and other work currently being undertaken for Eastleigh Borough Council. Given that the existing status of the route would not be altered, for the time being at least, there is no reason to modify the plan to refer specifically to the Botley by-pass, other than the clarification now to be included in para 3.51 (**MM 5**). Nor would it justify a delay to the allocation of the strategic site as suitable, in principle, for new development as a result.
83. The fact that clay reserves on the site may be limited in extent/depth and of a quality that restricts their possible uses does not obviate the need to properly examine the potential for prior extraction before any new built development that might "sterilise" them, commences. Therefore, the requirement to this effect that the Council has added is necessary to accord with national policy.
84. Whilst it is appropriate that a range of types and sizes should be provided as part of a large new housing scheme in any event, an expectation that this should be "aligned to support the existing employment opportunities in the locality" as in para 3.66 is unreasonably detailed. Moreover, it is also unrealistic in terms of effectiveness in that definition is likely to prove difficult and divisive, potentially delaying delivery, as well as complicated to monitor, even if that can be done without disproportionate resources proving necessary. Accordingly, this part of the plan's text is not sound (**MM 8**).

85. In recognition of the inability to finalise the primary health care requirements of the new community in the absence of a detailed proposal, including in relation to existing local facilities, the Council properly proposes adding “, as required,” to the second point of the policy (**MM 8**).
86. Regarding affordable housing, the need for flexibility over targets to take into account economic viability, in accord with national guidance in the NPPF (e.g. para 173) is acknowledged by the Council in modifying policy SH1 to refer to “is expected to”, rather than “will”. In North Whiteley in particular it must also be borne in mind that many, if not all, of the site specific requirements listed in policy SH3, notably the completion of Whiteley Way and the new school provision, are not only “non negotiable” in principle, but also “essential at an early stage of development” if it is to be a sustainable urban extension.
87. This clearly has implications not only for the financing of the scheme but also for the delivery of those other infrastructure requirements that have the greatest influence on overall viability, such as the percentage, total and type of affordable housing. Whilst the new “affordable rent” model should help in this respect, as the evidence of the developer’s consultants predicts there may well have to be a certain prioritisation of infrastructure requirements by the Council and others to ensure continuing scheme viability, potentially on a staged basis over the plan period. Nevertheless, this is a matter to be addressed at the planning application stage and does not require any change to policy SH2 or its supporting text, as there is no doubt that the scheme is generally viable and deliverable even under current market conditions.
88. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (EB212) confirms that the new built development envisaged can be provided entirely on Zone 1 land. All the Zone 2 and 3 areas would be kept free of significant new building and retained as either open space, woodland or as part of the extensive general provision of green infrastructure. Consequently, the Environment Agency is content with the strategic allocation and, in principle, it complies with policy CP17.
89. Regarding surface water drainage, the largely impermeable soils mean that SUDS features will need to be provided within the development. The available evidence indicates that this can readily be done with a 100 year design period and a 30% allowance for climate change, as endorsed by the Environment Agency. The Council has now included an appropriate additional point in the policy to reflect this conclusion. Accordingly, there is no reason to expect an increase in flood risk elsewhere arising from the development and the proposals therefore comply with policy CP17 in this respect too.
90. At present, the plan refers to “at least 3,000” new dwellings (para 3.65) and acknowledges that a higher number may well prove achievable in due course, subject to suitable avoidance and mitigation measures being delivered in relation to nearby internationally designated sites of nature conservation interest, amongst other things. It is reasonable to conclude from the SA/SEA work carried out so far, amongst other things, that those very necessary measures are unlikely to vary greatly in scale, extent and/or cost whether the overall scheme is “at least 3,000” or “about 3,500” units in total.

91. Taking into account the overall size of the site and the technical analysis already undertaken, as well as the existence of a building consortium that stands ready to deliver the scheme, there is every indication that a higher total of about 3,500 new dwellings could be provided over the full plan period. Given that it is realistic, the higher figure would help to provide an improved degree of flexibility for new housing delivery over the district as a whole. It would also assist the viability of the overall project, as the available evidence is that, on the cumulative basis on which it must be considered in accord with the NPPF, the affordable housing percentage sought may have to be reduced somewhat, initially at least, in the present economic circumstances.
92. As the scheme is presently envisaged, the most environmentally sensitive parts of the total site have been excluded from consideration for any new built development. Nevertheless, the site is close to the Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods Special Protection Area (SPA), which is also part of the Solent and Southampton Water Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Arising from the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) work carried out to date in examining the potential impacts of the overall proposals on the nature conservation interests of these designated areas, the policy rightly requires a more detailed, project level, HRA, when site specific proposals are available.
93. In particular, this needs to include a full range of avoidance and mitigation measures for all qualifying species present and in relation to all relevant criteria, including regarding any increased recreational pressures on the R. Hamble and the Solent, both from this development and in combination with other nearby sites. It would also need to take into account the specific recommendations of the Solent Mitigation and Disturbance Project (OD 9), which is designed to ameliorate the impacts of growth across the sub region, with a final report anticipated during the first half of 2013, as well as relevant local hydrological factors.
94. Only around half of the approximately 200 ha site would be subject to new built development in any event and consequently there is more than sufficient space to provide very generous levels of new green infrastructure of varying types (including to attract dog walkers). Furthermore, whilst not directly comparable in respect of the relevant nature conservation interests potentially affected, the scale would be comfortably in excess of that deemed necessary to achieve similar nature conservation objectives in areas such as the Dorset and Thames Basin Heathlands.
95. Bearing in mind the Council's proposed changes to this policy and its supporting text, as well as Map 7, this reinforces the judgement that adequate avoidance and mitigation measures for nearby designated sites in all appropriate respects are realistically capable of being provided as part of the overall scheme. This includes in regard to access to the internationally protected sites around the R. Hamble, as endorsed by Natural England.
96. Both Natural England and the Environment Agency, as the relevant statutory bodies, are satisfied that, given the large areas of land, plus extensive areas of existing woodland adjoining, available to provide alternative recreational space for new and existing residents, a suitable, viable and deliverable package of measures can be provided. In particular, Natural England have endorsed the HRA process to date and specifically the AA undertaken of the North Whiteley strategic allocation at submission

stage (SD8), as well as the changes made to policy SH3 as a result (**MM 8**). Accordingly, no materially harmful impacts, including in respect of water and air quality, should arise for the international and nationally designated sites nearby and, in principle, there are no outstanding environmental reasons why the site cannot be allocated for development in a strategic level plan.

97. In the light of all of the above and taking into account the difficulty of definition, it is not reasonable or justified to require “exceptionally” high standards for the avoidance/mitigation proposals in the policy or that open space provision should “significantly exceed” normal requirements under other plan policies. However, it is necessary to ensure that the measures are managed and retained in perpetuity if they are to be effective and the Council proposes a suitable addition to the policy wording accordingly (**MM 8**).
98. Moreover, it remains essential to ensure that a fully detailed analysis is properly completed in connection with any specific scheme. As modified, policy SH3 is now sound in this respect and in full accord with the relevant national guidance in the NPPF (notably paras 113, 117 – 119 and 176). In the light of all of the above, the allocation of the site for new development of about 3,500 new dwellings is therefore sound, in principle, at this stage of the planning process, in advance of any detailed scheme being prepared.

Issue 7 – Barton Farm, Winchester

Policy WT2

99. Outline planning permission for 2,000 new dwellings and associated development has recently (October 2012) been granted on this strategic site, consistent with policy WT2. Given the lack of any land assembly issues, there is every indication that construction should start as soon as all relevant matters of detail are resolved. Consequently, new housing delivery should proceed as envisaged in the Council's trajectory in Appendix F of the plan. A modification to the policy wording is necessary to reflect the up-to-date position, in that a phasing plan is now sought rather than assuming development will commence from the south, as it may not (**MM 4**).
100. There is one outstanding issue to be resolved, as the extent of land east of the railway line to be provided as green infrastructure in connection with the outline permission does not include a small area in the south eastern corner and west of Courtenay Road. This lies outside the present built up area boundary of the town, as firmly defined by the rear gardens of existing housing, and will remain so once the Barton Farm scheme is completed with the new built development on land west of the rail line. Notwithstanding a clear line of vegetation along its northern boundary, this area is, effectively, both visually and physically, currently part of the open countryside at present. This close relationship will not be significantly altered by the new development to the north west across the strong boundary formed by the rail line.
101. The Council's Green Infrastructure Study (EB202) (2010) highlights the current shortfall of open space serving the town, which will not be entirely overcome by the new provision associated with the Barton Farm scheme. Moreover, the small area in question is unlikely to form a viable agricultural entity on its own, divorced as it will be from any adjoining farms or

holdings. In such circumstances, it is appropriate that a countryside designation continues to apply to this area. Accordingly, no change to the plan is required for soundness in respect of this matter.

102. It is also suggested that land to the north of Barton Farm, beyond Well House Lane, should be allocated for development in this plan to provide about 500 more new dwellings and around a further 20 ha of employment uses, in addition to WT2. However, in the absence of any detailed assessment of the likely environmental, landscape and/or infrastructure implications of such a scheme, let alone a SA, it is not possible to conclude that this site has any realistic delivery prospects for such proposals within a reasonable timeframe.
103. Furthermore, the identified scale of need in Winchester over the plan period, in accord with the overall strategy of the plan, is capable of being met at Barton Farm and elsewhere in and around the town under policies DS1 and WT1. As such, there is simply no need for a new or significantly extended strategic land allocation in this location, on a greenfield site in the open countryside, that will only even adjoin the built up area of the town on one side once the Barton Farm scheme is complete. Again, therefore, no change to the plan is required in respect of this matter. In conclusion, the policies and proposals for this strategic site are appropriate and justified, clear and deliverable.

Issue 8 – Market Towns and Rural Areas

Policies MTRA 1 and MTRA 2

104. The spatial strategy for this area relies largely on focussing most new development in and around local service centres, whilst also meeting the purposes of the SDNP and promoting the rural economy. As now amended by the Council, policy MTRA 1 sets out a suitable general approach to achieve these objectives, as endorsed in the SA/SEA. The four tier settlement hierarchy has evolved gradually from the 2006 Local Plan (POL2), through various consultation stages during the overall plan process and, importantly, now also takes into account the twelve principles listed as guidance in para 17 of the NPPF.
105. The Council's capacity work to date, including the SHLAA (EB104) (2011), has indicated some potential for new housing in nearly all of the district's market towns and larger villages to meet local needs without compromising the plan's other important sustainability objectives. It would also be consistent with the aim of achieving a sustainable pattern of development across the district for some new housing to continue to be built in the relevant rural service centres and their supporting settlements, in accord with the plan's overall strategy.
106. With this in mind and taking into account conclusions reached elsewhere in this report regarding total new housing numbers over the plan period, including the use of "about" to provide some flexibility, it is unclear and unsatisfactory in strategic terms for policy MTRA 2 to refer to a range for new housing in the market towns and rural areas, both overall and individually. This is particularly so when each settlement is soon to be assessed in detail for specific sustainable development options as part of the LP2 process, including a review of gap and settlement boundaries. Moreover, it is the upper level figures of the ranges which are needed to

meet the projections in the still extant SE Plan and local affordable housing needs, given that it is clearly unrealistic to assume zero net in-migration in this district over the plan period. The SA/SEA of the plan included the higher figures in the MTRA.

107. Accordingly, the plan needs to identify more specific targets for new housing delivery in the relevant area up to 2031 for clarity and to assist delivery. All the available evidence (as well as a simple addition of the figures in the ranges set out in MTRA 2 for the eight main settlements alone) shows that the higher figures should be readily achievable over the next twenty years. The altered figure would also facilitate greater consistency with the requirements of the SE Plan across the district in terms of new housing delivery and some back up in the event that the annual new housing delivery on the main strategic sites does not actually achieve the high levels envisaged in the Council's housing trajectory. Policy MRTA 2 should therefore be modified accordingly (**MM 13**), with consequential modifications to paras 3.87 and 3.97 (**MMs 11/12**).
108. In strategic terms, outside the SDNP but as "gateway locations" to it, both Bishops Waltham and New Alresford are clearly sustainable locations for new development to meet local needs, with a wide range of services and facilities serving rural hinterlands, as well as reasonable public transport links that are capable of improvement. Initial studies, including the SHLAA (EB104) (2011), indicate that both are realistically capable of accommodating some new housing within their present built up areas, as well as on suitable greenfield sites adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, so that there is capacity for about 500 dwellings at each over the plan period. Notwithstanding their position at the top of the settlement hierarchy, any significantly higher new housing allocations for either or both would risk an over-concentration at these locations that might unbalance the rural development pattern and the ability of smaller settlements to meet their own local needs for new housing.
109. At the next level a target of about 250 new dwellings each for the other six named settlements would properly reflect past levels of development, recent population projections and public consultations through the Blueprint exercise, amongst other things, including the SHLAA. The revised policy would allow for some minor deviation above and below the target figure, according to relevant local circumstances. It would also provide the opportunity for limited expansion to help meet local needs, including supporting existing facilities and some economic/commercial growth, where appropriate, as well as providing for local families and the increasing numbers of elderly people to help retain a balance of population (**MM 13**).
110. All individual land allocations and site specific issues, including regarding employment land/premises and retail uses in the MTRAs, as well as the details of open spaces and gaps between settlements, are essentially matters for LP2. This includes the review of all MTRA 2 settlement and gap boundaries, taking account of the above, as part of a plan led approach, in accord with the NPPF.
111. In relation to Wickham, there are existing local development constraints relating to surface water flood risks and the capacity of the waste water treatment works pending improvements not planned before 2017. Consequently, the settlement's specific capacity and local needs for new housing, together with the contributions that development might make to

necessary infrastructure improvements, are clearly matters for consultation, consideration and conclusion as part of the LP2 process and not this plan.

112. Notwithstanding and irrespective of proximity to the Fareham SDA, there is no firm evidence to demonstrate that Wickham cannot fulfil its designated role in the district's settlement hierarchy over the plan period which would justify any change to the identified number of new dwellings in the plan. On the other hand, in the light of all of the above, nor is there any present justification for seeking to bring forward new housing schemes in advance of the full LP2 process or to increase the allocation to reflect the fact that, as a district centre, Wickham's retail facilities are of a higher order than many other settlements of similar size.

Policy MTRA 3

113. The list of settlements included in this policy and the implications thereof have been queried in some instances, such as Twyford, Sparsholt and East Stratton, as well as Otterbourne and Littleton. However, the district's settlement hierarchy properly applies to areas within the SDNP as to those outside it, without in any way altering the legal duties and responsibilities applicable in the former. The fact that this plan has been submitted jointly by the SDNPA provides further confirmation that there is no reason to alter this or any other policies to achieve any greater level of protection of the Park's assets and qualities than would already be provided in the plan, as modified.
114. In all other respects the application of particular policies to individual settlements largely reflects their position under present policies in the 2006 Local Plan but also now has to take on board the guidance in the NPPF regarding rural areas. Based on all the factors taken into account by the Council, including population, service levels, public transport and links to larger centres, there is insufficient evidential justification for any changes to the lists of settlements or the overall hierarchy.
115. Nevertheless, in accordance with the April 2012 Local Plan Regulations, it would be possible for the Council to amend the lists as part of the LP2 process should a strong case for any such change emerge, without having to review this plan first. Consequently, the lists in MTRA 3 are not necessarily set for the full plan period. They could be adapted to better fit specific local circumstances should the need arise through the LP2 process or the South Downs National Park Local Plan, when the future of all the MTRAs settlements will be subject to greater scrutiny of site specific issues than is necessary for a strategic level plan. For clarity in relation to settlement boundaries it is necessary to delete "existing" from the first part of the policy and to make the same change as elsewhere in the plan regarding the protection of designated areas (**MM 14**).
116. In the absence of any strategic need for new housing in the smaller settlements, or the wider countryside to which policy MTRA 4 applies, there is no assumption that existing boundaries there would need to be reviewed. Nevertheless, scope exists for specific local needs to be met if clear community support is forthcoming. This policy is therefore considered to be generally consistent with the NPPF, notably paras 28 and 55, as well as reasonably and realistically capable of implementation.

Policy MTRA 4

117. Part two of the policy is not entirely consistent with national guidance in para 55 of the NPPF in excluding new residential conversions, unless for affordable housing. However, the relevant special circumstances in the district at present include that proposals for the conversion of existing rural buildings to new market housing only would be very likely to proliferate, due to high demand in an area of attractive landscape, much of which is within the SDNP.
118. For many buildings, this would inevitably be at the expense of alternative schemes for the other potential uses listed in the policy that would normally contribute more to the social and economic well being of the area and the SDNP, as well as positively assisting the implementation of national guidance in para 28 of the NPPF. It might also result in the need for more rural buildings across the landscape to meet the requirements of agriculture and other legitimate rural businesses. Accordingly, in these specific local circumstances, including the extent of the SDNP in the district, on balance, the case for a particular policy approach that differs from para 55 of the NPPF to a limited degree is considered sound and consistent with para 28 of the NPPF.

Policy MTRA 5

119. Despite its important tourism role in the local economy, given its location in the SDNP there is no need or justification for any special or different policy treatment for Marwell Wildlife Park, beyond what is already included in the plan under this generally positive policy.

Conclusions

120. In response to criticisms of some details in the submitted version, the Council has responded with suitable proposed additions to the supporting text for the MTRA policies. Notably, this includes changes to clarify responsibilities in relation to the SDNP, which covers much of the area, and also to better reflect national guidance in the NPPF. There is also further text relating to retail provision in the area, including that Bishops Waltham, New Alresford and Wickham, but not Denmead, are "District Centres" and clarifying how any new retail schemes should be assessed (**MM 10**). In addition, further additions are included to assist the implementation of the economic strategy, with complementary changes to the policy wording in MRTA 1.
121. Similarly, two new paras would now follow MTRA 2 to clarify how it is to be implemented, including through the LP2 process. With these modifications, policies MTRA 1 – 5 inclusive are considered to be sound and consistent with both the NPPF and the SE Plan.

Issue 9 – Environment [Policies CP11 – CP14]

Policy CP11 and Policy CP12

122. The Council has an extensive evidence base, including the Renewable Energy Study (2008) (EB208), the up to date Viability Study (2012) (EB101) and the 2012 BP3, to support the challenging targets set out in policies CP11 and CP12 on Low/Zero Carbon and Renewable Energy respectively. The district presently has one of the highest per capita carbon footprints in the South East, as well as water stress, and this situation is

recognised in the Council's Community Strategy (CD1) (2010).

123. The proposed policies would also be essentially consistent with the extant SE Plan, notably policy CC4 (and NRM1), as well as the non statutory PUSH sustainability framework and the equivalent policies of neighbouring authorities such as Southampton, Fareham and New Forest, albeit not Havant. Despite the additional cost burden arising, the relevant evidence indicates that, taking into account the full range of likely contributions as required by the guidance in the NPPF, most new development would remain viable at current values.
124. Taking into account the modifications that the Council now puts forward, to include reference to "allowable solutions" in the first point of CP11 (and the consequent deletion of the second point) (**MM 22**) and the clarification relating to areas designated for their international, national and/or local importance in the first point of CP12 (**MM 23**), both policies are reasonable and realistic regarding implementation across the district. Both are generally consistent with the expectations and guidance in paras 93 - 98 of the NPPF in setting out a proactive strategy, as well as making a positive contribution to the overall sustainability of the plan as a whole, in taking account of climate change over the long term. Accordingly, both are considered to be sound in this particular local context, albeit revision may be necessary if and when new national guidance is produced by central government.

Policy CP13

125. The criteria set down in this policy, to be augmented by more detailed guidance in LP2 in due course, should assist in securing high quality design for all new development in the district and each is relevant and appropriate in this context. Subject to the minor rewording modifications proposed by the Council for clarity, this policy is therefore considered to be sound.

Policy CP14

126. This policy requires schemes to maximise the development potential of all sites, particularly in urban areas, but subject to high quality design that responds to the general character of the area. This locally defined approach is consistent with the national guidance in the NPPF (para 47), albeit not always an easy balance to achieve in practice. Nevertheless, any use of minimum (or maximum) densities would reduce the flexibility to help deliver suitable outcomes that are well related to their surroundings. Whilst some rewording and reordering is necessary for clarity of interpretation and implementation, the policy is essentially sound in this strategic context (**MM 24**).

Issue 10 – Environment [CP15 – CP20]

Policy CP15

127. As proposed to be modified by the Council, this policy is positively worded and consistent with the NPPF's guidance, notably in paras 99 and 114, as well as including appropriate references to the water bodies of nature conservation interest in the district. Based on the robust evidence in the Green Infrastructure Study (EB202) (2010), it is closely aligned with both the PUSH Green Infrastructure Study (OD36) (2010) and the

Implementation Framework (OD34) (2012). Together with the revised supporting text, it is also suitably linked with other relevant policies of this plan, such as CP7, and those for the strategic sites, as well as in relation to biodiversity, the water environment and climate change. Accordingly it is sound and should prove effective in delivery terms.

Policy CP16

128. The submitted version of this policy has been updated from earlier ones to reflect the outcome of the SA and HRA processes, as now endorsed by the most relevant environmental agencies. It is therefore consistent with section 11 of the NPPF and supported by both the Council's Biodiversity Action Plan and Community Strategy. Nevertheless, as now acknowledged, it is also essential to update both policy and text to refer to the anticipated outcomes of ongoing studies, such as the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project, which is expected to report in 2013, albeit there is no need to list each individually in a strategic policy, if only because they may be superseded or become outdated over time.
129. Reference to the strategic approach to air quality is also required, for the reasons given in the proposed additional text (**MM 25**). With these modifications and taking into account the other relevant policies, including those concerning the strategic sites, the plan's overall approach on biodiversity and related matters is considered sound and should prove effective in practice.

Policy CP17

130. Both the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (EB212) (2007) and the PUSH document (OD14) (2011) provide a solid underpinning for this policy, which is supported by the Environment Agency. The Council's recent additions to the text, including a reference to the new joint Local Flood Risk Assessment for Hampshire, and particularly the clarification of the application of the sequential test in the first point of the policy would ensure consistency with the NPPF. With these changes the plan is sound at the strategic level in respect of the water environment, including regarding flooding and flood risk.

Policy CP18

131. There is an effective consensus that the implementation of a major development area (SDA) at North Fareham on the borders of the district clearly justifies, in principle, the designation of a new strategic gap between the SDA and Knowle/Wickham, as identified on Map 8 under policy SH4.
132. However, the policy and its supporting text are also quite clear that all the other gaps listed will be subject to review as part of LP2 in relation to local development needs, amongst other things, which will supersede the 2006 Local Plan. The text already includes the full criteria set out in the PUSH "Policy Framework for Gaps" (OD35) (Dec 2008), which will be applied to help ensure a consistent approach across the area. Therefore, there is no need for this strategic plan to include any further, more detailed or local guidance as to how the review should be carried out in practice.
133. The relationship of Twyford to Winchester and its location within the SDNP means that it neither justifies nor needs the definition of a new strategic

gap. This is particularly so given its position in the settlement hierarchy of the district, whereby any significant new greenfield development on its periphery is unlikely to be appropriate in policy terms in any event.

134. In Denmead, as in and around all towns and villages throughout the district, the detailed definition of specific boundaries for any settlement gaps and protected open spaces will take place in conjunction with the allocation of any necessary new land for development to meet district and local needs, in addition to the strategic sites, as part of the LP2 process. It is not a matter for this strategic level plan.
135. Moreover, as clarified by the Council at the hearings, the phrase “only development that does not physically or visually diminish the gap” implies that some which is generally appropriate to rural areas will meet that test. It is also not intended to preclude, in principle, the provision of suitable new infrastructure of an appropriate scale and extent, where it is necessary to help deliver strategic and other development that is otherwise acceptable under other relevant plan policies

Policy CP19

136. The supporting text to this policy specifically sets out the statutory purposes and duties of national park designation and, as submitted, this is a joint plan fully endorsed by the South Downs National Park Authority. Accordingly, there is no clear evidence to indicate that the impacts on the park and its environs have not been properly taken into account by the relevant authorities during the long plan preparation process.
137. Bearing in mind all the other relevant plan policies that also apply, including those temporarily “saved” from the 2006 plan pending LP2, and the national guidance in the NPPF, policy CP19 is considered to provide an entirely sound basis for assessing any proposals affecting the SDNP and its surroundings. It should also support its social and economic well being over the plan period. Details of local land management policies for the park as a whole or particular parts are not a matter for a strategic level plan such as this one.

Policy CP20

138. In response to English Heritage, the Council has recently included suitable and satisfactory additions to both the policy wording and supporting text to clarify their approach to heritage assets throughout the district and provide consistency with the NPPF in this respect.
139. The possibility of a Green Belt being defined around Winchester would have to involve the identification of an inner boundary which leaves space for sufficient new land for development to come forward, at the appropriate time, to meet long term needs well beyond the timescale of this plan. Given the SDNP to the east, this would presumably affect land on the periphery of the existing built up area to north, west and south of the town. It would therefore partly prejudge complex decisions about the long term future of Winchester that the Council is not in a position to realistically make at the present time. Nor should they in the absence of full consultation on and consideration of all the possible options that are practically deliverable.
140. In conjunction with the NPPF, the current suite of policies in this plan and elsewhere available to the Council is more than sufficient to ensure that

inappropriate and/or unsustainable development proposals in and around Winchester are unlikely to progress, during this plan period at least. The heritage assets and landscape character of the town and the district as a whole should receive appropriate protection accordingly. Therefore, there is no current necessity for a Green Belt around the town.

Issue 11 – Transport

Policy CP10

141. Notwithstanding criticisms of a lack of sufficient action on implementation to date, notably in Winchester itself, the aims and specific wording of policy CP10 are suitable and appropriate for a strategic plan. Importantly, the policy is entirely consistent with the priorities and objectives of the Hampshire Local Transport Plan (OD40), which has the same end date, and the relevant national guidance in the NPPF (e.g. paras 17 and 30). Moreover, in relation to cycling at least, a recently approved District Cycling Strategy and the construction of National Cycle Route 23 through the town indicates that some funding is being utilised to back up the objectives for Winchester, albeit more still needs to be done, not least in relation to car parking locally.
142. Partly by focussing development in large scale urban extensions, with existing public transport services that are capable of improvement, the plan's strategy is sufficiently positive in encouraging the use of modes other than the private car. This is particularly so bearing in mind the content of other policies, including DS1 and those relating to the strategic sites. In particular, policy CP10 should help to ensure that the development of the three main areas of new housing includes the necessary on site facilities to make them sustainable locations in their own right and, where necessary, also delivers effective off site improvements, including to the strategic road network, if appropriate.
143. Nevertheless, the addition of a new para (before 6.25) to the supporting text, as proposed by the Council, would assist effectiveness and implementation (**MM 21**). Specific highway concerns relating to North Whiteley, including the future of the Botley by-pass scheme, are addressed under Issue 6. There is no need to specifically refer to that proposal in this general policy.

Issue 12 – Infrastructure, Delivery, Flexibility, Monitoring, Implementation

Policy CP21

144. Following the 2011 Infrastructure Study, the 2012 Infrastructure Delivery Plan (EB106), which involved full consultation with providers and others, confirms that there is no overall constraint to the delivery of the plan's overall strategy. However, a number of key infrastructure elements, including in relation to the strategic road network and specifically the M3 and M27 motorways, have been identified. The 2012 Viability Study (EB101) has examined the provision of these essential requirements and others on a cumulative basis, as required in para 173 of the NPPF, and concluded that they are economically deliverable.
145. This includes in respect of each of the strategic sites, as documented in the

relevant Background Papers (BP5, BP6 and BP7). Accordingly, it may be concluded that there is clear, robust and up to date evidence to justify that the proposals in the plan can be realistically delivered with the necessary supporting infrastructure over the plan period.

146. Consultations with the local water companies have confirmed that, notwithstanding the district's status as part of a "water stress" area, in common with large parts of SE England, there is adequate supply capacity to meet the needs of the new development proposed in the plan, including for each of the strategic sites and elsewhere. As now to be modified to reflect practical and viability concerns, **(MM 22)**, policy CP11 takes into account the requirements of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH),.
147. Questions relating to specific household waste disposal facilities, including on the strategic sites, such as North Whiteley, are a matter for the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, taking into account the levels of new development over the plan period and the relevant national regulations. Nevertheless, the Council's proposed addition to para 3.73 to confirm the need for additional provision in connection with the strategic housing development at North Whiteley (policy SH3), albeit not necessarily on site, is desirable for clarity **(MMs 9/28)**.
148. A plan has to have sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, not least in respect of the national and local economy, over the plan period. Therefore, it is essential to include modifications that ensure the plan's policies avoid being inflexible. For example, "will" has to be amended to "should" (or similar) in respect of affordable housing provision, to allow for the potential cumulative effects of various other infrastructure requirements on economic viability to also be taken into account **(MMs 3/6)**.
149. This is reinforced by the ongoing importance of monitoring, including regarding delivery on the three strategic housing sites, as now recognised by the Council through significant earlier additions to App D of the plan and a modification to para 8.5 **(MM 27)**. Amongst other things, this would require other sources of supply to come forward in the event of difficulties or delays with delivery of one or more of the main sites. Given the Council's commitment to review it around 2020/2021 in any event, the plan may be judged as sufficiently flexible and therefore likely to deliver on its objectives over the plan period.
150. Criticisms of policy CP21 in relation to developer contributions for mitigation and avoidance measures needed to protect designated sites can be addressed by adding a new last point to para 7.57, as the Council proposes **(MM 26)**. This refers appropriately to "protect, avoid or mitigate harm", as well as "local, national or international importance ", regarding designated areas. It is not necessary to also list specific sites or areas (whether in Winchester district or nearby) for this to be effective, given the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, nor to link it directly to any specific current studies or reports, as they may become out of date or be superseded at any time.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

151. My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The Local Plan Part 1 is identified within the approved LDS July 2012 which sets out an expected adoption date of March 2013. The Local Plan Part 1's content and timing are compliant with the LDS.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in January 2007. Consultation has been compliant with the requirements therein, including on the Council's post-submission proposed 'main modification' changes (MM).
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out and is adequate.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The Habitats Regulations AA Report (2012) plus Addendum (2012) (MM 30) concludes that the Local Plan Part 1 will not have adverse effects on the integrity of European sites alone or in combination with other plans and programmes and sets out why further AA will be necessary at the project level.
National Policy	The Local Plan Part 1 complies with national policy, except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Regional Strategy (RS)	The Local Plan Part 1 is in general conformity with the South East Plan, except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations.	The Local Plan Part 1 complies with the Act and the Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

152. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness for the reasons set out above which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

153. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Nigel Payne

Inspector

This report is accompanied by the Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Appendix – Main Modifications

The main modifications are expressed by specifying the changes in words in italics.

The main modifications, page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the Submission Local Plan Part 1 (June 2012) – Version 2 (03/10/12).

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM1	29 77	DS1 CP1	Move para 1.42 to form first part of policy DS1. Add “about” before “4,000” in first point, replace “some 5,500” with “about 6,000” in second point and replace “1,500” with “about 2,500” in third point of policy DS1 Replace “11,000” with “12,500” in first line of policy CP1. Replace “5,500” with “6,000” in fifth line, “1,500” with “2,500” in sixth line, “7,500” with “8,000” in seventh line and “3,000” with “3,500” in ninth line of policy CP1.
MM2	29	3.1	In the second sentence replace “11,000” with “about 12,500” and add “about 20 hectares of new employment land to assist” before “economic”.
MM3	40/41	WT1	In first main point add “about” before “4,000” and replace “will” with “should” after “40%”. In second main point replace “(projected to be” with “of” and delete “with this figure being updated prior to any site allocations)”.
MM4	42	WT2	In second point replace “radiating from the southern urban edges of the site” with “in accordance with an approved phasing plan”.
MM5	50	3.51	In last sentence add “through saved Local Plan Policy T12” after “completed” and add new sentence at end - “The status of Policy T12 will be reviewed by Local Plan Part 2 taking account of any plans by the highway authority relating to the timing and implementation of the by-pass, including the need for developer contributions.”.
MM6	53	SH1	In second point replace “will” with “should”. In third point replace “3,000” with “3,500” and “will” with “should”.
MM7	54	SH2	In first part delete “(of which about 2,350 will be within Winchester District in this plan period)”. In third point replace “at least” with “about”. In last point replace “two primary schools” with “primary school places”.
MM8	58	SH3 3.66	In first part replace “3,000” with “3,500”. In second point replace “two additional primary schools” with “additional primary school places” and add “, as required,” after “provision”. In sixth point add “, to include improvements to Junction 9 of the M27 to be agreed with the relevant highway authorities.” after “traffic”. In ninth point add “, including their phasing and long term management.” after “development”. First sentence of para 3.66 to stop after “types”.
MM9	60	3.73	Add new sentence at end – “There is a need for a new household waste recycling centre in the area which the development should contribute towards, either by providing a site if appropriate or through a financial contribution.”.

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Policy/ Paragraph</i>	<i>Main Modification</i>
MM10	66	3.84	<i>In first part of first sentence replace “Wickham and Denmead” with “and Wickham”.</i>
MM11	66	3.87	<i>Delete fourth sentence.</i>
MM12	69	3.97	<i>Delete last sentence.</i>
MM13	69/70	MTRA2	<i>In second part replace “400 – 500” with “about 500” and “150 – 250” with “about 250”. In last part replace “local or national” with “local, national or international”.</i>
MM14	72	MTRA3	<i>In first point delete “existing”. In last part replace “local or national” with “local, national or international”.</i>
MM15	77	5.9	<i>Update table for consistency with other modifications, including “Total - 12,500”, and revised trajectory in Appendix F.</i>
MM16	80	CP2	<i>In last part delete “family” after “bed”.</i>
MM17	87	CP5	<i>In penultimate part replace “local or national” with “local, national or international”.</i>
MM18	88	CP6	<i>Add new point at end – “whether the loss is part of an agreed plan to provide improved services in equally accessible locations.”.</i>
MM19	95	CP8 6.14	<i>At end of first part of CP8 add new sentence “About 20 hectares of new employment land will be provided for economic growth and future employment needs.”. Replace last sentence of 6.14 with “About 20 hectares of new land will need to be found.”.</i>
MM20	47	WT3 3.39 3.40	<i>In first sentence replace “identified as an Opportunity” with “allocated as an Employment”. Replace paras 3.39 and 3.40 with – “Its development should help realise the Vision for Winchester and the Community Strategy’s aims for the wider District and must be compatible with the policy framework set out in this plan. Consequently, Bushfield Camp is allocated for employment uses. This recognises the opportunity for the site to contribute towards social, economic and environmental aspirations for Winchester and for a form of development which ensures that the key aspects of the site are retained in perpetuity.”.</i>
MM21	98	6.25	<i>Add new para before 6.25 – “Implementation of this policy will be through the development management process and the delivery of the strategy set out in this plan. Details of transport related schemes are set out in a number of plans and strategies such as the Hampshire Sustainable Transport Towns Project and the Council’s Cycling Strategy. In addition, Hampshire County Council, in partnership with the Local Planning Authorities, has adopted (September 2012) a Transport Statement for the Winchester District, providing details of transport objectives and delivery priorities. The list of schemes in the statement will be updated annually and a “live” version is available on the County Council’s website”.</i>
MM22	100	CP11	<i>Replace last sentence of first point with “If this is shown not to be feasible or viable the Council will accept an on site carbon reduction of not less than the relevant Carbon Compliance levels stipulated by the Zero Carbon Homes policy, with the remaining reduction of regulated emissions to be provided by means of “Allowable Solutions.”. Delete second point.</i>

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Policy/ Paragraph</i>	<i>Main Modification</i>
MM23	101	CP12	<i>In first part replace “local or national” with “local, national or international”.</i>
MM24	104	CP14	<i>Reword policy to read – “In order to ensure that scarce development land is used effectively, the Local Planning Authority will support higher densities on sites which have good access to facilities and public transport, particularly within the urban areas. The development potential of all sites should be maximised and will be balanced against the need to promote high quality design. The primary determinant of the acceptability of a scheme will be how well the design responds to the general character of the area.”.</i>
MM25	109	7.29	<i>Add new para after 7.29 – “In addition, the Habitats Regulation Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal advise that a strategic approach to air quality management is required. This is to ensure the continued protection of sites of international, European and national importance, as well as local nature conservation sites given the planned level of growth. The location of air quality monitoring sites and the setting of thresholds to trigger further investigation should be determined through lower level assessments and, where appropriate, be applied as a condition on planning permissions.</i>
MM26	118	7.57	<i>In last point add “protect” before “avoid” and replace “local or national or European” with “local, national or international”.</i>
MM27	123	8.5	<i>Replace second sentence with – “This will be monitored to ensure both an adequate 5 year supply of housing land District-wide and to check the situation in each of the spatial areas, particularly in relation to the strategic allocations.”.</i>
MM28	177	App E	<i>Delete “N” before “Whiteley”.</i>
MM29	191	App F	<i>Update Housing Trajectory as in Council Schedule of Further Modifications 12 November 2012, modified in accord with other recommendations in this Report.</i>
MM30	HRA	HRA	<i>Add addendum to HRA as in Council Schedule of Further Modifications 12 November 2012.</i>

SCHEDULE OF WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (2006)
POLICIES TO BE RETAINED OR REPLACED ON ADOPTION OF LOCAL PLAN
PART 1

Policies shaded dark grey not saved from 2006 Local Plan

Policies shaded light grey to be not saved from adoption of Local Plan Part 1

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
DP1	Design Statement requirement		No – delete
DP2	Master Plan requirement for large sites		Yes
DP3	General Design Criteria		Yes
DP4	Landscape and the Built Environment		Yes
DP5	Design of Amenity Open Space		Yes
DP6	Efficient Use of Resources		
DP7	Aerodrome Safety		No - delete
DP8	Flood Risk.		
DP9	Infrastructure for New Development	DS1, WT1, SH1, MTRA1, CP21	
DP10	Pollution Generating Development		Yes
DP11	Unneighbourly Uses		Yes
DP12	Pollution sensitive development		Yes
DP13	Development on Contaminated land		Yes
DP14	Public Utilities		Yes
DP15	Renewable Energy Schemes		
CE1	Strategic Gaps	CP18	Yes (Gap boundaries)
CE2	Local Gaps	CP18	Yes (Gap boundaries)
CE3	Development in Gaps	CP18	
CE4	Essential Services	CP6	
CE5	Landscape character	CP20	
CE6	AONB	CP19	
CE7	Nature Conservation – International Sites		
CE8	Nature Conservation – National Sites	CP16	
CE9	Nature Conservation –	CP16	

¹ Policies which are retained will continue to be ‘saved’ as statutory planning policies until replaced by future Development Plan Documents.

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
	Locally Designated Sites		
CE10	Other Sites of Nature Conservation Interest	CP16	
CE11	New and Enhanced Sites of Nature Conservation Value	CP16	
CE12	Agricultural Land Quality		
CE13	Essential rural development	MTRA4	
CE14	Agri-industry Agri-distribution	MTRA4	
CE15	Fish Farms	MTRA4	
CE16	Farm diversification	MTRA4	
CE17	Re-use of non-residential buildings in the countryside		Yes
CE18	Existing Employment Uses	MTRA4	
CE19	Housing for Essential Rural Workers		Yes
CE20	Housing for Essential Rural Workers (permanent dwellings)		Yes
CE21	Removal of occupancy conditions		Yes
CE22	Dwellings for Other Rural Workers		Yes
CE23	Extension & Replacement of Dwellings		Yes
CE24	Conversion & changes of Use to residential		Yes
CE25	Conversion of Larger Buildings in Extensive Grounds		Yes
CE26	Staff Accommodation		Yes
CE27	Gypsies & Travelling Showpeople		
CE28	Sustainable Recreation Facilities		Yes
HE1	Archaeological Site Preservation		Yes
HE2	Archaeological Site Assessment		Yes
HE3	Historic Parks, gardens and battlefields	CP20	
HE4	Conservation Areas – Landscape Setting		Yes

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
HE5	Conservation Areas – development criteria		Yes
HE6	Conservation Areas – detail required		Yes
HE7	Conservation Areas – Demolition of Buildings		Yes
HE8	Conservation Areas – Retention of Features		Yes
HE9	Shopfronts – Retention of Existing		Yes
HE10	Shopfronts – New Shopfronts		Yes
HE11	Signage		Yes
HE12	Blinds & Shutters		Yes
HE13	Historic Buildings – Changes of Use		
HE14	Alterations to Historic Buildings		Yes
HE15	Listed Buildings – Demolition of		
HE16	Listed Buildings – Setting of		
HE17	Re-use and conversion of historic redundant, agricultural or industrial buildings		Yes
H1	Provision for Housing Development	CP1	
H2	Local Reserve Sites	CP1	
H3	Settlement Policy Boundaries		Yes
H4	Outside Policy Boundaries	MTRA3	
H5	Affordable Housing	CP3	
H6	Rural Exception Sites	CP4	
H7	Housing Mix and Density	CP2 & CP14	
H8	Special Needs Housing		
H9	Mobile Homes (New)		No – delete
H10	Mobile Homes (Loss)		Yes
E1	Employment Strategy	DS1, WT1, SH1 MTRA1, CP8	
E2	Loss of Employment	CP9	
E3	Winchester Office Development – Town Centre		
E4	Winchester Office Development - Outside Town Centre	DS1, WT1	
SF1	Town Centre		Yes

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
	Development - New		
SF2	Town Centre Development - Loss		Yes
SF3	Town Centre Development – Food & Drink		Yes
SF4	Town Centre Development – Residential		
SF5	Primary Shopping Area		Yes
SF6	New Facilities and Services	CP6	
SF7	Loss of Facilities and Services	CP6	
SF8	Further & Higher Education	MTRA5	
RT1	Important Amenity Areas		Yes
RT2	Important Recreational Space		Yes
RT3	Smaller Important Open Spaces	CP7	
RT4	Recreational Space for New Housing Development	CP7	
RT5	Site Allocations for Recreation		Yes
RT6	Children’s Play Facilities	CP7	
RT7	Public Use of Private Facilities		
RT8	Formal Recreational Facilities in Countryside		
RT9	Recreational Routes	CP15	
RT10	Meon Valley Bridleway		
RT11	Equestrian Development		Yes
RT12	Golf related development		Yes
RT13	Noisy Sports		Yes
RT14	Indoor Leisure Uses	DS1, WT1, SH1, MTRA1	
RT15	Facilities for tourism in the settlements	DS1, WT1, SH1. MTRA1, CP8	
RT16	Tourism & Leisure Facilities in the Countryside		Yes
RT17	Camping/ Caravanning Sites		Yes
RT18	Permanent Short-Stay		Yes

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
	Tourist Accommodation in Countryside		
RT19	Enabling Development with Tourism, Recreation & Leisure Developments in Countryside		
T1	Development Location	DS1, WT1, SH1, MTRA1, CP10	
T2	Development Access		Yes
T3	Development Layout		Yes
T4	Parking Standards		Yes
T5	Off-Site Transport Contributions	CP21	
T6	Integrated Transport Infrastructure	CP10	
T7	Re-use of railway lines		
T8	Footpath cycling etc networks improvements		
T9	Freight Facilities		Yes
T10	Traffic Management B3354/B2177		
T11	New Road Schemes		No - delete
T12	Safeguarded Land (Botley By-pass & Whiteley Way)		Yes
W1	Winchester's Special Character	WT1	
W2	Town Centre, Shopping & Facilities - Broadway/Friarsgate		Yes
W3	Recreation - Bushfield Camp	WT3	
W4	Park and Ride		Yes
W5	Town Centre Traffic Management	WT1	
W6	Parking Controls & Servicing – New Public car parks		Yes
W7	Parking Controls & Servicing – Parking Standards		Yes
W8	Parking Controls & Servicing – Service Vehicles		
W9	Environmental Traffic Management	WT1	
W10	New Footpath Proposals		Yes
W11	New Bridleway		Yes

WDLPR Policy	WDLPR 2006 Policy Topic	Replaced by Local Plan Part 1 Policy?	WDLPR Policy retained?¹
	Proposal		
MDA1	Proposals for West of Waterlooville	SH2	
MDA2	Proposals for Winchester City (north)	WT2	
S1	Bishop's Waltham – Ponds		Yes
S2	Bishop's Waltham - Malt Lane		Yes
S3	Bishop's Waltham – Abbey Mill	CP9	
S4	Bishop's Waltham – Pondsides		Yes
S5	Bishop's Waltham – transport		
S6	Cheriton – Freeman's Yard	CP9	
S7	Curdrige – Hilsons Road		Yes
S8	Denmead – centre		
S9	Kings Worthy – footpaths	CP15	
S10	Proposals for land at former station yard Sutton Scotney		Yes
S11	Whiteley – Whiteley Farm		
S12	Proposals at Whiteley Green		Yes
S13	Whiteley – Solent 1		
S14	Whiteley – Solent 2		Yes
S15	Whiteley – Little Park Farm		Yes
S16	Pegham Coppice (Wickham)		

Part of the Winchester District Development Framework

Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy

Final Version of Policies recommended for
adoption by Full Council on 20 March 2013



Development Strategy

Policy DS1 - Development Strategy and Principles

When considering development proposals across the District, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council will work proactively to find solutions which mean proposals that accord with planning policies can be approved wherever possible and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

The Local Planning Authority will support the delivery of new housing, economic growth and diversification through the following development strategy:-

- Winchester Town will make provision for about 4,000 new homes through a range of accommodation to meet the needs of the whole community and to ensure that the local economy builds on its existing and growing strengths in higher education, creative and media industries, and other knowledge-based activities, whilst respecting the town's special heritage and setting.**
- The South Hampshire Urban Areas will make provision for two sustainable new neighbourhoods to provide about 6,000 new homes and contribute towards meeting the PUSH strategy of improving economic performance by providing major housing and economic growth and community and physical infrastructure.**
- The Market Towns and Rural Area will make provision for about 2,500 new homes, and to support economic and community development that serves local needs in the most accessible and sustainable locations, promotes the vitality and viability of communities, and maintains their rural character and individual settlement identity.**

Development proposals will be expected to make efficient use of land within existing settlements, and prioritise the use of previously developed land in accessible locations in accordance with the development strategies set out in Policies WT1, SH1 and MTRA1.

In delivering the District's housing, employment and community requirements development proposals will be expected to demonstrate conformity with the following principles:-

- Maintaining and enhancing the importance of environmental, heritage and landscape assets and making efficient use of scarce natural resources,**
- making the use of public transport, walking and cycling easy, to reduce non-essential car use;**

- **integrating development of homes, jobs, services and facilities;**
- **applying a town centres first approach to retail, leisure or other development proposals that are high attracters of people, in accordance with the following hierarchy of centres:**
 - **Sub-regional town centre – Winchester**
 - **Town centre – Whiteley**
 - **District centres – Bishops Waltham, New Alresford, Wickham**
 - **Local centres – Denmead, Kings Worthy, and in Winchester Oliver’s Battery, Stockbridge Road/Andover Road, Weeke;**
- **achieving high standards of design and sensitivity to character, setting and cultural heritage;**
- **contributing to individual and community wellbeing, health and safety and socially inclusivity;**
- **testing existing infrastructure and service capacity to serve new development, and making arrangements in a timely manner for appropriate increases in capacity or measures to mitigate impact;**
- **addressing the impact on climate change, renewable energy, air quality, green infrastructure, recycling/waste, flooding issues and the water environment.**

Policy WT1 - Development Strategy for Winchester Town

The spatial planning vision for Winchester Town will be achieved through:-

- **provision of about 4000 new homes (2011-2031) to meet a range of community needs and deliver a wide choice of homes including affordable homes to ensure social inclusion. This will be achieved through :**
 - **development and redevelopment of existing premises and sites and other opportunities within and adjoining the defined built-up area of Winchester, to deliver some 2000 new homes .**
 - **a new neighbourhood to the north of Winchester at Barton Farm for about 2,000 homes, of which 40% should be affordable, and associated support facilities and services in accordance with the requirements of Policy WT2;**
- **opportunities for economic development and diversification through:**
 - **retention of existing employment land and premises (in accordance with policy CP9) and new development or redevelopment to provide for new business growth to broaden Winchester’s economic base through growth in sectors including knowledge, tourism, creative and media industries and more specifically start-up premises to encourage entrepreneurship;**

- provision of additional retail floorspace through existing planned developments at Silver Hill in the short to medium term and future additional provision of about 9,000 sq. m. to 2031 to support Winchester's role as a sub-regional shopping centre for existing and new communities.
- promotion of the town centre as the preferred location for new development that attracts high visitor numbers such as retail, commercial and offices, leisure, culture and tourism. Proposals for new floorspace of 1,000 sq. m. or more outside the defined town centre will need to demonstrate that it would not have a harmful impact on the town centre;
- provision of education facilities to meet the needs of the Town, through the provision of a primary school in conjunction with Barton Farm and an additional primary school on a site to be identified;
- additional open space and recreational provision, including:
 - opportunities to address any under-provision of open space, to be secured through new allocations and in conjunction with development;
 - retention of existing open space and recreation provision and not releasing this for alternative purposes, given the amount of the existing shortfall;
- retention of existing and provision of new green infrastructure to ensure that the Town retains its well-treed character, attractive green setting, its well-defined urban edge, and access to open space and adjoining countryside;
- implementation of the Winchester Access Plan and the Winchester Air Quality Action Plan to ensure that transport provision and access to and within the Town provides opportunities for sustainable transport provision and reduces pollution and carbon emissions;
- exploring the opportunities presented by the site at Bushfield Camp in accordance with Policy WT3;
- ensuring that all new development is of the highest design quality in terms of architecture and landscape, fully considers and respects the context of its setting and surroundings to reflect local distinctiveness, and the historical and cultural heritage of the Town and makes a positive contribution to the quality of the area.

Policy WT2 - Strategic Housing Allocation – North Winchester

Land at Barton Farm, Winchester, as shown on the following map, is allocated for the development of about 2,000 dwellings together with supporting uses. Development should accord with the Development Strategy for Winchester Town (Policy WT1), other policies in this Plan and the following site-specific requirements:-

- **the creation of a distinctive, well integrated suburb of Winchester Town which respects its local context, and enhances the standards of sustainable design in the locality;**
- **the proposal should follow an organic sequence of development, in accordance with an approved phasing plan, with the timely provision of infrastructure and community facilities to the benefit of the new community at the earliest possible time, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Summary at Appendix E;**
- **development proposals should be accompanied by a comprehensive masterplan for approval, which includes an indicative layout and phasing plan and sets out details of how this will be achieved. The masterplan should reflect the location of the site and minimise its impact on the setting of Winchester and local landscape, to incorporate the highest standards of contemporary urban design and the effective use of the site through the application of appropriate densities, layout and form;**
- **the development should be designed to meet the housing needs of all sectors of the community, including families, the young and older people to ensure equality and social cohesion. House types and affordability should be matched so far as possible to the local employment base in order to reduce the need for in and out commuting;**
- **provision of a new local centre, with a range of shopping facilities to meet locally-generated needs, small-scale employment uses, pre-school facilities, and primary education. The potential for relocating all or some of the facilities on the current Henry Beaufort secondary school site should be investigated;**
- **improved accessibility to the town centre and the railway station by sustainable transport systems to reduce the need to travel by car, including public transport provision and enhancement, footpaths, cycleways, bridleways, and green corridors. Measures to mitigate the traffic impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road networks should be included and funded, including the provision of a park and ride ‘light’ scheme within the northern part of development;**
- **the provision of publicly accessible land to the east of the railway line to help meet requirements for green infrastructure, and to mitigate potential environmental impacts, in addition to substantial areas of on-site open space to meet all the recreational needs of the new community, including the retention and enhancement of existing routes within the site to provide links between existing and proposed green infrastructure;**
- **avoid harmful impacts on water resources, given the proximity of the site to the River Itchen which is designated as a European site of**

nature conservation interest. The development should provide a fully integrated Sustainable Drainage System to mitigate against any potential flood risk, apply a flood risk sequential approach to development across the site, and ensure adequate separation from the Harestock Waste Water Treatment Works;

- **protection and enhancement of landscaping and mature trees along the ridge which runs from east to west across the site, along Well House Lane and Andover Road, and within the area to the east of the railway line;**
- **the provision of major new structural planting, especially to soften the impact of development in views from the north and to reduce the impact of noise and light pollution arising from the development of the site.**

Policy WT3 - Bushfield Camp Employment Site

Land at Bushfield Camp, Winchester, as defined on the following map, is allocated as an employment site. A comprehensive, conservation led approach is required for the site, given its location in the Winchester - Compton Street Local Gap, its proximity to the South Downs National Park and the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation, and the presence of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation Interest, existing trees and archaeological remains.

Proposals must resolve the long term future of the site by securing sustainable development and delivering a high quality, accessible scheme which meets the following criteria:-

- **limits the total area of development to 20 hectares of land, prioritising use of the previously occupied area;**
- **delivers necessary social, economic or environmental development which could not otherwise be accommodated within or around Winchester, does not compete or detract from the town centre, is compatible with the provision made elsewhere through this strategy, and reflects other policy statements prepared by the Council including the Vision for Winchester;**
- **secures and lays out for public use the undeveloped part of the site for recreational purposes in perpetuity, but allowing for appropriate strategic landscaping;**
- **promotes non-vehicular access to and within the site, through the creation of new routes and extensions/diversions of existing routes to ensure that the site integrates with surrounding areas and to minimise and mitigate its impact on the strategic highway network;**

- **exploits the site’s proximity to the Winchester South Park and Ride site to access the site without reliance on the private car;**
- **includes a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment to consider the potential effects on biodiversity, on-site and on the River Itchen, and the possible in-combination effects of the development on nearby sites of national and international importance. The development proposals must meet the tests of the Habitats Regulations and be accompanied by a full set of measures to avoid or mitigate the local and wider impacts of the development;**
- **prepare a green infrastructure strategy to both enhance the development and mitigate potential impacts on the water environment and biodiversity. This should include the provision of multi-functional green links throughout the site and with the adjoining area;**
- **be of exemplary design and configuration so as to have an acceptable impact on the setting of Winchester, the South Downs National Park and the wider area, retain key views, and take into account its unique gateway location and the various designations that affect the site and its surroundings;**
- **maximises the use of sustainable construction techniques and materials so that it achieves high levels of sustainability and delivers a zero/low carbon scheme.**

Only schemes which incorporate an innovative and progressive approach, resulting from assessing the needs of the town and community views, and satisfy the above criteria and other relevant policies of this Plan will be favourably considered.

Policy SH1 - Development Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas
--

The vision for the South Hampshire Urban Areas will be achieved through the provision of:-

- **new housing to meet a range of community needs and deliver a wide choice of homes, including affordable, to ensure social inclusion;**
- **a new community to the West of Waterlooville consisting of about 3,000 homes (about 600 in Havant Borough), of which 40% should be affordable, and associated employment provision, support facilities and services, in accordance with the requirements of Policy SH2;**
- **a new community to the North of Whiteley consisting of about 3,500 homes, of which 40% should be affordable, which will support existing employment provision and provide new and expanded**

infrastructure, facilities and services, in accordance with the requirements of Policy SH3;

- **peripheral green infrastructure associated with the North of Fareham Strategic Development Area, which is located within the adjoining Fareham Borough, in accordance with the requirements of Policy SH4;**
- **commercial floorspace at Whiteley, Segensworth and West of Waterlooville (mostly already committed), which will contribute to achieving the economic strategy for the PUSH area and help to provide balanced new communities nearby;**
- **protection of important natural assets, particularly habitats of national and international importance, and Gaps which are important in defining the urban structure of the area.**

Policy SH2 - Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville

Land to the West of Waterlooville (as shown on the following map) is allocated for the development of about 3,000 dwellings together with supporting uses.

The development should deliver the agreed vision for the West of Waterlooville major development area which aims to create a sustainable urban extension to Waterlooville, integrated with Waterlooville town centre and forming the fourth quadrant of the town. It should accord with Policy DS1, in addition to the following site-specific requirements:

- **be integrated with Waterlooville town centre, including measures to enable good pedestrian and cycle access across Maurepas Way;**
- **retail provision within the development should be within a modest local centre which is subservient to Waterlooville town centre;**
- **provide about 23 hectares of employment land, including uses which will help link the development to the town centre, create a vibrant commercial area and include some mixed housing/ commercial areas;**
- **provide a new access road through the development between the A3/Ladybridge Road roundabout and the A3/Maurepas Way roundabout with public transport provision and other measures to reduce traffic generation. The development should fund any off-site transport improvements necessary to achieve this and to accommodate traffic likely to be generated by the development;**

- **provide primary school places and contributions to off-site improvements to secondary education to accommodate the development, along with other physical and social infrastructure.**

Policy SH3 - Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whiteley

Land to the North of Whiteley (as shown on the following map) is allocated for the development of about 3,500 dwellings together with supporting uses. The development should reflect Whiteley's predominantly wooded character and setting by maximising the opportunities presented by the substantial areas of green space within and adjoining the allocated area, which are either unsuitable for built development or needed to mitigate potential impacts on protected sites. Development proposals should be accompanied by a comprehensive masterplan which includes an indicative layout and phasing plan, and sets out details of how this will be achieved

The development should also complement and take advantage of facilities in the nearby town centre and major employment at the Solent Business Parks. It should accord with Policy DS1, in addition to the following site-specific requirements:

- **protect and enhance the various environmentally sensitive areas within and around the site, avoiding harmful effects or providing mitigation as necessary. This will include any measures as necessary to mitigate the impact of noise and light pollution on the adjoining areas. The existing woodlands on and adjoining the site should be used to create attractive neighbourhoods with a distinctive sylvan character, improve biodiversity, provide recreational facilities including areas for children's play, and possibly be managed to as a source of renewable energy (woodfuel);**
- **provide for pre-school facilities, additional primary school places and a secondary school to accommodate the development, along with other physical and social infrastructure (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Summary at Appendix E), including provision, as required, for primary health care in the locality to serve the new community;**
- **provide a comprehensive assessment of existing access difficulties affecting Whiteley, agree solutions prior to planning permission being granted, and incorporate specific proposals to ensure that these are implemented at an early stage of the development;**
- **undertake a full Transport Assessment to ensure that the package of mitigation measures are incorporated into the scheme, including pedestrian and cycle links, a public transport strategy and any off-site contributions as deemed necessary;**

- **complete Whiteley Way at an early stage of development, in an environmentally sensitive manner which does not cause undue severance for the new community or encourage traffic from adjoining areas to use the new route to gain access to the strategic road network;**
- **provide measures to ensure that smarter transport choices are made to achieve a modal shift which minimises car usage, manages the impact of private cars on the highway network, and implements measures necessary to accommodate additional traffic, to include improvements to Junction 9 of the M27 to be agreed with the relevant highway authorities. These should improve Whiteley’s level of self containment and make a significant contribution towards reducing commuting levels;**
- **avoid harmful impacts on water resources, given the proximity of the site to European sites of nature conservation interest. The development should provide a fully integrated Sustainable Drainage System to mitigate against any potential flood risk and apply a flood risk sequential approach to development across the site;**
- **undertake a full assessment of the impact on habitats and bio-diversity (especially those of national and international importance such as the River Hamble and the Solent) of development both on-site and in combination with other nearby sites;**
- **include a Green Infrastructure Strategy which sets out measures to avoid harmful impacts and mitigate the local and wider impacts of the development, including their phasing and long-term management. The strategy will also need to include any off-site measures required to mitigate harmful impacts on European sites;**
- **assess the potential for prior extraction of minerals resources before development commences.**

Policy SH4 - North Fareham SDA

The City Council will cooperate with Fareham Borough Council to help develop a Strategic Development Area of between 6,500 - 7,500 dwellings together with supporting uses, centred immediately to the north of Fareham.

Land within Winchester District (as shown on the plan below) will form part of the open areas required by the South East Plan, to ensure separation between the SDA and the existing settlements of Knowle and Wickham. The open and undeveloped rural character of this land will be retained through the application of Policy CP18 - Gaps.

Policy MTRA1 - Development Strategy Market Towns and Rural Area

The spatial planning vision for the Market Towns and Rural Area will be achieved through:-

- identifying and providing for the needs of each settlement, to fulfil its needs relative to its role and function;
- the provision of new homes to meet the local housing needs of the settlements in this spatial area. A range of housing types, sizes and tenures, including affordable housing, should be provided to meet a range of requirements, including those of older persons and people with disabilities and support needs to ensure social inclusion;
- retention or redevelopment of existing employment land and premises, and development of new sites or buildings, to provide and improve local employment opportunities for both existing and new businesses and to support entrepreneurship;
- the retention and improvement of rural shops and community facilities, including expansion at an appropriate scale in keeping with the location and the community they serve and their role in the hierarchy of retail centres;
- development proposals which maintain and enhance important local character and built or natural features and retain settlement identity;
- development should be of an appropriate scale so as not to exceed the capacity of existing services and infrastructure or should be accompanied by any required improvements to physical and community infrastructure provision, including rural transport initiatives and communications technology.

Policy MTRA 2 - Market Towns and Larger Villages

The Local Planning Authority supports the evolution of the larger settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area to maintain and improve their role and function and to meet a range of local development needs through:-

In Bishops Waltham and New Alresford, provision for about 500 new homes in each settlement and provision for about 250 new homes in each of the following settlements:- Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham.

Economic and commercial growth will be supported to maintain and improve the shopping, service, tourism and employment roles of these settlements where consistent with their role in the hierarchy of retail centres. Proposals for new floorspace of 500 sq. m. or more outside

defined centres will need to demonstrate that it would not have a harmful impact on the centre. There should be improvements to public transport provision, where possible, and development should be appropriate in scale and result in a more sustainable community by improving the balance between housing, employment and services. Existing facilities, services and employment provision should be retained or improved to serve the settlements and their catchment areas.

Housing, employment, retail and services should be accommodated through development and redevelopment opportunities within existing settlement boundaries in the first instance. Sites outside settlement boundaries will only be permitted where, following an assessment of capacity within the built-up area, they are shown to be needed, or to meet a community need or realise local community aspirations identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support. Uses which are essential to the role and function of the settlement, or to maintaining the balance between housing, employment and services, may be relocated if they can be re-provided in a location which is as at least as suitable and accessible and if proposals for the re-use of vacated land and premises are also acceptable.

All new development should be appropriate in scale and design and conserve each settlement's identity, countryside setting, key historic characteristics and local features, particularly as identified in Village Design Statements, the District Landscape Assessment or other guidance. Development should protect areas designated for their local, national, or international importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park.

Policy MTRA 3 - Other Settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area

Within those settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area listed below the purpose of development should be to meet local needs through development, commensurate with their size, character and function:-

- **Within the defined boundaries of the following settlements development and redevelopment opportunities will be supported:-**

Cheriton, Compton Down, Corhampton, Droxford, Hambledon, Hursley, Itchen Abbas (part), Knowle, Littleton, Micheldever, Micheldever Station, Old Alresford, Otterbourne, South Wonston, Southdown, Southwick, Sparsholt, Sutton Scotney, Twyford, West Meon.
- **Within the following settlements, which have no clearly defined settlement boundary, development and redevelopment that consists**

of infilling of a small site within a continuously developed road frontage may be supported, where this would be of a form compatible with the character of the village and not involve the loss of important gaps between developed areas:-

Abbots Worthy, Avington, Beauworth, Beeches Hill, Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Bramdean, Chilcomb, Compton Street, Crawley, Curbridge, Curdridge, Durley, Durley Street, East Stratton, Easton, Exton, Gundleton, Headbourne Worthy (part), Hundred Acres, Itchen Stoke, Kilmeston, Lower Upham, Martyr Worthy, Meonstoke, New Cheriton/Hinton Marsh, Newtown, North Boarhunt, Northbrook, Northington and Swarraton, Itchen Abbas (part), Otterbourne Hill, Ovington, Owslebury, Shawford, Shedfield, Shirrell Heath, Soberton, Soberton Heath, Stoke Charity, Tichborne, Upham, Warnford, Wonston, Woodmancott.

Other development proposals may be supported to reinforce a settlement's role and function, to meet a community need or to realise local community aspirations. These should be identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or process which demonstrates clear community support.

All new development should be appropriate in scale and design and conserve each settlement's identity, countryside setting, key historic characteristics and local features, particularly as identified in Village Design Statements, the District Landscape Assessment or other guidance. Development should protect areas designated for their local, national, or international importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park.

Policy MTRA 4 - Development in the Countryside

In the countryside, defined as land outside the built-up areas of Winchester, Whiteley and Waterlooville and the settlements covered by MTRA 2 and 3 above, the Local Planning Authority will only permit the following types of development:-

- development which has an operational need for a countryside location, such as for agriculture, horticulture or forestry; or**
- proposals for the reuse of existing rural buildings for employment, tourist accommodation, community use or affordable housing (to meet demonstrable local housing needs). Buildings should be of permanent construction and capable of use without major reconstruction; or**
- expansion or redevelopment of existing buildings to facilitate the expansion on-site of established businesses or to meet an**

operational need, provided development is proportionate to the nature and scale of the site, its setting and countryside location; or

- **small scale sites for low key tourist accommodation appropriate to the site, location and the setting.**

Development proposed in accordance with this policy should not cause harm to the character and landscape of the area or neighbouring uses, or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation.

Policy MTRA 5 - Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside

The Local Planning Authority will support the retention and development of major commercial and educational establishments which occupy rural locations in the District, where this will help them continue to contribute to the District's economic prosperity. Because of their sensitive rural locations, masterplans should be prepared prior to development which identify the site opportunities and constraints, promote sensitive land and building stewardship, promote sustainable development, and maximise sustainable transport opportunities, whilst limiting impacts on the surrounding environment and communities.

Core Policies

Active Communities

Policy CP1 - Housing Provision

Provision will be made within the District for the provision of about 12,500 dwellings (net) in the period April 2011 to March 2031, distributed between the three spatial areas as follows:

Winchester Town	4,000 dwellings
South Hampshire Urban Areas	6,000 dwellings
Market Towns and Rural Area	2,500 dwellings

Approximately 8,000 of this total will be within major developments at North Winchester (2,000), West of Waterlooville (2,500) and North Whiteley (3,500). The spatial strategy for the District is set out in detail in Policies WT1, SH1 and MTRA1.

Policy CP2 - Housing Provision and Mix

New residential development should meet a range of community housing needs and deliver a wide choice of homes, with priority being given to the provision of new affordable housing.

Development should provide a range of dwelling types, tenures and sizes and, as appropriate to the site size, location and characteristics, this should include a mix of market homes for sale, affordable homes and homes attractive to the private rented sector, particularly on larger sites. Specialist forms of accommodation such as extra care housing for older persons and homes for those with disabilities and support needs should be provided, where appropriate, taking into account local housing needs.

A majority of homes should be in the form of 2 and 3 bed houses, unless local circumstances indicate an alternative approach should be taken, including where there is an imbalance of housing types and sizes in particular parts of the District.

Policy CP3 - Affordable Housing Provision on Market Led Housing Sites

In order to help meet affordable housing needs, all development which increases the supply of housing will be expected to provide 40% of the gross number of dwellings as affordable housing, unless this would render the proposal economically unviable. Normally, 70% of the affordable homes should be for rent (with rent levels being determined having regard to local incomes of those living in priority housing need), with the balance being Intermediate Affordable Housing.

Affordable housing should be provided on-site, indiscernible from and well integrated with market housing, unless off-site provision would better meet priority housing needs and support the creation of inclusive and mixed communities. On sites of less than 5 dwellings a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision will be accepted.

Affordable housing should remain available for as long as a need exists. In considering housing proposals the aim will be to balance housing needs, the economics of provision and local circumstances.

Policy CP4 - Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs

In order to maximise affordable housing provision to meet identified affordable housing needs the Local Planning Authority will exceptionally grant permission or allocate sites for the provision of affordable housing to meet the specific local needs of particular settlements, on land where housing development would not normally be permitted, and

in addition to general housing provision in Policy CP1. This will include meeting community aspirations identified through a Neighbourhood Plan to provide affordable housing where this is consistent with other policies in this Local Plan.

Development will only be permitted where:-

- **the proposal is suitable in terms of its location, size and tenure to meet an identified local housing need that cannot be met within the policies applying to the settlement to which that need relates;**
- **the scheme is of a design and character appropriate to its location and avoids harm to the character of the area or to other planning objectives, taking account of the policy objective to maximise affordable housing provision;**
- **the affordable housing is secured to meet long-term affordable housing needs, and will remain available in perpetuity (subject to any legislative requirements).**

Subject to the needs of the local community the affordable homes should be for rent (with rent levels being determined by reference to local incomes of those in priority housing need). In exceptional circumstances a modest element of other tenures may be allowed on the most suitable identified sites in order to enable a development to proceed, providing no less than 70% of the homes proposed meet priority local affordable housing needs.

In these circumstances the applicant should demonstrate that the proposal has community support and that alternative forms of housing are required due to the economics of provision. The quantity, tenure and type of that housing should be limited to that which allows the affordable housing development to proceed.

Policy CP5 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The Local Planning Authority will undertake needs assessments (in Local Plan Part 2 or the South Downs Local Plan) to quantify the accommodation requirements for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople within the District.

Sites will be allocated and planning permission will be granted for sites to meet the objectively assessed accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, providing they meet all of the following criteria:-

Sites should be well related to existing communities to encourage social inclusion and sustainable patterns of living, while being located so as to minimise tension with the settled community and:-

- **avoid sites being over-concentrated in any one location or disproportionate in size to nearby communities;**
- **be accessible to local services such as schools, health and community services but avoid placing an unreasonable burden on local facilities and services;**
- **avoid harmful impacts on nearby residential properties by noise and light, vehicle movements and other activities.**

Sites should be clearly defined by physical features, where possible, and not unduly intrusive. Additional landscaping may be necessary to maintain visual amenity and provide privacy for occupiers. This and any security measures should respect local landscape character;

Sites should be capable of accommodating the proposed uses to acceptable standards and provide facilities appropriate to the type and size of the site, including:-

- **water supply, foul water drainage and recycling/waste management;**
- **provision of play space for children;**
- **sites for travelling showpeople should include space for storing and maintaining equipment;**
- **safe vehicular access from the public highway and adequate provision for parking, turning and safe manoeuvring of vehicles within the site (taking account of site size and impact);**
- **in rural locations, any permanent built structures should be restricted to essential facilities such as a small amenity block.**

Proposals should be consistent with other policies such as on design, flood risk, contamination, protection of the natural and built environment or agricultural land quality and protect areas designated for their local, national, or international importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park.

Existing permanent authorised gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites within the District which are needed to meet the identified needs of particular groups will be retained for the use of these groups unless it has been established that they are no longer required.

Policy CP6 - Local Services and Facilities

The Local Planning Authority will support proposals for the development of new, extended or improved facilities and services in

accordance with the development strategies set out in Policies WT1, SH1 and MTRA1.

The Local Planning Authority wishes to retain and improve the facilities and services available across the District. Development proposals should not threaten or result in the loss of premises or sites used to provide services and facilities unless it can be demonstrated that:-

- **the site/premise is not required because the service or facility has been satisfactorily relocated or is no longer needed to serve the locality; and**
- **the site or building has no reasonable prospect of being used for an alternative service or facility which would benefit the local community.**

When considering proposals, account will be taken of:-

- **whether the loss of the service or facility would cause harm for those living within the neighbourhood, settlement, or rural catchment with a reasonable need to access such facilities in the future; and**
- **whether the loss of the facility would have a detrimental impact upon the overall vitality and viability of the settlement; and**
- **whether the loss is part of an agreed plan to provide improved local services in equally accessible locations.**

Policy CP7 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation

The Local Planning Authority will seek improvements in the open space network and in built recreation facilities within the District, to achieve the type of provision, space required and levels of accessibility set out in the Council's most up to date open space and built facilities standards. This will be achieved by new and improved provision, or by improving public access for all to existing facilities and educational provision.

New housing development should make provision for public open space and built facilities in accordance with the most up to date standards (currently set out in Tables 1 and 2), preferably through on-site provision of new facilities where feasible or by financial contributions towards off-site improvements.

There will be a presumption against the loss of any open space, sports or recreation facility (including built facilities), except where it can be demonstrated that:-

- **alternative facilities will be provided and are at least as accessible to current and potential new users, and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality; or**
- **the benefit of the development to the community outweighs the harm caused by the loss of the facility.**

Prosperous Economy

Policy CP8 - Economic Growth and Diversification

The Local Planning Authority will support economic development and diversification across Winchester District, in accordance with the spatial strategies for the District, through the retention, regeneration and intensification of previously developed land and by allocating land as necessary to support employment growth at sustainable locations. About 20 hectares of new employment land will be provided for economic growth and future employment needs.

The Local Planning Authority will support development within the District's five key economic sectors of public administration and business services, land based industries, tourism and recreation, knowledge and creative industries and retail. This will be achieved through the retention of appropriate premises and, where feasible and consistent with the spatial strategy, new development to ensure that there is an adequate supply of land and premises, suitable to maintain a diverse and successful local economy.

The Local Planning Authority will support measures to promote self employment and working from home, consistent with other policies of this Plan, including the development of live-work accommodation and ensuring good access to modern communications technology. Appropriate opportunities to expand the economic base and foster innovation in the District will also be encouraged, in particular the promotion of a low carbon economy and the emerging 'green collar' industries.

Policy CP9 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises

In order to retain a mix of employment land and premises in the District, the Local Planning Authority will resist the loss of existing or allocated employment land and floorspace within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8. Losses will only be permitted where retaining a business use would not be reasonable having regard to the following:-

- **the redevelopment potential for other employment uses or a mix of uses including the scope for intensifying or providing an effective**

use of the site or building, and the potential to improve and extend the range of modern employment floorspace;

- **whether the building or use meets or could meet a specific local requirement, such as providing low cost start up accommodation;**
- **the environmental impact of business use on neighbouring uses;**
- **the access arrangements for the site/buildings, by road and public transport;**
- **strength of local demand for the type of accommodation;**
- **the benefits of the proposed use compared to the benefits of retaining the existing use.**

Policy CP10 - Transport

The Local Planning Authority will seek to reduce demands on the transport network, manage existing capacity efficiently and secure investment to make necessary improvements. Development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel. The use of non-car modes particularly walking and cycling should be encouraged through travel plans, management and improvements to the existing network, and improvements to accommodate additional traffic should be undertaken (or funded) where necessary.

High Quality Environment

Policy CP11 - Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

Developments should achieve the lowest level of carbon emissions and water consumption which is practical and viable. Specifically, the Local Planning Authority will expect:-

- **new residential developments to achieve Level 5 for the Energy aspect of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) and Level 4 for the water aspect of the CSH from adoption of this Plan. If this is shown not to be feasible or viable the Council will accept an on-site carbon reduction of not less than the relevant Carbon Compliance levels stipulated by the Zero Carbon Homes policy, with the remaining reduction of regulated emissions¹ to be provided by means of 'Allowable Solutions;**

¹ Regulated emissions refer to those related to space heating, hot water provision, fixed lighting and ventilation. Unregulated emissions are those related to cooking and plug-in appliances. Unregulated emissions are not counted for the purposes of calculating carbon compliance.

- **non-residential development that requires an Energy Performance Certificate to meet ‘BREEAM Excellent’ standard from adoption of this Plan and ‘BREEAM Outstanding’ standards from 2016.**

In meeting these requirements developments should follow the hierarchy below, except where it can be demonstrated that it would be more practical and achieve greater carbon reductions, to utilise measures further down the hierarchy:-

- **be designed to maximise energy efficiency and design out the need for energy use by means of the scheme layout and the orientation and design of individual buildings, making full use of passive heating and cooling systems as far as is practical;**
- **connect to existing combined heat and power (CHP) and District Heating/Cooling networks, or contribute to their future development;**
- **use renewable energy technologies to produce required energy on-site;**
- **make use of Allowable Solutions to deal with any remaining CO₂ emissions up to the relevant Code for Sustainable Homes/Zero Carbon Homes level.**

Policy CP12 - Renewable and Decentralised Energy

The Local Planning Authority is supportive of the generation of renewable and decentralised energy in the District. It will support the creation of CHP/district heating/cooling systems and the development of larger-scale renewable energy developments, especially where there is a strong degree of community benefit and/or community ownership. When assessing proposals for large-scale renewable energy and decentralised energy schemes, account will be taken of:-

- **impact on areas designated for their local, national, or international importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park, conservation areas and heritage assets, including their setting;**
- **contribution to national, regional and sub-regional renewable energy targets and CO₂ savings;**
- **potential to integrate with new or existing development, whilst avoiding harm to existing development and communities;**
- **benefits to host communities and opportunities for environmental enhancement;**
- **proximity to biomass plants, fuel sources and transport links;**

- **connection to the electricity network;**
- **effect on the landscape and surrounding location.**

Policy CP13 - High Quality Design

New development will be expected to meet the highest standards of design². In order to achieve this all proposals for new development (excluding small domestic applications and changes of use) should demonstrate that:-

- **an analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and its surroundings have informed the principles of design and how the detailed design responds positively to its neighbours and the local context;**
- **the proposal makes a positive contribution to the local environment and creates an individual place with a distinctive character;**
- **the public realm has been designed to ensure that it is attractive, safe, accessible and well connected to its surroundings, including walking and cycling routes to and within the development, to encourage their use;**
- **the accompanying landscape framework has been developed to enhance both the natural and built environment and maximise the potential to improve local biodiversity;**
- **measures to minimise carbon emissions and promote renewable energy and reduce impact on climate change form an integral part of the design solutions.**

Policy CP14 – The Effective Use of Land

In order to ensure that scarce development land is used effectively, the Local Planning Authority will support higher densities on sites which have good access to facilities and public transport, particularly within the urban areas. The development potential of all sites should be maximised and will be balanced against the need to promote high quality design. The primary determinant of the acceptability of a

² This policy sets out the high level design principles that all new built development will be expected to comply with. More detailed design standards and guidance will be developed through the Local Plan Part 2, which may include the potential for producing locally-derived internal space standards.

scheme will be how well the design responds to the general character of the area.

Policy CP15 - Green Infrastructure

The Local Planning Authority will support development proposals which:-

- **maintain, protect and enhance the function or the integrity of the existing green infrastructure network identified at a District and sub-regional level, including strategic blue and green corridors and spaces, as illustrated on Map 9, particularly where the proposal allows for the enhancement of GI both on-site and in the immediate area;**
- **Provide a net gain of well managed, multifunctional green infrastructure, in accordance with the categories and standards specified in Policy CP7 and appropriate for the scale of development, through on-site provision which:-**
 - **addresses deficits in local green infrastructure provision where appropriate;**
 - **integrates with the green network/grid identified at the District and sub-regional level (as illustrated on Map 9);**
 - **provides a high quality public realm for the local community;**
 - **encourages public access to and within the natural environment where appropriate;**
 - **allows for adaptation to climate change;**
 - **is well planned to allow cost effective ongoing management of the GI;**
 - **links areas of biodiversity;**
 - **is provided at the earliest feasible stage.**

Where on-site provision is not possible financial contributions will be required for the provision and management of GI sites and will be negotiated on a site by site basis.

Policy CP16 - Biodiversity

The Local Planning Authority will support development which maintains, protects and enhances biodiversity across the District, delivering a net gain in biodiversity, and has regard to the following:-

- **protecting sites of international, European, and national importance, and local nature conservation sites, from inappropriate development;**
- **supporting habitats that are important to maintain the integrity of European sites;**
- **new development will be required to show how biodiversity can be retained, protected and enhanced through its design and implementation, for example by designing for wildlife, delivering BAP targets and enhancing Biodiversity Opportunity Areas;**
- **new development will be required to avoid adverse impacts or, if unavoidable, ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated, with compensation measures used only as a last resort. Development proposals will only be supported if the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm to the habitat and/or species;**
- **maintaining a District wide network of local wildlife sites and corridors to support the integrity of the biodiversity network, prevent fragmentation, and enable biodiversity to respond and adapt to the impacts of climate change;**
- **supporting and contributing to the targets set out in the District's Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for priority habitats and species.**

Planning proposals that have the potential to affect priority habitats and/or species or sites of geological importance will be required to take account of evidence and relevant assessments or surveys.

Policy CP17 - Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment

The Local Planning Authority will support development which meets all the following criteria:-

- **avoids flood risk to people and property by:-**
 - **applying a Sequential Test to the location, and the Exception Test if required, and applying the sequential approach at the site level³;**
 - **managing flood risk from new development to ensure risk is not increased elsewhere and that opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding within the District through development are taken;**
 - **safeguarding land and designated structures and features from development that is required for current and future flood management;**

³ As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

- **including sustainable water management systems such as Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should be designed to meet the relevant standards so as to gain approval by the SuDS Approval Body.**
- **does not cause unacceptable deterioration to water quality or have an unacceptable impact on water quantity (including drinking water supplies) by:-**
 - **protecting surface water and groundwater through suitable pollution prevention measures;**
 - **using opportunities to improve water quality where possible;**
 - **optimising water efficiency.**
- **is located at a sufficient distance from existing wastewater treatment works to allow adequate odour dispersion, or takes appropriate odour control measures;**
- **ensures that water supply, surface water drainage and wastewater infrastructure to service new development are provided and connect to the nearest point of adequate capacity.**

The Local Planning Authority will support the development or expansion of water supply, surface water drainage and wastewater treatment facilities where they are needed to serve existing or new development or in the interests of securing long term supply, provided that the need for such facilities is consistent with other policies such as the development strategy, flood risk, contamination and protection of the natural and built environment.

Policy CP18 - Settlement Gaps

The Local Planning Authority will retain the generally open and undeveloped nature of the following defined settlement gaps:-

- **Bishop’s Waltham – Swanmore – Waltham Chase – Shedfield – Shirrell Heath;**
- **Denmead – Waterlooville;**
- **Kings Worthy – Abbots Worthy;**
- **Otterbourne – Southdown;**
- **Winchester – Compton Street;**
- **Winchester – Kings Worthy/Headbourne Worthy;**
- **Winchester – Littleton;**

- **Whiteley – Fareham/Fareham Western Wards (the ‘Meon Gap’).**

Within these areas only development that does not physically or visually diminish the gap will be allowed.

To protect the individual character and identity of those settlements adjoining the proposed SDA at North Fareham, an area of open land is identified as a Gap to be maintained between the SDA and Knowle and Wickham (see Policy SH4). Development which would threaten the open and undeveloped character of this area will be resisted and the land should be managed to secure the long-term retention of its rural character.

Policy CP19 - South Downs National Park.

New development should be in keeping with the context and the setting of the landscape and settlements of the South Downs National Park. The emphasis should be on small-scale proposals that are in a sustainable location and well designed. Proposals which support the economic and social well being of the National Park and its communities will be encouraged, provided that they do not conflict with the National Park’s purposes.

Development within and adjoining the South Downs National Park which would have a significant detrimental impact to the rural character and setting of settlements and the landscape should not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal is of over-riding national importance, or its impact can be mitigated.

Policy CP20 - Heritage and Landscape Character

The Local Planning Authority will continue to conserve and enhance the historic environment through the preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans and/or other strategies, and will support new development which recognises, protects and enhances the District’s distinctive landscape and heritage assets and their settings. These may be designated or undesignated and include natural and man made assets associated with existing landscape and townscape character, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, listed buildings, historic battlefields and archaeology.

Particular emphasis should be given to conserving:-

- **recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;**

- **local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.**

Policy CP21 - Infrastructure and Community Benefit

The Local Planning Authority will support development proposals which provide or contribute towards the infrastructure and services needed to support them, which should be delivered using the following approach:-

- **testing the capacity of existing infrastructure and where there is insufficient capacity securing the timely provision of improvements or additional provision;**
- **infrastructure provision or improvements should be provided on-site, as an integral part of a development, wherever possible and appropriate;**
- **where off-site measures are needed, or on-site provision is not possible, planning obligations will be needed to secure the necessary provision or a financial contribution towards provision;**
- **where a contribution towards other infrastructure improvements or provision is needed and viable this will be achieved through planning obligations, or the Community Infrastructure Levy when introduced.**

Any on-site provision or financial contribution should:-

- **meet the reasonable costs of provision to support the development or offset its impact; and**
- **be related to the size and type of each development and the nature of the improvements required; and**
- **take account of the cumulative impact of requirements on the viability of development, especially where the development meets a particular local need or provides particular benefits.**

The Local Planning Authority will support the improvement or development of locally and regionally important infrastructure where needed to serve existing or new development required through this Plan, or to secure long term supply, provided that the need for such facilities are consistent with other policies within this Plan.