

**WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM – SPECIAL MEETING****5 October 2015****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Weir (Chairman) (P)

E Berry (P)

J Berry

Burns

Gosling (P)

Green (P)

Hiscock (P)

Hutchison (P)

Mather (P)

Maynard (P)

Osborne

Prowse

Sanders (P)

Scott (P)

Scowen (P)

Tait (P)

Thompson

Tod (P)

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

Councillors Byrnes (Portfolio Holder for Local Economy) and Read (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment)

---

**1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillors Mather and Tod declared disclosable pecuniary interests due to their roles as Hampshire County Councillors. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

**2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Phil Gagg, representing WinACC, Judith Martin, representing the City of Winchester Trust, and Patrick Davies addressed the Forum under item 4. A summary of their comments are contained within the respective items below.

4. **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING WINCHESTER CHAPTER OF DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 (Appendix M (Winchester refers))**

(Report CAB2721(LP) refers)

Members noted that the Report had not been made available for publication within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration due to the need to consult with the Forum on its content.

At the invitation of the Chairman, three members of the public addressed the Forum during public participation and their comments are summarised below:

Phil Gagg spoke on behalf of WinACC. He queried whether LPP2 would be found to be sound by the inspector at examination. The Sustainability Appraisal assessed each of the development areas as having major negative transport effects, and if these were scaled up across the District then this would lead to traffic chaos. There were insufficient mitigating factors to deal with this and policies in LPP2 were vague and ineffective. He also pointed out that the Cycling Strategy had not produced one scheme.

Judith Martin spoke on behalf of City of Winchester Trust, pointing out that the Trust had made detailed representations to the Plan in particular policies WIN1-6. She queried different references in the plan to special character and local character, there was a need to be consistent and define special character and that the special/local character of Winchester should be protected and the plan should include reference to shared space. It was suggested that DM policies 27-31 should be cross referred to in WIN 1-6. She queried when the local list of heritage assets (Policies DM29 and DM31) would be produced. Policy DM33 on shopfronts was welcomed.

Patrick Davies stated that there were no conclusions in paragraph 10 of Appendix M as to the capacity of the gas/water/sewerage infrastructure, and pointed out that the NPPF required local authorities to plan positively for infrastructure to support development. He queried the lack detail in relation to additional provision for secondary education and that there should be references to further and higher education given the provision in the Town. .

The Head of Strategic Planning introduced the report. He explained that the Local Plan Part 1 set the overall framework, housing targets for settlements, and key residential allocations, whilst Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) allocated sites to meet the remainder of the housing needed, and also set out the development management policies that would apply.

LPP2 did not cover the South Downs National Park, as the Park Authority was consulting on its local plan for the Park area. In addition, it did not cover gypsies and travellers, which would be the subject of a separate development plan document.

He explained that since 2012, background evidence had been gathered, and work undertaken with individual communities, leading to a draft plan in 2014 which had been published for consultation. The current draft before Members took into account the comments which had been received. Following a meeting of Cabinet on 6 October (which would consider the Winchester Town and New Alresford policies), the full draft plan would be considered by full Council on 21 October 2015, prior to being published for six weeks for representations, before being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Inspector.

The Head of Strategic Planning referred to the various draft policies for Winchester Town, as set out in Appendix M to the report, which included Silver Hill, Station Approach, and a new policy for Winnall. He confirmed that there was a healthy supply of land for housing.

During the consideration of this item, the Head of Strategic Planning and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services responded to a number of detailed questions from Members. In response, the following points were made.

- (i) Contributions from developments such as North Whiteley would be used to provide affordable housing across the District, including by new Council homes, or enhancing the level of affordable housing on private developments.
- (ii) The ward boundary changes would not affect the Plan, as these were unrelated to the settlement boundaries set out in the Plan.
- (iii) It was considered that the affordable housing policies were extremely robust, seeking up to 40% where this was viable.
- (iv) 130 dwellings would be provided across Stanmore, Abbots Barton and Station Approach, in addition to sites already permitted or included in the SHLAA.
- (v) If proposals for a Park and Ride site off Junction 9 of the M3 at Winnall were received, it would be necessary to look at what changes to Junction 9 might be required to accommodate such development.

Members discussed the roofscape of Winchester, and the important heritage role it played.

One Member suggested that Policies WIN5, 6 and 7 should be re-organised to move generally-applicable policies to WIN5, and retain only site-specific policies in WIN6 and 7. Development of both sites should be looked at together.

A Member expressed concern that the 40% figure for affordable housing was arbitrary, and if this was not achieved, it might affect the strength of other policies. Another stated that the development proposed would not produce

sufficient affordable housing to deal with the need and meet the desire to create inclusive and balanced communities.

It was proposed that additional wording should be included in the new paragraph in 3.6.6 of the Plan, to ensure that streets and roads in new developments were consistent with the principles of the Walking and Cycling Strategies, and created/enhanced links to the existing pedestrian/cycle network.

The 21 new homes in Stanmore with local lettings plans were welcomed by a Member, who spoke in support of the Stanmore Planning Framework. He also welcomed the work on HMOs and policy WIN9.

The Chairman summarised the views of the Forum as follows:-

- Concern that the Plan might not produce sufficient affordable housing and meet the desire for inclusive communities;
- Concerns over unplanned growth in the tertiary education sector;
- The need to carefully deal with traffic and transportation issues, and consider whether the policies are sufficient in this regard;
- Enhancing the wording of 3.6.6 to integrate walking and cycling strategies and new development;
- Are the heritage policies set out clearly enough in the Plan?
- The need to ensure that existing open space is properly used and accessible.

The Chairman thanked the Forum and members of the public for their participation and contribution.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.15pm

Chairman