

CAB2231(LDF)
FOR DECISION
WARD(S): ALL

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

28 September 2011

CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO PLANS FOR PLACES AFTER
BLUEPRINT

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Jenny Nell Tel No: 01962 848278 jnell@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Plans for Places....*after Blueprint*, was published on 27 June 2011 for a six week consultation period which closed on 8 August. 1027 comments were received from 201 respondents.

Plans for Places did not include detailed policy wording, but included a commentary on the proposed development strategies for the District, followed by a detailed question to seek opinions.

The revised housing provision of 11 000 new dwellings and its distribution across the District generated many responses. The majority of these objected to the housing numbers but for opposing reasons. Some felt the number was too high and/or the distribution proposed too much development in a particular area, whilst others suggested it was too low either for the District as a whole or a particular spatial area

The Council commissioned consultants DTZ to assess both the economic prospects for the District and the revised housing projections, and their report and its findings are set out in detail in CAB2232(LDF) elsewhere on this agenda.

The DTZ report acknowledges that there are various 'downward' influences on the housing figures, but also notes that there are 'upward' pressures too, especially later in the Plan period, which runs to 2031. The DTZ report concludes that the 11,000 figure remains realistic once the impacts of economic and other changes are carefully considered.

In terms of housing distribution, Plans for Places specifically looks at the development strategies for Winchester Town, South Hampshire Urban Areas and the Market Towns and Rural Area.

In Winchester Town, Plans for Places proposed 4,000 new dwellings. However, due to the uncertainty over the Barton Farm appeal decision, two possible strategies for delivering it with/without the Barton Farm site were expressed. The Council is still awaiting the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal, following the public inquiry held earlier this year. This decision is fundamental to the strategy for the town and at this stage is not covered in this report as it would not be appropriate to pre-judge the outcome. An oral update will be given at the meeting.

Within South Hampshire Urban areas, it is proposed to deliver 5500 new dwellings through two strategic sites at West of Waterlooville and North Whiteley. West of Waterlooville now has planning consent for 2500 homes in Winchester District and 100 have been completed to date. The proposal for a strategic allocation at North

Whiteley raised many comments, covering highways issues and the timely provision of infrastructure, and the potential impact on designated sites of ecological importance. The ecological and environmental constraints on this site are well known. Numerous meetings have been held with both Natural England and the Environment Agency to ensure that the correct procedures are adopted by the Council in bringing forward this site for development, which will include further assessment work to ensure that it will have no adverse effects on any of the nearby sites of international importance.

The remainder of the District falls within the Market Towns and Rural Area, which also includes the National Park. The Council was fortunate enough during 2010 to receive additional expertise through the Government's Rural Masterplanning project on how to address rural issues. This data, together with Blueprint responses, has provided the Council with an understanding of the many common issues affecting the rural area, and the recognition that many communities accept the need for limited development to maintain both services and community vitality.

Therefore, through Plans for Places, a revised development strategy was proposed which suggested that the market towns of Bishops Waltham and New Alresford each provide for 400 –500 new homes over the plan period, with Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham, providing between 150 -250 each. Various comments were received relating to the provision of infrastructure, scale of development, priority to brownfield sites etc. In relation to the remainder of the settlements an alternative approach was suggested, through using a set of criteria to consider small scale schemes serving a local need.

The Council has collated throughout the evolution of the Core Strategy a detailed evidence base in relation to the rural parts of the District. It is considered that this forms a robust basis for the proposed development strategy to include a range of dwelling provision to allow settlements to respond to local circumstances.

The comments received to Plans for Places reaffirms that the general spirit of the Core Strategy is heading in the right direction.

There is now some urgency to finalise and formally progress the Core Strategy given the Government's announcements, in the draft NPPF, on the presumption in favour of sustainable development, particularly where a plan is silent or absent. The adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006) does not adequately deal with a number of issues facing the District, and it is therefore necessary to seek to get the Core Strategy adopted as soon as is practicable.

On this basis, the intention is to seek Cabinet and Council approval for the pre-submission/submission version of the Core Strategy in December 2011. This will be subject to 6 weeks consultation (on the principles of soundness) during January/February 2012, followed by formal submission in April and the examination period thereafter. This then anticipates the Inspector's Report in October/November 2011 with formal adoption by end 2012. This timetable is, however, dependent on having the Barton Farm decision shortly to allow it to be taken into account.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the responses to *Plans for Places...after Blueprint*, be noted and used to inform the preparation of the pre-submission/submission version of the Core Strategy, to be reported and agreed at the next meeting of this Committee.

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

28 SEPTEMBER 2011

CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO PLANS FOR PLACES AFTER BLUEPRINT

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

DETAIL:

1 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Plans for Places....*after Blueprint*, was published on 27 June 2011 for a six week consultation period which closed on 8 August. Plans for Places was prepared following the Blueprint consultation undertaken in late 2010. It was a commentary on how the Council might respond through its emerging Core Strategy to the comments made to Blueprint, taking into account updated evidence and revised housing and population projections.
- 1.2 Plans for Places was placed on the Council's website and all those who responded to the consultation process were notified of its publication and given the opportunity to comment. It was the lead article on the Council's website for a number of weeks, and was freely available to download. Copies were also sent to a range of statutory consultees.
- 1.3 The format of Plans for Places was intentionally different to previous consultations. Rather than being drafted as detailed text and policy wording, it posed a number of questions on the emerging development strategy for the District (focussing on the different strategies for the District's three spatial areas). These took the form of a commentary, followed by a detailed question to seek opinions on the strategy proposed. The purpose was to test whether the approach to development, and the outcomes the Council is seeking to achieve, reflected the way in which people felt about their own communities and future needs.
- 1.4 The strategy for Winchester Town included two scenarios, one with and one without the development site at Barton Farm, reflecting the fact that the Council does not know whether CALA's application will be permitted, or indeed when a decision on the appeal will be made.
- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to consider the responses received to Plans for Places and to suggest the principles to be incorporated into the 'pre submission' draft of the Core Strategy, to be considered by the Council before the end of the year. There is now some urgency to expedite publication of the Core Strategy, given the various Government announcements in relation to

the presumption on favour of sustainable development, particularly where plans are silent on specific issues. Given that the Winchester District Local Plan Review was adopted in 2006 after several years of debate, it is essential that a more up to date development plan is put in place without further avoidable delay.

1.6 The recently adopted Local Development Scheme for the District sets out the timetable for the production of the Core Strategy and includes the following key milestones :-

- a) Publication of Pre-submission version for 6 weeks consultation
December 2011 – February 2012
- b) Consideration of representations February – March 2012
- c) Submission for examination – April 2012
- d) Hearing period – June – November 2012
- e) Inspector's report – fact check October 2012
- f) Inspectors report - final November 2012
- g) Adoption – December 2012

1.7 Even in the period since Plans for Places was published, there have been a number of documents published that will impact on strategic planning . The first item of significance is the Localism Bill which has been amended during its progress through Parliament, notably in relation to the duty to co-operate in the preparation of development plans. The second is the draft National Planning Policy Framework which is currently out for consultation, and this will be the subject of a detailed report to Cabinet on 12 October 2012. This policy sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development, demonstrating the urgency of having a plan in place, to provide the guidance necessary to assist the decision-making process.

1.8 The following sections of this report examine the responses received to Plans for Places and suggest how some of these should be incorporated in the pre-submission/submission versions of the Core Strategy. All responses received can be viewed in full on the Council's website via the following link

www.winchester.gov.uk/plans4places

2 Responses to Plans for Places

2.1 1027 comments were received to Plans for Places from 201 respondents ranging from parish councils, the development industry, members of the public and the statutory agencies. These included many comments from organisations that had positively contributed to the Blueprint exercise.

3 **Question 1 - The District's housing requirement and distribution**
Summaries of all responses to Question 1 are set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

3.1 Plans for Places suggested the revised housing provision for the District as follows:-

Table 3 : Winchester district Housing Requirement 2011 – 2031

Spatial Area	Number of new dwellings 2011 - 2031
Winchester Town	4,000
South Hampshire Urban Areas	5,500
Market Towns and Rural Area (incl SDNP)	1,500
Total	11,000

Sources : WCC Housing Technical Paper 2011

Question 1 :

Table 3 identifies the amount of housing to be provided in the District, We think this housing distribution reflects the function and characteristics of the District, in a way that will provide the right number of new homes in the most appropriate locations over the next 20 years.

Do you agree with this or is there another way to distribute the housing requirement? If not, why not and what evidence do you have in support of that view that we could look at?

3.2 This was clearly a key issue and generated substantial comment by 100 respondents. The majority of responses (60) were opposed to the housing number proposed, but for differing reasons. Some felt the number was too high and/or the distribution proposed too much development in a particular area, whilst others suggested it was too low either for the District as a whole or a particular spatial area.

Technical Matters

(see Housing Technical paper
<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/staging/General.asp?nc=29WO&id=27213>)

3.3 A few respondents suggest that a housing increase of 11,000 for a population increase of 16,550 means that an unrealistically low household occupancy rate (1.5 persons per dwelling) is being used - if the national rate (about 2.36)

was used, the housing requirement would be much lower. However, the 11,000/16,550 figure relates to the increase in housing/population, whereas household size within the whole population is changing. Therefore it is the total housing and population figures which should be considered, as explained in the footnote to Table 1 of Plans for Places. On this basis, the household size in 2011 is 2.37, falling to 2.22 in 2031. This is realistic and consistent with the household size suggested by the respondents.

- 3.4 Some respondents highlight an 'anomaly' in the housing projections, whereby they are relatively low in the first 5 years of the plan period. This is recognised and explained in paragraph 4.5 of the Housing Technical Paper but, in any event, is consistent with the recent fall in housing completions, which are expected to increase gradually as the economy improves.

Economic Situation/Assumptions

- 3.5 Many respondents criticised the housing projections because they felt that the 2008-based Sub National Household Projections would not use up-to-date data or assumptions given the subsequent changes to the economy, migration, public sector/defence cuts, etc. The Housing Technical Paper acknowledged that this may be an issue (although not one that was likely to significantly change the outcome) and further work has been commissioned on the demographic projections. The resulting study by DTZ Consulting is the subject of report CAB2232(LDF) elsewhere on this agenda.
- 3.6 The respondents who took issue with the proposed amount of housing did not attempt to quantify the extent to which they believe the projections are overstated, or analyse in detail which assumptions may have changed. The DTZ study does this and agrees that there are various 'downward' influences on the figures, but also notes that there are 'upward' pressures too, especially later in the Plan period. The update studies conclude that the 11,000 figure remains realistic once the impacts of economic and other changes are carefully considered.

Government Policy

- 3.6 A large number of respondents point to the changes in Government policy being proposed in the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other Government statements. Others highlight the fact that the South East Plan has not been revoked and the Core Strategy will therefore need to comply with its requirements for so long as it remains in existence.
- 3.7 The draft NPPF had not been published when Plans for Places was produced but it is clear that it places great emphasis on economic growth and development and this is consistent with other Government statements since the Budget. The level of housing and economic development proposed in Plans for Places is aimed at meeting the housing and economic needs of the District, as required by the NPPF. It was, of course, a key aim of Blueprint to identify and plan for these needs. In fact, the housing projections allow for

substantial in-migration to the District in order to allow for economic growth and maintain a balanced population structure, rather than only meeting the District's indigenous needs.

- 3.8 Many respondents suggest that the NPPF requires authorities to plan for an extra 20% of housing, over and above what is needed. This is a misreading of the NPPF requirement and confuses the advice on 'plan-making' with that on maintaining a 5-year supply of sites. The reference to an extra 20% of housing is very clearly made in relation to identifying a 5-year supply of housing sites, not in relation to establishing the level of housing to plan for.
- 3.9 The draft NPPF is a consultation document which may yet change, although it would be sensible to take account of it and seek to avoid any obvious conflicts. Similarly, given the uncertain timescale for revocation of regional strategies, it cannot be assumed that the South East Plan will have been revoked by the next stage of the Core Strategy and it may be necessary to continue to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is in general conformity with regional guidance. Given that the South East Plan's requirement of 12,240 dwellings covers a different period to the 11,000 proposed in Plans for Places, it is not considered that there will necessarily be a problem in showing general conformity with the South East Plan, if necessary. Given the public statements of Government ministers in relation to meeting housing need, and having evidence-based plans, it would not be reasonable to suggest acknowledging a housing need and then not providing for it.

Plan Period

- 3.10 There was general support for amending the plan period to 2011-2031. Some respondents were concerned at the implications for additional housing, but current (PPS12) and emerging (NPPF) Government advice are clear that plans need to cover a period of at least 15 years from adoption.

Housing Scenarios

- 3.11 The Housing Technical Paper examined 4 possible scenarios for housing provision and concluded that the 'Government projection' scenario (ONS 2008-based projections) is the most robust for the Council to rely upon. Few respondents commented in any detail on the merits of the scenarios and no new ones were suggested. Of those that commented, almost all welcomed the rejection of the 'zero net migration' scenario.
- 3.12 Several respondents suggested that the affordable housing-led or economically-led scenarios had been too quickly rejected. The importance of affordable housing, in particular, is mentioned in a large number of comments, both from those promoting more housing and those arguing for less (but aimed at meeting local needs). Several respondents point out that seeking 40% affordable housing on a total provision of 11,000 will not meet the affordable housing need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and 2010 update.

- 3.13 One of the issues raised was that affordable housing needs are only assessed over a 5-year period and that this assessment should not be used over the whole plan period. In order to update the evidence of housing need and to seek a more long-term assessment, a further update of the SHMA has been commissioned. This makes clear that the assumption made in previous assessments, that the affordable housing 'backlog' could be overcome within 5 years, is neither realistic nor practical, and that it should be accepted that a much longer period will be needed to achieve anything like the necessary additional level of provision. On this basis, the level of affordable housing needed to overcome the backlog and meet newly-arising need is estimated at 350 new affordable units per annum (having accounted for re-lets and transfers).
- 3.14 The planning system is not intended to be the sole solution to affordable housing problems and there is not a simple correlation between providing more housing and overcoming affordability problems. The fact that affordable housing need may exceed the level of provision that can be achieved is not new or unusual, either locally or within the South East more generally. Many authorities have a level of affordable housing need which is well above the proportion of total provision that is achievable, but this is not in itself a reason for basing total provision only on affordable housing needs, just as environmental constraints should not be the only determinate of the levels of housing supply. The NPPF makes clear that the planning system should aim to deliver a sufficient quantity of housing consistent with the land use principles and other policies in the Framework. The planning system's role is to balance interests in order to arrive at sustainable solutions, rather than to exclusively promote one interest at the expense of all others. To do so would undermine the principles underpinning sustainable development and be unlikely to be favourably considered as part of the sustainability appraisal that is part of the plan making process. The NPPF encourages neighbourhoods to plan positively to promote more development than is set out in the local plan, and presents the opportunity for more affordable housing to be proposed and brought forward if this is the wish of particular communities.
- 3.15 A few respondents suggest that the economically-led scenario should have been followed, or that housing and economic strategies need to be more closely aligned. The study by DTZ Consulting (report CAB2232(LDF) on this agenda) has updated the economic projections, indicating that the level of job growth will be less than had been projected in the 2007 Economic Study. The level of housing provision necessary to provide this level of jobs (580 dwellings per annum) is therefore now much closer to the 550 dwellings per annum being planned for, and below the 612 dwellings per annum required by the South East Plan.

Conclusion – Overall Housing Provision

- 3.16 Further work has been undertaken to update the economic studies, test the assumptions behind the household projections, and update the SHMA. The technical basis for the housing requirement of 11,000 dwellings is considered to be entirely sound and the evidence used to derive it is consistent with the emerging NPPF. The updated work has reduced the differences between the 'Government projection' scenario of 11,000 dwellings and the affordable housing-led and economic-led projections.
- 3.17 In view of the Government's clear intentions for economic growth and housing provision, it is essential that the Council does not ignore the evidence of housing need and seek to promote a figure which is not sufficient to provide what the District will need. This is the suggested figure of 11,000. It is important to note that the 11,000 figure is not an absolute ceiling, because neighbourhoods can use neighbourhood plans to promote additional development if they see fit as provided for in the Localism Bill.

Housing Distribution

Overall Approach

- 3.18 There are a large number of comments in relation to the distribution of housing between the three spatial areas. These cover all of the spatial areas and include responses which promote more growth and others promoting less. It is, however, clear that there is general acceptance of the spatial split itself, although there seems to be some confusion between the PUSH area (which is not a spatial area in Plans for Places) and the South Hampshire Urban Areas (which are).
- 3.19 The broad approach adopted within the proposed distribution is to focus development in the most sustainable settlements/locations, namely the South Hampshire Urban Areas (West of Waterlooville and Whiteley) and Winchester Town. Elsewhere, the aim was to provide for a level of development that would achieve the aspirations identified through Blueprint, not just for housing, but also to support facilities and services or meet particular needs such as affordable housing or housing for the aging population. Settlements in the remaining parts of the District (the Market Towns and Rural Area – MTRA) were either allocated a range of housing numbers based on assessed needs or would have a criteria-based policy allowing such needs to be met.
- 3.20 A few of the comments supported the focus on urban areas, but most concentrated on the changes they wished to see to the distribution. Most of the comments suggesting changes to the spatial split are based on whether the particular respondent is promoting a site in a particular area or, conversely, seeking to resist development in a certain location. Whilst various criticisms are levelled at the proposed distribution, and several arguments are made for changing it, these normally refer in fairly general terms to a greater/lesser 'need' for development (particularly affordable housing), various

environmental or other constraints, or limited capacity within current settlement boundaries. Little or no hard evidence of local needs is provided, certainly not enough on which to base a revised distribution.

- 3.21 The issues raised in respect of each spatial area are considered below and account should also be taken of the responses to Questions 3-9 which relate in more detail to the strategies for the 3 spatial areas.

The South Hampshire Urban Areas

- 3.22 Plans for Places proposed 5,500 dwellings in this sub-area, which consists of West of Waterlooville (2,500) and Whiteley (3,000). The proposed development at North Whiteley attracted by far the greatest proportion of comments for this sub-area, with arguments in favour of more development and others suggesting less/none.
- 3.23 Many of the arguments for more development in this sub-area are from residents in other parts of the District (particularly Denmead) who feel their area would be less 'threatened' by development if more was focussed on Waterlooville and/or Whiteley. They suggest that these areas have previously been planned to be larger and these plans should be reinstated, although it is not clear which plans are being referred to, especially as the 'reserve' element of West of Waterlooville is included in the figures.
- 3.24 The proposed distribution already focuses development on the South Hampshire Urban Areas and provides more development than the settlements themselves (or even the PUSH part of the District as a whole) would need. This is a cause for objection for some respondents who oppose the North Whiteley proposal, but focussing development on these areas has been supported at previous consultations and is an integral element of the PUSH strategy which the City Council has endorsed.
- 3.25 The housing figures for the MTRA are aimed at meeting that sub-area's needs, based on Blueprint responses, and to divert housing from the MTRA area to the South Hampshire Urban Areas would under-provide in the MTRA area, contrary to the aim of providing for needs locally.
- 3.26 On the other hand, given that the overall housing requirement is considered appropriate, the only way to reduce the South Hampshire Urban Areas' allocation, as suggested by some respondents, would be to relocate this to the part of the MTRA area within PUSH. While this may still provide the scale of housing envisaged by the PUSH strategy, it would be less well related to the main PUSH urban areas and planned employment provision. It is therefore inherently less sustainable.
- 3.27 The environmental constraints around the proposed North Whiteley allocation are fully recognised and have been taken into account from the outset, along with other matters raised such as flood risk and transport issues. Discussions have taken place over several years, as the development strategy has

evolved, with Natural England, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency and other statutory and non-statutory stakeholders about the nature conservation, flooding, transport and other matters. While further work is acknowledged to be needed and is being undertaken, investigations so far have not identified these issues to be 'show-stoppers' and there is certainly no suggestion from Natural England that the development would be 'unlawful' due to its impact on European sites, as claimed by some respondents.

- 3.28 The particular issues in relation to Whiteley are dealt with also in response to Question 5. However, in terms of the overall distribution of housing between the spatial areas, it is concluded that the responses relating to the South Hampshire Urban Areas do not raise any matters that warrant a change to the proposed requirement of 5,500 dwellings concentrated at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley.

Winchester Town

- 3.29 Plans for Places proposed 4,000 dwellings in this sub-area and, because of the uncertainty over the Barton Farm appeal decision, considered two possible strategies for delivering it. While there is some support for the proposed level of housing in Winchester Town, and significant numbers who suggest the figure is too low, the majority of responses felt the requirement was too high. The reasons for this tend to fall into two groups.
- 3.30 The first (slightly larger) group of people oppose the Winchester requirement, on the basis that it exceeds the capacity of the existing settlement boundary, requiring it to be extended, and/or that this would damage the historic character and landscape setting of the town. These responses are amplified in response to Questions 3-4 and are expressed particularly by those who oppose the Barton Farm development. This group tends to argue that the scale of development in Winchester should be limited to its existing urban capacity, with some arguing for higher density development to increase the capacity. Many argue that local housing needs, especially affordable, should be prioritised rather than seeking to meet wider needs/demand.
- 3.31 The second group who suggest the Winchester requirement is too low suggest that the capacity of the town has been over-estimated and that it cannot/should not accommodate the level of housing proposed. They suggest that the level of housing in Winchester should be reduced and the balance reallocated to various settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Areas or to the MTRA or South Hampshire areas generally. These responses highlight particularly the impact of developing at 75 dwellings per hectare within the Town and the loss of car parks to housing, which they say would harm the character or economy of the Town. Most are promoting the development of sites in the MTRA area and wish to increase provision there.
- 3.32 Several responses criticise the method of calculating the Winchester requirement as simplistic, arbitrary or crude, or allege that it concentrates a disproportionate amount of housing in Winchester.

- 3.33 As noted above, the overall development strategy is to locate the majority of housing in the most sustainable locations and Winchester is identified as the most sustainable location in the District. In practice, the spatial split allocates a level of housing to Winchester which is based on its proportion of the current District population and it is this methodology that is criticised by some as simplistic, something which is addressed below.
- 3.34 Given Winchester's sustainability credentials, it is a sound approach to focus development here. Indeed, there could be justification for the requirement to exceed Winchester's current proportion of the District population. However, it is also very clear that Winchester has special characteristics which are highly valuable and must be retained. Local people are rightly concerned that these should not be harmed by inappropriate development. However, it is not reasonable in planning terms to make the case that Winchester as a whole is so constrained by its surroundings that the existing settlement boundary cannot be changed at any point.
- 3.35 Basing the Winchester housing requirement on its proportion of the District population may seem simplistic, but it is an attempt to find a logical, evidence-based means to arrive at a housing requirement, taking account of the lack of consensus on any other principle from which to derive housing numbers for Winchester. Despite the volume of responses for and against development, none suggested any evidence-based methodology for arriving at a new requirement, other than by referring back to the alternative scenarios for overall District housing levels (considered in the Housing Technical Paper).
- 3.36 Although many people argue for a capacity-based approach, based on the existing settlement boundary, this would fail to meet the needs identified through Blueprint in Winchester, such as for affordable housing, economic development, etc. It would also be in conflict with the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, which requires that housing needs should be identified, and met, using a robust evidence base.
- 3.37 It is therefore concluded that 4,000 dwellings is the right level of housing which should be provided to meet Winchester's various needs, and that the town has capacity to achieve this. How this is delivered will depend on the outcome of the Barton Farm decision.

Market Towns and Rural Area

- 3.38 Plans for Places proposed 1,500 dwellings in this sub-area, based on the remainder of the 11,000 District-wide provision, after providing for the majority of development in Winchester and the South Hampshire Urban Areas. Many of the references to the MTRA housing requirement are made in response to Questions 6-9 or through suggestions that some of the requirement for other spatial areas should be moved to/from the MTRA area.

- 3.39 There are, therefore, a limited number of responses to Question 1 specifically on the MTRA requirement. Of these, very few suggest the requirement as a whole is too high (but see Questions 6-9 where some respondents argue the figures for specific villages are too high/low), but a number suggest the overall figure is too low. Sometimes this is because they wish to reduce the requirement for other spatial areas (see above) and sometimes because they suggest it will not meet the villages' needs. Some respondents point out that the sum of the requirements for the named MTRA settlements alone exceeds 1,500 (see also Questions 6-9).
- 3.40 The MTRA strategy suggests 400-500 dwellings in the largest settlements (Alresford and Bishop's Waltham), 150-250 in 6 smaller local service centres, and has no specific target for the many other smaller settlements. The total for the named settlements might range from 1700 to 2500 dwellings, were communities to wish to grow as suggested by Blueprint responses. The proposed 1500 figure contained in Plans for Places was derived from the 'top-down' projection for the District and the overall requirement of 11,000. 11,000 is considered the correct figure as a baseline to be achieved, but if communities wish to develop at a settlement level which produces, in total, a number exceeding 1500, then this will be permitted by the production of neighbourhood plans – the essence of localism as set out by the Government. There is considered to be no contradiction between these two perspectives.
- 3.41 The other main area of comment in relation to the MTRA area was that there should be a target housing figure for the smaller settlements (below the 8 larger named settlements). The approach to the small settlements is considered in more detail below, in response to Question 9. However, the setting of a target would undermine the 'bottom-up' approach to the smaller settlements, whereby the criteria-based policy allows them to provide for their local needs, at whatever scale is necessary and appropriate to the settlement concerned. This 'bottom-up' approach was widely supported (see responses to Question 9). Accordingly, it is not considered that a specific target should be set for the smaller settlements, but the suggested criteria that apply to them do refer to identifying development needs and locations and this should remain.
- 3.42 Indeed, it is important in all the MTRA settlements that local needs are identified and met, to avoid each settlement seeking just to provide the minimum required level of development. The next version of the Core Strategy will, therefore, need to make clear that all the settlements need to satisfy the criteria for identifying and providing for development, as well as those relating to protecting the character of settlements or their settings. This will also help to ensure that the MTRA area makes a significant contribution to overall housing needs, which is likely to be significantly in excess of the 1,500 minimum requirement.

Conclusion to question 1

- 3.43 There was a large response to Question 1, with many respondents disagreeing with the overall level of housing provision, its distribution, or both. However, when looking at specific issues there was very little consensus over whether the requirements as a whole, or for each spatial area, were too high or low. There was also little or no new or technical evidence produced to suggest a different approach and the majority of responses were influenced by whether people were promoting or opposing development, and where. In this respect, it is noticeable that most comments of support are from various types of statutory consultee, who perhaps have a broader overview, whereas most opposition was from either development interests (or their agents) or residents.
- 3.44 Taking account of the representations received, the further work which has been done, Government advice and previous evidence, it is recommended that the next stage of the Core Strategy should promote the provision of 11,000 dwellings in the period 2011 to 2031.
- 3.45 The proposed distribution is considered to be justified and no better-justified alternatives have been put forward. On this basis, the recommended housing provision and distribution is:

Spatial Area	Number of new dwellings 2011 - 2031
Winchester Town	4,000
South Hampshire Urban Areas	5,500
Market Towns and Rural Area (incl SDNP)	1,500
Total	11,000

- 4 **Question 2 : District Retail and Employment Land Requirements**
Summaries of all responses to Question 2 are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.

Question 2:

Tables 4 and 5 identify the amount of retail and employment development that is required for the whole of the Winchester District up to 2026 / 2031.

Do you agree with the amounts and distributions suggested? If not, why not and what evidence do you have in support of that view that we could look at?

Are there any other key land uses that should be quantified and specified for any of the three spatial areas of the District?

- 4.1 Question 2 sets out the retail projections and the employment land requirements for the District up to 2026. It breaks down the retail floorspace into convenience and comparison goods and distributes them between the Winchester Urban Area; the Winchester Rural Area; and Whiteley. The forecast is for a total of an additional 36,524 sq m of retail floorspace, mostly located in the Winchester Urban Area. This projection is based on the NLP Retail Study undertaken in 2010.
- 4.2 The district employment land requirement is broken down into: B1 office uses; B2 light industrials; and B8 warehouse and distribution. This is split between the M27 corridor, Winchester Town, and the rural area. Based on a study undertaken by SQW in 2007, an additional 84.4 hectares of employment land would be required up until 2026. However a more recent employment study has been undertaken by DTZ (report CAB2232(LDF) refers), which takes into account the current economic forecasts and projects a lower floorspace requirement of 15.7 hectares over a longer period up to 2031.

General

- 4.3 Of the 68 responses to this question there was a degree of support for the figures and several respondents expressed caution in down-grading the forecast under the current economic circumstances, as the plan period is over 20 years when the economic outlook should be much healthier. There were also comments on the Government's stated policy of promoting sustainable economic growth and the need to ensure adequate floorspace to meet the eventual upturn in the economy. This in turn requires a flexible approach to the provision of employment floorspace, although in practice the main challenge for the Council in the past has been retaining employment floorspace rather than providing it.
- 4.4 Several respondents raised the issue that there is an increase in home working which needs to be taken into account. The latest DTZ economic study also points to the fact that self-employment is one of the highest sectors in the local economy (at around 12% of the workforce and rising), and this will need further consideration in policy development.
- 4.5 Others suggested that housing delivery and employment/retail development should be more closely aligned, in part to reduce the need for in and out commuting
- 4.6 Winchester Town Forum is concerned about the current evidence in relation to economic growth and retail provision. The retail data is recent reflecting an update of the 2007 Retail Study in 2010. The economic position is covered by the updated economic report elsewhere on this agenda. The Town Forum also request that references to Bushfield Knowledge Park should be separate from the improvement of Bar End/Winnall, as the sites are not interdependent. The approach to resolve the planning status of Bushfield Camp is currently

being explored, given the recent economic update report and a reduction in the amount of floorspace required over the plan period.

Retail

- 4.7 Several respondents commented on changes in retailing as a result of the recession and the potential impact of on-line shopping. Several consider the Study to be out of date. However, the Retail Study was undertaken only last year and has taken into account current trends in predicting the floorspace requirements.
- 4.8 The amount of additional retail floorspace was also questioned, particularly in the light of the many vacant retail shops, and additional floorspace already in the pipe-line. However it should be stressed that the retail projections are taking a long-term view, based on increases in population and household spending in the District.
- 4.9 One respondent questioned the retail provision at Whiteley, which is set to increase by 8,830 sq m up until 2026. However, it should be borne in mind that Whiteley is set to increase its population by over 7,200 new residents during the plan period.
- 4.10 The City of Winchester Trust submitted their own assessment of retail needs and predict a much lower floorspace requirement, no additional convenience floorspace before 2026, and only 12,450 sq m of comparison floorspace.
- 4.11 Several respondents were clear that, in their view, Denmead did not need any further retail, although it should be stressed that the Core Strategy will not be allocating retail floorspace to individual settlements (except to refer to permitted or allocated schemes for Winchester Town and Whiteley)

Employment in Winchester Town

- 4.12 The projection of a requirement for a further 20 hectares of B1 for Winchester Town was considered inadequate by several commentators, although it should be noted that the current Study has reduced the total requirement for the District as a whole to just 9.6 hectares over a longer period.
- 4.13 There was a suggestion of creating a business zone along Andover Road to include Barton Farm. Although Barton Farm is predominantly a housing development, there are a number of potential development opportunities around the railway station and existing commercial/retail premises in this area of the town.
- 4.14 There was general support for the recognition of the need to create start-up space, especially for the creative industry. The need for more live-work units was also suggested, although the Council's experience from West of Waterlooville suggests that in practice there is little actual demand for this type of accommodation.

- 4.15 One suggestion was to divert the potential increased requirement for employment floorspace in the rural areas to a business park located along the eastern side of the City, while others felt strongly that there should be no further employment floorspace outside of the settlement boundary, with a preference for mixed use development on existing sites. There was a suggestion that in future, single-use zoning should not be pursued.
- 4.16 There were a number of comments on the type of employment uses that would be appropriate for the Town, including: knowledge base industries; tourist related employment; and international standard conference and performance facilities.
- 4.17 New employment floorspace should be developed to high densities, provide less parking, and be close to public transport options, and not along motorway corridors

Rural employment floorspace

- 4.18 The point was made that there should be a distinction between the National Park (where development might be more restricted) and the rest of the rural area. However, in practice this would prove difficult to do, as there are no specific site allocations at this stage of the plan process. In any event, Blueprint highlighted the need for settlements in the National Park to be able to capitalise on the employment opportunities presented through enhanced rural tourism attracted to the Park

Employment M27 corridor

- 4.19 One respondent suggested that there was already an adequate supply of employment floorspace at Whiteley and the projected increase of 40.5 hectares along the M27 corridor in the Winchester District should take this into account. These figures will require a further review in the light of the up-dated employment study alongside all the other spatial areas.

Conclusions

- 4.20 The Retail Study is robust and up to date, and nothing in the responses would require a rethink of the projections. The floorspace increase is of a relatively modest scale when spread over the plan period, which would not require a strategic site allocation to deliver, so where necessary, any sites required to meet the identified increases in floorspace will be determined through the proposed Site Allocations DPD.
- 4.21 The evidence base for the employment floorspace requirements used in Plans for Places has now been up-dated, (see report CAB2232 (LDF) elsewhere on this agenda) and a lower requirement has been identified as a consequence. Although the Study does make the point that the amount of floorspace required to meet the changing economy in Winchester Town as it is

rebalanced away from the dominant public sector, towards creating more private sector jobs, could justify a greater increase in floorspace than that implied in the Study. This could be achieved either through a strategic site allocation in the Core Strategy or through a future Area Action Plan which comprehensively considers the employment and regeneration needs of the Town.

- 4.22 This up-dated Study also highlights the importance of the market towns and rural areas particularly for employment in business services, one sector which is expected to grow over the plan period. Around 33% of all employment in this sector can currently be found in the MTRA, roughly the same as for Winchester town and the PUSH area.
- 4.23 Therefore, the precise quantum of employment floorspace required in the District over the next 20 years, together with its apportionment throughout the spatial areas, will need to be considered and finalised as part of the next stage of policy development.

5 **Question 3: Winchester Town land use requirements**

Summaries of all responses to Question 3 are set out in Appendix 3 to this report.

Question 3:

Table 7 lists the various land uses required within Winchester Town and suggests potential sources. Have we missed any particular requirements or sources of development opportunities?

- 5.1 The purpose of Table 7 was to highlight and illustrate both the amount and type of competing land uses to be achieved in a limited amount of space, within the existing defined built-up area of Winchester Town.
- 5.2 Over 70 people/organisations responded to this question, many purely commenting on the need for more/less housing land and/or more/less employment land, and a number promoting their own sites/land for development: few actually focussed their comments on those matters being sought, which was to assess the land use requirements of the Town and potential sources of development land, looking ahead to 2031, within the existing boundary of the Town.
- 5.3 In terms of employment land, various suggestions include: lowering business rates to encourage occupation of vacant offices; intensify existing employment sites; focus employment provision in the town centre and not on edge/out of town sites vs promotion of sites on the edge of the Town. Other suggestions include specific reference to Barton Farm and the opportunity to promote a more business/commercial focus on Andover Road and around the Station area of the Town, and for Bushfield Camp/Badger Farm to be used for retail, business and housing.

- 5.4 Since publication of Plans for Places, the updated economic study suggests that significantly less land is required for employment purposes over the plan period. As indicated in response to Question 2 above, there may be the need for further employment land depending on the strategy to be adopted and the focus for economic growth particular to re-balance the economy, which is currently heavily reliant on the public sector. There is also the suggestion that consideration is given to the preparation of an Area Action Plan which can focus on specific areas of the town and provide a focus for regeneration.
- 5.5 Few responses raise new suggestions as to potential sources of housing land. Some suggest that there is an over reliance on SHLAA sites coming forward, but the Council is required to annually update the SHLAA for this specific purpose to ensure that the sites listed are available and deliverable. A number of comments refer to densities some suggesting higher than 75 dph can be achieved, whilst others comment that this is too high. Changing densities on sites can deliver more housing but it will be necessary to assess the impact of achieving significantly higher densities on a site by site basis to ensure that the overall character of the area is not diminished.

Conclusion

- 5.6 In terms of actual land requirements that have been omitted from Table 7, comments include the need to refer to health and education uses, and Winchester Town Forum specifically refer to the need for primary education. Other comments relate to the need for Southampton University to expand, provision for cultural activities and facilities, sports and leisure provision and the provision of allotments. These are all valuable land uses that contribute to Winchester being an attractive place to live and work. However, the Council is not aware of significant proposals that will require land to be specifically allocated in the Core Strategy. Policies within the Core Strategy and other development plan documents will provide for the consideration of these activities. Obviously, large scale strategic allocations will have to include, in the allocating policy, all those requirements to be included within the development.

6 **Question 4 : Development Strategy for Winchester Town**

Summaries of all responses to Question 4 are set out in Appendix 4 to this report

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

- 4a) If Barton Farm gets planning permission do you agree with the additional components of the development strategy for Winchester Town (at paragraph 5.30) that will also need to be implemented? If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

4b) If Barton Farm does not get planning permission do you agree with the alternative development strategy for Winchester Town (at paragraph 5.31), If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

6.1 It is not possible at this stage to respond to this question in light of the lack of a decision by the Secretary of State in relation to the outstanding planning appeal on the Barton Farm site.

7 **Question 5 Development Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas**

Summaries of all responses to Question 5 are set out in Appendix 5 to this report

Question 5:

Do you agree that our strategy to deliver the majority of the development requirement for the Winchester District portion of the PUSH area should be to focus on large urban extensions at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley? If not, what alternative do you suggest and why?

7.1 This question sought to test whether there was support for the strategy to deliver the majority of the housing requirement in the South Hampshire Urban Area, in two urban extensions at North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville; and if not, what would be a viable alternative strategy.

General

7.2 There was a good deal of support for this strategy, but a lot of it came from respondents from outside of the area. No one really put forward an alternative strategy, although a small number of respondents suggested either spreading it around more or making up any potential shortfalls in the market towns and rural areas, particularly in the early part of the plan period.

7.3 A number of respondents suggested a smaller MDA at Woodcroft Farm but it was not clear as to whether this was in addition or instead of either North Whiteley or West of Waterlooville. The bulk of this site is within Havant and the part of the site within the Winchester District is not required to meet the Council's housing targets.

7.4 One major house builder pointed out that 5,500 new homes is below the requirement in the SE Plan for 6740 new dwellings. However this ignores the fact that the South Hampshire Urban Area is not the same as the part of the District within the PUSH area. A number of respondents questioned either the sites' capacity or delivery rates as a means of promoting alternative sites.

7.5 Several respondents commented on the proposed Strategic Development Area in Fareham Borough. The CPRE recommended that Winchester should

oppose the SDA, although it recognised the importance of retaining the gaps between settlements. The Consortium promoting the SDA broadly support the approach adopted by the City Council, but object to the presumption against any formal open space within the Green Infrastructure provided in the Winchester District.

West of Waterlooville

- 7.6 This Major Development Area (MDA) now has planning consent for 2,500 new dwellings in the Winchester District, the development has commenced and over 100 new homes have been completed to date. The remainder of the housing is expected to be built out over the next 10 years or so, and so it is not surprising that this allocation drew little comment. The main concerns were regarding the potential rate of delivery, but with both developers now on site, there are no planning impediments to delivering the full number of new houses within the plan period.

North Whiteley

- 7.7 The potential allocation of this site drew the most comment. While there was some active support for the proposal as a means of diverting pressures from other areas, there were more responses from those opposed to the allocation of this site. There were a number of concerns expressed regarding highways issues and the timely provision of infrastructure: however, the overwhelming majority raised concerns regarding the potential impact on designated sites of ecological importance. In doing so, several respondents questioned the legality of the potential allocation because of its impact on the Upper Hamble Special Protection Area. Responses were received from both the RSPB and National Trust, who, while not objecting to the proposed MDA per se, highlighted the importance of undertaking further work to fully assess the impacts on all protected sites and species, and in putting in place a full package of mitigation measures to avoid any potential harm.
- 7.8 In fact, the ecological and environmental constraints on this site are well understood and over the past few years numerous meetings have been held with both Natural England and the Environment Agency to ensure that the correct procedures are adopted by the Council in proposing this site for development. Before the site can be formally allocated, it will need to undergo further assessment work to ensure that its development would have no adverse effects on any of the nearby sites of international importance. This work will be undertaken in close cooperation with Natural England to ensure that the process and methodology are both sound, and legally robust. However, to date there has been no indication whatsoever that all of the potential impacts cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. In this context, it should be noted that Natural England raised no objections in response to the Plans for Places consultation.
- 7.9 Comments have also been raised on flood risk. Again, certain parts of the site are known to be within flood risk zones, but all built development would be kept

well away from any area at risk of flooding, and it would be a policy requirement that a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) should be designed and incorporated into the layout to capture potential water run-off on the site. Discussions have been held with the Environment Agency to ensure that an effective SuDS is provided on the site to avoid both flooding on the site or excessive run-off leading to flooding elsewhere in the area.

- 7.10 Transport is another area where concerns have been raised, and the Highways Agency made the point that a package of appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce the impact on the strategic highways network, particularly around Junction 9 of the M27 motorway. This will require sustainable transport measures to be adopted as part of a transport delivery strategy. Eastleigh Borough Council raise concerns about the transport impact of the site particularly on their local road network. Fareham broadly supports the allocation, but agrees that the timely delivery of infrastructure is key. These issues will need to be considered and addressed as part of the development of a package of sustainable transport measures.

Conclusions

- 7.11 No new issues have been raised in respect of the spatial strategy for the South Hampshire Urban Areas. West of Waterlooville is already consented, and under development. The potential MDA at North Whiteley requires further work to fully assess the ecological impacts on the internationally-protected sites, and a package of measures should be developed to either avoid or mitigate any potentially adverse impacts. Work on the necessary Habitats Regulations Assessment is already well underway but will need to be completed and form part of the evidence base prior to the next stage of the Core Strategy.
- 7.12 Likewise, the transport impacts will need to be modelled and assessed, and a package of mitigations and sustainable transport measures developed and agreed by both the Highways Agency and Hampshire County Council as the highways authority.
- 7.13 By the next stage of the policy development, an infrastructure delivery strategy will need to be developed which sets out all of the social and physical infrastructure required to support the new community, and this should be tested for viability and deliverability.
- 7.14 The area of land under consideration at North Whiteley is around 220 hectares. About half of this area is either environmentally constrained or required to provide buffers, but the remaining 110 or so hectares available for development is more than adequate to provide at least 3,000 new dwellings. The precise number should be determined by the master-planning process.

8 **Market Towns And Rural Area**

Question 6 : Revised vision for Market Towns And Rural Area

Summaries of all responses to Question6 are set out in Appendix 6 to this report

Question 6

Do you agree this revised vision more appropriately reflects the aspirations for this area and the key common elements raised through Blueprint - supporting appropriate development while maintaining rural character and settlement identity? If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

- 8.1 This spatial area covers the majority of the District, including that part that lies within the South Downs National Park. The Council was fortunate enough during 2010 to receive additional expertise through the Government's Rural Masterplanning project on how to address rural issues. This data, together with Blueprint responses, has provided the Council with an understanding of the many common issues affecting the rural area, and the recognition that many communities accept the need for limited development to maintain both services and community vitality. Hence, it was considered appropriate to update the vision for the Market Towns and Rural Area to that contained in the Preferred Option Core Strategy.
- 8.2 Of the 66 responses to this question, many agreed with the revised vision, particularly to ensure that settlement identity is retained (albeit whilst allowing for sustainable growth based on local needs). Of the remainder of comments, those disagreeing or commenting on the revised text were primarily concerned that the revised vision fails to make adequate provision for both affordable and market housing to meet future needs. Many of the responses are from the development industry, suggesting that a greater proportion of housing should be met within this spatial area - the housing requirement for this part of the District is examined in detail in the responses to Question 1 (set out in Section 3 of this report), where the emphasis is on responding to local needs in this part of the District given the nature of the settlements, their facilities and services and how well they are connected.
- 8.3 Some comments make the observation that the small amounts of housing to be provided in the individual settlements through the revised strategy will fail to support the retention of local services or indeed provide for their own infrastructure. Provision of infrastructure has always been a critical issue when considering smaller levels of development. Policies in the Core Strategy will require new development to provide its own infrastructure. However, with the introduction of CIL, there will be opportunities for the charges levied and collected to contribute to schemes which have a wider community benefit.
- 8.4 There is a suggestion that the vision is sub-divided to respond to the larger and smaller settlements in line with the strategy proposed for the different

levels of settlement. The purpose of the vision is to express in the Core Strategy the aspirations for this spatial area of the District. It is then for the policies to express how this will be achieved through the appropriate levels of development etc.

- 8.5 Linked with question 6 are the proposed development strategies to cover the whole of the Market Towns and Rural Area, the responses to which are dealt with under questions 7, 8 and 9 which follow.
- 8.6 Blueprint generated many well considered, positive, responses from the communities in the rural part of the District, with many acknowledging the need for limited growth in keeping with the scale and character of the settlements, so that homes can be provided for families and older people, and that appropriate economic opportunities can be maximised. Unfortunately, these aspirations have not been carried forward in some of the responses received to Plans for Places, where there are a number of objections to development in principle and specific concerns about matters which received support through Blueprint.

Conclusion

- 8.7 The comments received do not raise fundamental issues with the revised vision. It will, however, be necessary (when the pre-submission version of the Core Strategy is drafted) to ensure that the vision reflects the many aspirations for this spatial area that can be delivered by the accompanying strategic policies.

9 **Question 7 : Development strategy for New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham**

Summaries of all responses to Question7 are set out in Appendix 7 to this report

Question 7

- 7a) Do you agree that New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham are the main settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area and with the suggested amounts of new housing to be provided (around 20-25 dwellings a year to produce a total of 400- 500 new homes over 20 years)?
- 7b) Do you agree that the key elements that need to be addressed include:-
- maintaining and strengthening the shopping, service, tourism and employment role of these settlements;
 - ensuring that greenfield releases are aimed mainly at supporting this role or meeting other local needs;
 - protecting the adjoining National Park and other important aspects of the environment and setting of the settlements, or gaps between settlements;

- creating development opportunities by relocating/redeveloping certain uses or areas, provided important uses and facilities are re-provided in locations that will continue to serve the settlements;
- maintaining and where possible improving public transport provision;
- provision of adequate and timely infrastructure in conjunction with development and to address existing deficiencies.

If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Responses to Question 7a

- 9.1 Of the 65 comments received to this part of question 7, 31 agreed with the suggested levels of housing provision for both New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham. There is some confusion, however, with how these figures plus those expressed in question 8 total more than 1500 (which is the suggested level of overall provision for the Market Towns and Rural Area). This issue is covered in full in the response to Question 1, which explains that this is due to the settlement requirements being driven by a 'bottom-up' approach derived from the Blueprint responses and evidence about the needs of various levels of settlement, compared to the 1500 figure which is the 'residual left' from the 'top down' projection for the District of 11,000.
- 9.2 A further element of confusion with the suggested housing requirement is whether the 400 – 500 requirement was for each named settlement or New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham combined. To clarify, this is for each settlement, based on the range of evidence gathered through the evolution of the Core Strategy to date: both these settlements are sustainable locations for growth, albeit at an appropriate scale, which is what is being sought by this approach.
- 9.3 A number of responses support this range of provision, on the basis that it will support an ageing population, support the local economy and provide for affordable housing. This support is however couched in terms that the infrastructure required must be provided and priority is given to 'infill/brownfield sites' first. Provision of infrastructure is always an issue with new development and development proposals will be required to provide what is required to ensure that the site can be delivered in a timely fashion, whether this is through on-site infrastructure provision or contributions. The scale of development in Bishop's Waltham and New Alresford will not require land to be allocated in the Core Strategy. The policy setting out the development principles for these settlements will, however, give guidance as to the type of land and uses required and, as with the draft policy in the preferred option Core Strategy, it will give a steer to how this could be achieved. Any land to be allocated will be set out in the Development Management and Site Allocations DPD or a Neighbourhood Plan to follow the Core Strategy.
- 9.4 Of the responses objecting to the housing requirements these relate to a variety of reasons including:-

- figures/evidence is out of date and do not take account of the National Park
 - development should be spread around the villages
 - proposed numbers are too high/too low
 - lack of service provision to support new housing
 - the market towns are being required to absorb a high proportion of the housing requirement compared to their size
- 9.5 The amount of new housing to be provided in the market towns is addressed in Question 1 in this report. In relation to the National Park comment, this has been taken into account in the proportioning of the revised housing requirement, but both New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham act in a gateway capacity to the Park, being specifically excluded from it, and should maximise this opportunity.
- 9.6 It is not considered that the amount of new housing proposed is disproportionate to the size of settlement when taking into account population, service provision, connections with neighbouring settlements etc. This is a reasonable approach to plan for some growth to address changing circumstances and local aspirations. To disperse this requirement around surrounding villages would result in unsustainable piecemeal development: focussing the greater provision of growth in those settlements with a reasonable service and population base is the most sustainable solution.
- 9.7 The 400 – 500 housing requirement, when broken down into an annual rate across the plan period, equates to 20 -25 dwellings per annum. This corresponds to past growth rates and so reflects what has been occurring over a number of years.

Responses to question 7b

- 9.8 Part b to question 7 listed those key elements that it is considered need to be addressed in planning policy, and many responses agreed with the suggestions made. Of those commenting on the list, there were requests for the Core Strategy to be more site-specific and indicate the direction of growth. As previously stated, the Core Strategy will not allocate smaller sites for development - this will fall to a future DPD.
- 9.9 A point was also made that if facilities/uses are relocated, this should be in locations that continue to serve the settlements in the area. A further comment was to focus development for the elderly on sites near town centres. The Core Strategy will not be so specific: it will set the framework for growth and change and this will include the emphasis on the re-use of brownfield sites. Similarly, if uses are to be relocated, their new sites will be required to be accessible to ensure that local employment opportunities are not lost.
- 9.10 The following comments have been received from the relevant Parish Councils:-

Bishop's Waltham – key issues raised:-

- About 100 dwellings have already been built and these need to be taken into account when monitoring the 400 – 500 requirement
- Need to retain town's character
- Bullet 1 agree more local employment is needed
- Bullet 2 agree but only for employment needs
- Bullet 3 need to limit development in the National Park and protect gaps between settlements
- Bullet 4 agree but only to meet a lack of existing provision
- Bullet 5 agree need to improve current poor provision
- Bullet 6 agree need to plan for infrastructure with new development and this needs to be clear in the Core Strategy

New Alresford – key issues raised :-

- There's no logic to allocating BW and NA for 500 new dwellings as the target for the MTRA area is only 1500
- Agree with the suggestions in general, but disagree to the references to greenfield releases. NA requires open space land rather than land for development, the existing commercial development needs to be relocated out of the centre but retained in the area. Small towns are an effective nursery for innovative small businesses so there is a need for flexibility.
- Support need for 2-3 bed homes for ageing population and local housing needs
- There is no need for additional retail space but it is imperative that the existing space is retained.

9.11 In response to these, Officers would comment as follows.

9.12 The rationale behind the 400 – 500 suggested number of new homes to be provided in each of these settlements has already been covered. The accompanying policy will be required to express how it is anticipated this should be delivered. Bullet 2 specifically acknowledges the need to consider greenfield releases, but only to support the role of the settlement and to meet local needs, and this allows local circumstances to inform the process and is something that could be further considered through a Neighbourhood Plan as the Core Strategy will not allocate non-strategic sites.

9.13 Both settlements refer to the need to explore employment opportunities and the need for a flexible approach particularly considering the current economic situation and the need to be able to respond to changing circumstances. Given the plan period, the Core Strategy policy will have to provide flexibility to allow these settlements to address their employment requirements and to be able to respond to changing working practices.

9.14 The other detailed matters raised are noted and will be taken into account when the matters listed under 7b are expressed as planning policy.

Conclusion

- 9.15 The housing provision for Bishop's Waltham and New Alresford at 400 -500 new dwellings each over the 20 year plan period, is considered appropriate and justified given the size, form and function of these settlements and their role as Market Towns serving a much broader rural area, including those many smaller settlements now in the National Park.
- 9.16 The policy in the next version of the Core Strategy that expresses this requirement will cover the matters raised in question 7b in addition to other issues that may be appropriate. This is to ensure that the policy not only guides the right amount of development but also enables the necessary supporting infrastructure to be provided in a timely manner. The policy will also need to cover any local aspirations particularly for economic growth that will require strategic policy to be delivered. In terms of the need to release greenfield sites, the policy will not preclude consideration of this, given that this will set out the development strategy for a 20 year period. However, there will be a requirement for brownfield sites to also be considered as part of the strategy to ensure that there is a mix of development opportunities available.

10 **Question 8 : Development strategy for Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham**

Summaries of all responses to Question 8 are set out in Appendix 8 to this report

Question 8

- 8a) Do you agree that Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham are locally important service centres which should provide in the range of about 150 – 250 new homes each over 20 years?
- 8b) Do you agree that the key elements that need to be addressed include:-
- emphasising the need to maintain and improve local facilities and public transport provision;
 - enabling small-scale business developments, particularly for local start-up businesses;
 - promoting development suited to local housing needs, particularly for affordable housing or housing for older people;
 - conserving local features which are important in giving the settlements their character, particularly those identified in Village Design Statements or the District Landscape Character Assessment.
 - protecting the adjoining National Park and identified gaps between settlements;

If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Response to Question 8a

- 10.1 With regard to the proposed number of new homes to be provided in each of these settlements (150 -250), some agree that the range is right whilst others consider it too high or too low. Those promoting development sites suggest these figures should be increased – particularly for those settlements that fall within PUSH. The PUSH boundary does include a number of these settlements: however, in defining the spatial areas for the District, the smaller settlements that do not particularly relate to the economic growth strategy for PUSH were excluded for local planning policy purposes and included in the locally designated Market Towns and Rural Area, reflecting both local opinion and the actual role and function of these settlements. These settlements have a stronger affinity with the rural area and their supporting market towns, rather than the urban focus of PUSH. A further comment suggests that there is a need to distinguish between which settlements lie inside or outside the National Park – all of the settlements that fall into this category lie outside the National Park but act as service centres for the smaller settlements that lie within.
- 10.2 This range of settlements has all been identified for some growth, given their size and function. The purpose of suggesting a range of growth allows local requirements to inform the scale of new development and the Core Strategy policies will include the criteria to be addressed. This allows flexibility for each settlement to respond more specifically to its own needs and aspirations. Some responses suggested that the range should be reduced to 100 -150 new dwellings and any balance left added to Winchester. A key purpose of specifying a housing requirement in these smaller settlements is to allow them to address their own housing needs in a planned manner, to reduce the amount would not allow local housing requirements to be met and to reallocate the balance to Winchester would fail to address local needs.
- 10.3 A number of comments question the methodology as to how these settlements have been identified for some growth. Throughout the evolution of the Core Strategy, a comprehensive evidence base has been built up, which has provided the Council with the necessary tools and data to make qualified judgements. The settlements of Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham, have for a combination of reasons been identified as local services centres. More recent work, which was funded through the Government's Rural Masterplanning project, has allowed for other factors to be taken into account, in particular how well connected settlements are and how settlements interrelate with each other. All the data and subsequent analysis is set out in full in the Council's Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy Background Paper (2011) which can be viewed on the Council's website :-

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?nc=FGUP&id=27465>

- 10.4 That report concluded that “Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham all have quite different characteristics, but they all perform roles as locally-important service centres. The Blueprint responses show a desire to maintain and improve local facilities and public transport in these settlements, often with suggestions for new facilities or services, along with some localised concerns about the capacity of particular facilities or infrastructure. These smaller service centres acknowledge the need to provide for local housing needs, especially for affordable housing and older persons’ housing. “
- 10.5 In terms of the named settlements that this policy approach will be applied to, the following observations have been received from the relevant Parish Councils.
- 10.6 Colden Common PC – suggest minor wording changes to the criteria of 8b, and request changes to the settlement profile appended

Response – at this stage, this list under 8b purely identifies the key elements that will be covered by an accompanying policy in the Core Strategy and it will be necessary to express these requirements in planning terms in the next version. The settlement profiles were forwarded to parishes for comment prior to publication.

- 10.7 Denmead PC – would accept 200 houses over 20 years provided this includes housing at Little Frenchies field; is on brownfield land and within the settlement boundary.

Response – any allocation for Denmead will be able to take into account completions and planning permissions from the start of the plan period (which is 2011). The policy to accompany the strategy for these settlements will refer to delivering a range of dwellings on a mix of sites i.e brownfield and greenfield – the Core Strategy will not be allocating sites for this scale of development. Denmead has just received funding under the Government’s Neighbourhood Planning Front Runner pilot and this will provide an ideal forum for the Parish to determine how it wants to allocate sites.

- 10.8 Kings Worthy PC – need to retain rural bus services and a comprehensive public transport system is needed to support new development.

Response – the Council agrees with the sentiment of this comment: however, many rural bus services will have been affected by the recent changes to the rural bus subsidy received by Hants CC, which lies outside the City Council’s control. The identification of Kings Worthy for a limited amount of development is not based purely on its public transport accessibility, but on a wider range of factors.

- 10.9 Swanmore PC – comment that there should be clear policies to prevent the coalescence of settlements.

Response – the policy will include those elements listed at 8b which includes the need to protect identified gaps between settlements.

- 10.10 Waltham Chase (Shedfield PC) – the definition ‘locally important service centre’ is unknown and doubt whether Waltham Chase fits this category; agree with the matters listed in part b but need to be more specific on the type of business development that may be acceptable – need to safeguard against increase in HGV movement; local housing should be for local people; drainage matters need to be resolved.

Response – the term “locally important service centre” is used in planning guidance to refer to those settlements that act in a service capacity for surrounding villages and given Waltham Chase’s relationship with both Shedfield and Shirell Heath it, along with the other settlements listed under this question, generally fall within this category, and are of a size with a level of service provision to support new small-scale development. The other matters raised by the Parish Council will be covered when the list in part b is set out in planning policy terms, as it will need to make clear the type and scale of development that will be considered acceptable under the policy, including the need for new development to provide for its own infrastructure requirements.

- 10.11 Wickham PC – support maximum of 100 additional dwellings, if outside the settlement boundary these should be to the north of the village, any development should be phased over 20 years and resolve the current open space shortfall and contribute to community infrastructure. Regard should be had to the proximity of the Fareham SDA. Wickham needs family housing and social housing for only local needs, it should not be required to comply with the 40% requirement as it has an existing high proportion of social housing.

Response – given the size and facilities within Wickham, specifically as the 2010 NLP Retail update identifies Wickham as a District Centre along with Bishop’s Waltham, New Alresford and Whiteley, it is considered appropriate that Wickham is identified under this category to provide ‘about 150 – 250 new homes’ over the 20 year plan period. Wickham still has a housing need requirement and it will be necessary for it to comply with the affordable housing policies in the Core Strategy.

Response to Question 8b

- 10.12 As with responses to question 7b some of these suggest specific sites for development, whilst others request clarification as to what is intended. The policy to accompany the development strategy for Golden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham will need to be clear as to what is expected, acknowledging that local circumstances may require an individual response.

Conclusion

10.13 It is considered that the strategy promoted through Plans for Places for Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham reflects the conclusions set out in the Market Towns and Rural Area background report, and Blueprint and this forms a robust basis for a development strategy and corresponding strategic policy to be included in the next version of the Core Strategy.

11 **Question 9 : other settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area**

Summaries of all responses to Question 9 are set out in Appendix 9 to this report

Question 9

- 9a) Do you agree that the suggested criteria-based approach is the right one for the various smaller towns and villages?
- 9b) Do the matters listed cover the right things that should be used to judge what types and how much development is appropriate?
- If not what other items should be included and why?

11.1 For the remainder of the settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area a new approach was suggested in Plans for Places. This built on the feedback from Blueprint, where a number of the much smaller rural communities acknowledged that some limited development could be beneficial either to support local services or to provide much needed local affordable housing. This was in the light of the range of data collated for the settlements in the District and the analysis undertaken in the Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy Background Paper (2011), which concluded that :-

“The remainder of the settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area are very varied in terms of their size, character, level of service provision, etc. Many are very modest, both in terms of their population and their level of service provision. This is typical of a diverse rural area where there is a high degree of personal mobility and choice, which creates a complex pattern of settlement dependencies.

The assessment of these settlements does not reveal those that are explicitly stronger or more sustainable as they all have their own strengths and potential weaknesses. Although some of these settlements may be very small and do not necessarily perform well on traditional ‘sustainability’ criteria, almost all acknowledged through Blueprint the need for some housing, often smaller affordable units or housing for older people.

Plans for Places therefore proposes that for these settlements, the approach should be aimed at delivering the modest levels and types of development which they want, and which will also help to maintain their local population and services, whilst respecting their concerns about its impact. The diversity of settlements in this group means that some settlements have more to offer than others, and the approach reflects this.

It is suggested that all of the settlements in this group would be subject to a criteria-based policy which would allow for small-scale development appropriate to each settlement. It is not intended to quantify the amount of new development involved, as this will be locally-determined having regard to the needs of the local residents, businesses and services and in accordance with the criteria. “

- 11.2 Plans for Places therefore included both the concept and the list of matters that would be included in this revised criteria based approach that would be applied to all the settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area, including those that fall within the National Park.
- 11.3 Some 70 responses were received to question 9, with over 50% supporting the revised approach. Of those objecting, the reasons included:-
- Will not provide adequate housing
 - Criteria too vague/too narrow and open to interpretation – they should allow for local initiatives
 - Reinstate previous levels 3 and 4
 - Parish plans should take greater weight than the Core Strategy
 - Need to retain settlement boundaries
- 11.4 This approach provides a flexible pragmatic solution to a complex situation, where there are many small settlements of varying size, character and level provision of services. It is acknowledged that those matters listed in question 9b are broad and will need careful drafting to translate them into spatial planning criteria, so that they will provide sufficient guidance on which to base planning decisions. The removal of settlement boundaries will allow a responsive approach to decision making, to allow a broader consideration of matters that may contribute to the sustainability and well being of specific communities. This will also remove the confusion of applying the current H4 infill policy criteria. The approach is considered to be consistent with the approach to sustainable development contained in the draft NPPF.
- 11.5 It is not considered desirable to reinstate the categorisation of level 3 and 4 settlements as expressed in the Preferred Option Core Strategy, as the differences between these settlements can be small and often subject to

change at short notice. This revised approach is more responsive and will provide opportunities for communities to be pro-active in exploring initiatives, either through Parish Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. The current planning system does not formally recognise Parish Plans. The Localism Bill, however, introduces the concept of Neighbourhood Plans which will form part of the LDF. These will be subject to preparation guidelines and will need to comply with the strategic development strategy set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The Government has made clear that their purpose will be to allocate land for development if necessary over and above that set out in the Core Strategy - they are not a tool for saying “No” to development.

- 11.6 The amount of development to be delivered through this mechanism is unknown and for this reason a housing target has not been allocated to the settlements that will be subject to this approach. New housing coming forward will contribute to the Market Towns and Rural Area provision.

Conclusion

- 11.7 This revised approach to the range of small settlements in the District pro-actively responds to the Localism agenda and will provide opportunities for these smaller communities to plan for limited development subject to the criteria specified.

12 **Question 10 : Core Policies to be included in the Core Strategy**

Summaries of all responses to Question10 are set out in Appendix 10 to this report

Question 10

Are there any other strategic topics that should be included in the Core Strategy that apply to the District generally, rather than to any of the three spatial areas, and why do you think these should be covered?

- 12.1 The structure of the Core Strategy will consist of two parts as per the preferred option version published in 2009. The spatial development strategy for the whole District will be expressed according to the three spatial areas that exist. These policies will deal with the amount, type and broad location of development that will be required to be provided over the plan period to 2031 and other matters that are locally specific to that spatial area. In addition, it will also be necessary to set out a series of strategic policies that will be applied across the whole District, regardless of the spatial area a development proposal falls within. These policies will be grouped according to which theme of the Council’s Community Strategy they fall under.
- 12.2 Many of the 65 responses to this section of Plans for Places refer to topics that are already in the Preferred Option version of the Core Strategy and will be carried forward (subject to updating) to the Pre-submission version. A number of responses also refer to the introduction of the NPPF and the need

for this to be referred to. At this stage, the final content of the NPPF is uncertain, given the amount of interest and discussion that is currently taking place. The content of the NPPF and the implications for planning in Winchester will be reported to Cabinet on 12 October 2011. Notwithstanding the timing of the publication of the NPPF, the necessity to have an adopted 'local plan' in place, to provide guidance as to the right type, amount and location of development, is clear. The publication of the Core Strategy is the first stage in this process and under the current timetable its adoption is anticipated by end of 2012.

- 12.3 A number of responses refer to the need to plan for an ageing population – this matter was raised on a number of occasions through Blueprint and it will be necessary to ensure that the Core Strategy addresses any specific land use requirements unique to this sector of the community. This is also the case for gypsies and travellers and the Core Strategy will include a policy to guide development for this community which will also respond to the findings of the ISG on this subject that has recently concluded.
- 12.4 Some responses refer to the need to retain/remove local gaps. In responding to comments received through the Preferred Option Core Strategy, it was agreed that the draft policy on gaps be deleted and replaced with one that recognises the different roles of gaps in the District, namely those that help define major settlement structure and strategic allocations and one that helps define rural settlement pattern. At this stage the intention is that this approach will be incorporated into the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy, although the type and function of any specified gaps will be included in the spatial sections of the Core Strategy so that they relate to that spatial area rather than a more generic policy.

Conclusion

- 12.5 The above, and other general District-wide issues that need policy guidance on, will be included in the Core Strategy, either within the sections covering the spatial development strategy or within the core topic section. A key requirement will be to ensure that there is sufficient guidance in the Core Strategy to be able to give informed consideration to a range of planning proposals to come forward during the plan period.
- 12.6 Since the preferred option publication of the Core Strategy in 2009, there have been a number of changes to planning guidance. Notwithstanding the outcome of the draft NPPF, it will also be necessary to reflect the Localism Bill and the introduction of Neighbourhood Plans and the Duty to Co-operate, as well as the strategies set out in Local Enterprise Partnerships which have spatial planning implications and any other strategies requiring a planning policy response.

13 General Comments Received

Summaries of all responses that are not attributed to a specific question in Plans for Places are set out in Appendix 11 to this report

- 13.1 A number of respondents (15) raised general points which were not directed towards any one particular question. English Heritage, for example, raised the valid point that Plans for Places makes special reference to the historic environment in the city of Winchester but is largely silent on the wealth of material on the historic assets throughout the rest of the District, particularly those outside of settlements. They advise that the Sustainability Appraisal required for the next stage of preparing the Core Strategy will need to be updated to address this issue. This point is well made and will be taken into account in the next round of plan preparation.
- 13.2 The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) support parts of the document, particularly the notion of Parish Plans, and the emphasis placed on developing brownfield sites, but raise concerns regarding the NPPF and its emphasis on economic growth and lack of protection for the countryside, and the potential consequences for the District. This is more a point for Government than the City Council, since the Council must follow the guidance of the NPPF (as it has other statutory guidance in the past).
- 13.3 Finally, one respondent considered it unsound to proceed, on the basis that it is the Government's intention to abolish the South East Plan and that any consultations should have waited for the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal, as the decision will have consequences across the whole District. The Council is well aware of the Cala Homes High Court decision that clarified the situation with the South East Plan as far as plan making is concerned, and that it will remain a material consideration up until the point it is formally revoked. Until that stage is reached, the Core Strategy will need to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy. It has been on this basis that Plans for Places was prepared. The Council is also aware of the importance of the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal: however, it is also aware of the need for an up to date local plan, and could not await the outcome of the Public Inquiry, a decision which has subsequently been justified due to the delay in the Secretary of State reaching his decision. However, it will not be possible to proceed much further with the Core Strategy until the decision is known.

14 **Conclusion and Next Steps**

- 14.1 The comments received to Plans for Places reaffirms that the general spirit of the Core Strategy is heading in the right direction, if the principles expressed in the document are carried forward to strategic planning policy. There were many detailed comments and some opposing views, typically from the development industry vs local communities, but on the whole the comments support the approach proposed.
- 14.2 In terms of the District's housing requirement, it is concluded that this is the right amount of new homes to plan for over a 20 year period, allowing for a slow start as there is a move out of a recession to a greater demand in the later part of the plan period. The distribution of housing provision is again

right, given the varying roles and characteristics of the range of settlements in the District. The confusion about the housing numbers for the Market Towns and Rural areas being potentially greater than the requirement for this part of the District provides not only a degree of flexibility but also allows individual settlements to respond to local needs and aspirations.

- 14.3 In terms of the different spatial areas a major difficulty is how to address Winchester Town given the unknown conclusion of the Barton Farm inquiry held earlier this year. This decision is fundamental to the strategy for the Town and at this stage, discussion on this has not been covered in this report. Officers are in communication with DCLG to chase the process, but in the meantime it would not be appropriate to pre-judge the outcome. An oral update on this will be given at the meeting.
- 14.4 In the South Hampshire Urban Area, despite the increasing local awareness of the proposed strategic allocation at North Whiteley for residential purposes, the early discussions on this site are progressing well and it will be possible to allocate it in the Core Strategy and illustrate that it is deliverable and contribute to the much needed demand for new homes in the District.
- 14.5 There is also support for the strategy for both the larger and smaller settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area, to provide new homes and other development to contribute to the sustainability and attractiveness of this range of settlements.
- 14.6 There is now some urgency to finalise and formally progress the Core Strategy given the Government's announcements in the draft NPPF on the presumption in favour of sustainable development, particularly where a plan is silent or absent. The adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006) does not adequately deal with a number of issues facing the District, and it is therefore necessary to seek to get the Core Strategy adopted as soon as is practicable. On this basis, the intention is to seek Cabinet and Council approval for the pre-submission/submission version of the Core Strategy in December 2011, and this will be subject to 6 weeks' consultation (on the principles of soundness) during January/February 2012, followed by formal submission in April and the examination period thereafter. This then anticipates the Inspector's Report in October/November 2012, with formal adoption by end 2012.
- 14.7 This timetable is however dependent on having all the relevant evidence in place, any recent studies which are now reaching conclusion (see CAB2232(LDF)) and any other influencing factors – which in this case includes the outcome of the Barton Farm decision.
- 14.8 The next meeting of this Committee has provisionally been set for 10 November 2011, and the purpose of this meeting will be to agree and approve the Pre-Submission/Submission version of the Core Strategy. However, as yet it has not been possible to reconcile the development strategy for Winchester Town, and therefore those comments relating to the Town,

together with the outcome of the Secretary of State's decision, will be directly reported to Cabinet on 12 October 2011 to expedite preparation of the final draft of the Core Strategy. If, however, the Barton Farm decision has not been announced by this point, it will be necessary to review the Core Strategy timetable.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

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

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

16 **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

- 16.1 The key resources for undertaking work on the LDF have been approved as part of the budget process. The nature and scale of the LDF will continue to require shared resources in terms of utilising skills and expertise from other Teams within the Council. This is now even more critical given the emphasis on localism.
- 16.2 Proposals for the 2011/12 budget include withdrawing the annual contribution of £40,000 to the LDF Reserve to provide for possible future major costs such as the public examination stage. Based on current forecasts of expenditure on the LDF, this is likely to result in a significant budget shortfall from 2013/14 onwards and this would need to be reviewed in due course to assess whether additional funding is required to enable the LDF to progress.
- 16.3 The precise timing of the abolition of Regional Strategies is still unknown, and the Core Strategy will therefore be required to demonstrate compliance with it, in addition to the emerging NPPF. There is still a requirement to demonstrate a 5 year supply of available housing land and this could be increased through the NPPF to include an additional 20%. It is therefore necessary to ensure that the appropriate skills and resources are available to support this.

17 **RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

- 17.1 The publication of the Localism Bill in December 2010 reaffirms the Government's intention to retain LDFs and their constituent development plan documents. The National Planning Policy Framework and revised Local Planning Regulations, both published for consultation, also reaffirm the format

and content of development plan documents and the broad process LDFs will be required to follow.

- 17.2 A particular risk to the Council in the short term is the issue of an ageing Local Plan and challenges regarding not only housing supply but also the emerging presumption in favour of sustainable development which requires applications to be granted favourably if the local plan is silent or absent etc.
- 17.3 A further risk is the lack of a decision on the Barton Farm site which is fundamental to the development strategy for Winchester Town and this could have detrimental impact on progressing the Core Strategy in a timely manner, putting the Council more at risk of dealing with development proposals through the appeal process.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

APPENDICES:

- Appendix 1 : Summary of Responses to Question 1
- Appendix 2 : Summary of Responses to Question 2
- Appendix 3 : Summary of Responses to Question 3
- Appendix 4 : Summary of Responses to Question 4
- Appendix 5 : Summary of Responses to Question 5
- Appendix 6 : Summary of Responses to Question 6
- Appendix 7 : Summary of Responses to Question 7
- Appendix 8 : Summary of Responses to Question 8
- Appendix 9 : Summary of Responses to Question 9
- Appendix 10 : Summary of Responses to Question 10
- Appendix 11 : Summary of Responses to general comments

Appendix 1

Question 1: Table 3 identifies the amount of housing to be provided in the District. We think this housing distribution reflects the function and characteristics of the District, in a way that will provide the right number of new homes in the most appropriate locations over the next 20 years?

Do you agree with this or is there another way to distribute the housing requirement? If not, why not and what evidence do you have in support of that view that we could look at?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree with the distribution which should include 4000 dwellings at Winchester whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	Disagrees with the housing number stated, but agrees that distribution should be weighted towards urban or larger sites.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	See no reason to disagree although numbers may need to be reviewed in response to emerging government policy.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	Agree, but account should be taken of future public sector cuts, which may influence migration.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Otterbourne is in the Market Towns & Rural Area of the District. OPC suggests that the amount of housing (locally determined) is focused on smaller housing units (1/2/3 bed) affordable homes. This would reflect needs of young people and elderly population in small households.
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	Yes	Agreement with housing distribution figures assuming that forecasts are correct. Does not accept that additional housing is required to keep house prices down as people cannot always live where they want to. Lower housing numbers produces a better environment.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	N/A
	Reynolds	Yes	contact details
The Dever Society	Robertson	Yes	N/A
	Simmonds	Yes	On the assumption that that this LDF will be taken forward as planned, regardless of the make-up of the Council in months and years to come, unless "user" contribution is sought before each change proposed by any change in Council is tabled for decision
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	No expert view on numbers. New housing should be built in locations where higher densities and reduced traffic generation can be achieved and preferably on brownfield sites.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Denmead Village Association (Chair)	Stevens	Yes	Agree, except that numbers may need to be reviewed in line with emerging government policy. The council should take into account the the impacts of public sector cuts on expected migration figures.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)		No	The Housing Technical Paper acknowledges that further work is required and updating is needed. It assumes a household size of 1.5 persons per dwelling whereas the national level is 2.36. If this were applied the requirement would only be 7012 dwellings. Housing needs are therefore overestimated and the figures for the Market Towns and Rural Area settlemnts do not correspond to the requirement. The figures should be reconsidered to take account of the environmental importance of the countryside around Whiteley and the special character of Winchester.
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		No	The housing figure has no regard to the South East Plan requirement and is based on old projections. The Courts have concluded it is unlawful to take account of the proposed abolition of regional guidance in plan-making and DPDs must accord with regional guidance so long as it exists. The distribution relies heavily on Winchester and while it has the highest employment and access it is heavily constrained. The figure of 4000 should be reduced and the figures for the market towns and service centres increased.
	Acres	No	The distribution of housing for Winchester does not seem to be on a good basis. It should be based on a combination of natural population change and locating housing to reduce commuting.
	Bell	No	Perhaps the economic uncertainty merits more flexibility in our approach to numbers.
	Brinkman	No	Winchester has capacity for more housing on existing industrial sites like Bar End and Winnall. There should be emphasis on city-centre development to avoid congestion and protect the countryside. 1500 dwellings should be added to Winchester's targets and deducted from Market Towns and Rural Areas figures. New Alresford is too linear in geometry with outstanding surroundings to allow for cross penetrative development. The PUSH Area, Whiteley and Waterlooville should not be affected either - it would be better to build a new town in the PUSH area.
Brian Campbell Associates	Campbell	No	Disagree with the breakdown in Table 3, especially for the Market Towns and Rural Area. It is too restrictive, like policy H.4 which has resulted in very few development opportunities. The smaller settlements need development to meet their residents needs and retain facilities and services and there should not be reliance on a rigid criteria-based approach. The policies should support initiatives for local business and services and allow buildings to be adapted or extended to provide housing, particularly in the National Park where policies are more restrictive.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Orchard Homes	c/o agent	No	Support the extension of the plan period to 2031 but not the overall housing requirement or distribution. Housing provision needs to reflect the requirements of PPS3 for robust evidence. Welcome the rejection of zero net migration, but other evidence of housing need, particularly for affordable housing and economic growth, should not be dismissed and a figure of at least 15,000 is needed. The apportionment to Winchester based on its proportion of District population is very crude and does not reflect its sustainability credentials or the housing/employment imbalance. Winchester should have at least 4400 dwellings.
	Darrock	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is no indication of how much housing will be provided in the villages, with all the allocation of 1500 taken up by the larger towns/villages. At least 1000 should be allocated to the villages outside the National Park. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and part reallocated to the smaller villages.
	Davidson	No	Disagrees with figures for Market Towns and Rural Areas, as original figures for MDAs at Waterlooville indicated that they could accommodate at least 50% higher levels than those being planned. Increasing numbers at Waterlooville would preserve rural areas. Concerns of overdevelopment at Denmead.
	Davies	No	The need is for genuine affordable housing to meet local needs. The Council's understanding of affordable housing and how it will be provided should be explained. The changes being made by government to affordable housing are not taken into account. A large proportion of any affordable housing would not be affordable at 80% of market rents and the Council has committed to accepting this form of housing in major developments.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
CALA Homes	Emett	No	Planning for Growth and the draft National Planning Policy Framework set a clear context of government expectations. If the South East Plan is not to be followed the strategy needs to be proactive in driving growth and meeting housing, business, etc needs. The draft NPPF is clear that objectively assessed development needs should be met and there is no suggestion that development should be held back because of the state of the economy. The 11,000 dwelling forecast propogates past trends and will not deliver the increase in housing sought by government. The affordable housing and economic-led projections should not be rejected by the Housing Technical Paper and would be consistent with the messages from government. The approach taken is unsound and unsustainable and fails to follow the advice in the NPPF to plan for the full housing requirement (market and affordable). With other authorities reducing their housing targets, Winchester will not be able to continue to rely on these areas to meet its housing needs. The distribution is hugely simplistic and under-provides for Winchester town. Winchester is acknowledged as the main urban area and most sustainable location so should be the focus for planned housing growth. The concerns about environmental constraints were not supported by the South East Plan EIP Panel, which increased the housing allocation.
	English	No	The district is overpopulated and infrastructure is inadequate so housing should be forced elsewhere.
	Forbes	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. The capacity within Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester 'within town' requirement should exclude high densities and car parks and be reallocated to greenfield sites on the edge of Winchester.
	Garfath	No	The figures are pre-recession, inflated and unrealistic and should have been reduced to take account of the designation of the National Park. Too much is focussed on Winchester instead of spreading it around. Most services in Winchester are at capacity with no room for expansion.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Gillham	No	The figures are a projection of demand not need. This predict and provide process is not appropriate as the economic future will be fundamentally different from the pre-2008 period and it is better to wait to see what the new trends are than to plan on the basis of outdated ones. The trend towards falling household sizes is likely to change for economic reasons, the needs of the resident population are much lower, changed economic circumstances mean that migration trends are likely to be reversed. The arguments in the Housing Technical Paper do not take account of changed economic circumstances, the increasing costs of travel and other likely trends. The zero net migration assumption is likely to be the most realistic and, taken with the likely maintenance of household sizes, means there is no housing demand problem to solve. Should plan for housing need, the duty to provide accommodation for those who are socially deprived, which would best be met by council housing.
	Goodwin	No	The approach to development should be based on protecting the landscape setting of Wincheste, preserving the historic heritage and protecting green areas. Developments should only be within the settlement boundary, avoid over-development, minimise traffic increases, provide housing for local people and promote small retail units.
	Gray	No	Disagree with figures for South Hampshire Urban Areas and Market Towns and Rural Area. The original capacity of Whiteley and Waterlooville was at least 50% higher. Increasing numbers in these MDAs would reduce the threat to rural areas such as Denmead.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The failure of some PUSH authorities to meet their targets puts pressure on areas in Winchester District. The figures for the Market Towns and Rural Area are not clear as the document says 1500 but the residue for the smaller villages could be 0-600 dwellings. This needs to be distributed and there should be a figure for the smaller rural villages and the National Park area.
	Hare	No	11,000 dwellings is wholly inadequate to meet all housing needs (market and affordable) as required by government policy. The Housing Market Assessment has identified a backlog of 3000 affordable dwellings which has now risen to around 4000 and the level of housing proposed will not meet this and newly arising need (442 per annum). The distribution appears reasonable but the introduction of higher densities and development of car parks in Winchester would be harmful to its character and economy. The target for Winchester should be reduced by 1000 dwellings with this being redistributed elsewhere in the District.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Harvey	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is no indication of how much housing will be provided in the villages, with all the allocation of 1500 taken up by the larger towns/ villages. At least 1000 should be allocated to the villages outside the National Park. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and part reallocated to the surrounding villages.
	Hayter	No	Agree 11,000 total and 5,500 for South Hampshire Urban Areas but not the split of the remainder. There is no profile for Winchester and allocation of 4,000 takes no account of PPS1 or PPS3 requirements for sustainable locations. The housing allocations for Winchester are inconsistent with the employment projections (SQW). Winchester is the most sustainable location so its housing figure should be increased and the Market Towns and Rural Areas reduced.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	No	Does not agree that 11000 new dwellings matches the expected population increase of 16550. More housing should be distributed in the SHUA and Market Town and Rural Areas, and less within Winchester Town which is already stretched in terms of its roads, traffic, transport, schools and infrastructure. It is believed that Winchester would suffer from increased air pollution and noise as a result. Winchester's historic attributes should be protected. Less than half of the 4000 new homes proposed would be more appropriate.
	Hollis	No	The housing projections are flawed as they assume no change in population growth rates. They do not take account of changes in immigration or decreasing population growth.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	No	Question the government household projections which were developed in different economic circumstances. Do not agree with the balance of housing allocated to urban and rural areas - further development of the countryside would not be in keeping.
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Holmes	No	There should be a Habitat Regulations Assessment of Plans for Places due to the potential effect on European sites. This should also be assessed in a sustainability appraisal to ensure biodiversity and other sustainability issues are considered when deciding the scale and distribution of housing.
	Horn & Son	No	The housing numbers should be a guide, with flexibility on the exact numbers for each spatial area. The 1500 for the Market Towns and Rural Areas could be exceeded. Small scale development in sustainable locations should not be restricted. There should be a strategic policy setting out how the priorities of the Core Strategy can be reconciled with localism and locally supported initiatives should not be resisted because of conflict with the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Howard	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is no indication of how much housing will be provided in the villages, with all the allocation of 1500 taken up by the larger towns/ villages. At least 1000 should be allocated to the smaller villages. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and reallocated to the smaller villages.
	Howland	No	The 4000 figure for Winchester is not properly justified in the Housing Technical Paper. It does not take account of the pressure for housing resulting from the National Park or the loss of major Winchester employers. The conclusions on land requirements for Winchester are all seriously overstated and should be changed.
	Hunt	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is no indication of how much housing will be provided in the villages, with all the allocation of 1500 taken up by the larger towns/ villages. At least 1000 should be allocated to the smaller villages. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and reallocated to the smaller villages.
	Hutchison	No	In accordance with the draft NPPF, WCC should produce a 15 year plan. This should include provision for 8000 houses between 2011 and 2016, with just over one third in Winchester Town.
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	No	The projections pre-date the economic downturn and should be updated, which could affect migration and other factors. The figure for Winchester should be reduced to 1500-2000 to allow its character to be retained and the shortfall reallocated in the surrounding area, e.g. Worthy Down, South Wonston or possibly Micheldever Station. Priority should be given to meeting local needs.
	Kerr	No	It is not clear which uncompleted developments are included in the figures and there is no recognition of building over the last 20 years. Public sector cuts need to be taken into account and will affect migration.
Freelance	Kessler	No	Priority should be small, mixed and walkable developments within the existing urban fabric before taking on any large developments. A Framework is required before anything is released that links housing to other improvements and in a visionary way examines a wide variety of opportunities.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Kettell	No	Disagree with the figures for Market Towns and Rural Area. The original figures for West of Waterlooville and Whiteley were higher and should be reinstated to reduce the threat to rural areas such as Denmead.
	Lawes	No	The main influences on housing numbers seem to be population increases led by migration and lone parent households, suggesting the main requirement is for social housing, but in the absence of funds to provide it the projections are unrealistic. A capacity-based approach would be more sustainable.
	Long	No	Disagree with the housing requirement of 11,000, which should be increased to take account of the extension of the plan period by 5 years. There appears to be a statistical anomaly in the population projections, which are very low for the 2011-16 period. The proposed distribution perpetuates previous housing underprovision in Winchester (Town) and skews housing provision to Whiteley and Waterlooville. Waterlooville has underperformed and the emphasis should be moved to Winchester, which is a sustainable location for growth.
	McManus	No	The figure of 11,000 is very high and needs to be tested with further work. The 4000 figure for Winchester is excessive and disproportionate for its size and character.
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a	No	The reduced figure of 11000 will not address housing need. Significant evidence was heard before arriving at the South East Plan requirement of 12240 and this is below what was forecast to be needed. DPDs should not take account of the intention to abolish regional strategies and reducing housing requirements conflicts with the draft National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to increase housing provision. Settlements in the PUSH area should have an increased allocation and there is a large need for affordable housing.
	Piper	No	The distribution of dwellings between the spatial areas appears acceptable but the overall level should be increased to provide an extra 20% as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.
	Porter	No	There is no need for 4000 houses in Winchester and it would change the character of the City. Should improve existing facilities rather than expand the population and overstretch infrastructure and roads. The option of not expanding has not been fully explored.
	Pugh	No	Disagreement with figures for Market Towns and Rural Areas. The original figures for MDA's at Whiteley and Waterlooville were for 50% higher levels than those currently being planned. Threat to rural areas like Denmead could be reduced if numbers were increased in Waterlooville in line with the original proposal. This would help to preserve the current character of Denmead and other rural areas which will otherwise be irretrievably altered to the detriment of the village.
	Sansom	No	Should use the original approved plans and figures for West of Waterlooville and Whiteley which would lesson the adverse impact on the Market Towns and Rural Areas

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	savage	No	The overall total is more important than the distribution. This should not be developed from historic numbers but ones based on relativity to other parts of the world. Oil will be hugely more expensive by 2030 resulting in less car ownership, a move back to cities, rural depopulation, etc. A long range strategic assessment is needed to avoid micro-managing an incorrect forecast.
	Slattery	No	11,000 dwellings for 16,550 population increase assumes 1.5 persons per dwelling whereas the national average is 2.36, so the requirement should be 7,012 dwellings not 11,000. The proportion allocated to Winchester is too high (36% when it is only 8.8% of Hampshire), there should be more dispersal amongst settlements. Tourism is an important economic sector and Winchester District should not risk losing this by overdevelopment. People should be able to live and work in the area they grew up in, so housing and employment should be dispersed among the settlements. Development in flood risk areas must be refused.
	Slattery	No	Table 1 shows a population increase of 16550 in 11000 houses, which assumes 1.5 persons per dwelling. The current UK figure is 2.36 so far few houses are needed. The proportion for Winchester town is excessive and disproportionate with the PUSH area which can accommodate 6000-6500. The figures should be tested against the Census results and the Winchester figure reduced due to its impact, and spread amongst the other settlements.
	Smith	No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is inadequate housing planned for the South Hampshire part of the District and this should be increased by 1240 dwellings and allocated to the larger settlements. The housing requirement for the Market Towns and Rural Area should be increased to at least 3500 – at least 2500 for the larger settlements and a further 1000 for smaller settlements. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and reallocated around the District.
	Wardle	No	The original figures for Waterlooville and Whiteley showed a higher level of properties could be developed than is currently being planned. Increasing these would mean less impact on rural areas such as Denmead.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Welch	No	Disagree with the housing requirement of 11,000, which should be increased to take account of the extension of the plan period by 5 years. There appears to be a statistical anomaly in the population projections, which are very low for the 2011-16 period. The proposed distribution perpetuates previous housing underprovision in Winchester (Town) and skews housing provision to Whiteley and Waterlooville. Waterlooville has underperformed and the emphasis should be moved to Winchester, which is a sustainable location for growth.
	Welch Family	No	Disagree with the housing requirement of 11,000, which should be increased to take account of the extension of the plan period by 5 years. There appears to be a statistical anomaly in the population projections, which are very low for the 2011-16 period. The proposed distribution perpetuates previous housing underprovision in Winchester (Town) and skews housing provision to Whiteley and Waterlooville. Waterlooville has underperformed and the emphasis should be moved to Winchester, which is a sustainable location for growth.
Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	No	The housing figure has no regard to the South East Plan requirement and is based on old projections. The Courts have concluded it is unlawful to take account of the proposed abolition of regional guidance in plan-making and DPDs must accord with regional guidance so long as it exists. The distribution relies heavily on Winchester and while it has the highest employment and access it is heavily constrained. The figure of 4000 should be reduced and the figures for the rest of the District increased.
Bewley Homes		No	Agree with the broad distribution but the figures should be expressed as minima rather than a ceiling. The total requirement is lower than the South East Plan requirement, which is still the statutory plan. The strategy is heavily reliant on two major sites and should include flexibility to enable other locations to cover any under-delivery, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for an extra 20% to be identified.
City of Winchester Trust		No	In view of the importance of the 11,000 figure all the evidence used to derive it should be included in the evidence base. Cannot argue against the figure but doubt the need and ability to provide this number, particularly early in the plan period. Affordable housing need is not being addressed in full and requiring a proportion of development to provide affordable housing is not meeting the need. Another way of providing affordable housing is needed. Understand the logic of allocating 4000 to Winchester but the 1500 for the Market Towns and Rural Area is less than the need for the settlements there some of the Winchester requirement should be reallocated. Oppose the requirement in the draft National Planning Policy Framework for an extra 20% provision and windfall sites should be taken into account due to their consistent delivery. Need monitoring of land within settlement boundaries to ensure it is brought forward at suitable densities before greenfield sites are released.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	The National Planning Policy Framework says authorities should plan for an extra 20% of housing to provide choice and competition, even without this the housing requirement should be at least 13,000 dwellings. There is inadequate housing planned for the South Hampshire part of the District and this should be increased by 1240 dwellings and allocated to the larger settlements. The housing requirement for the Market Towns and Rural Area should be increased to at least 3500 - the full allowance for the larger settlements and a further 1000 for smaller settlements. There is an urgent need for affordable housing and the 40% requirement will not meet the need of 375 dwellings a year. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes. The capacity of Winchester town is over-estimated and should not rely on densities of 75dph or development of car parks. The Winchester requirement should be reduced and reallocated around the District.
Persimmon Homes		No	The overall housing figure of 11,000 should be subject to consultation. There is no sound analysis of why 11,000 is chosen and it is not clear whether the figures are targets or minima. The levels proposed for the market towns and rural area add up to more than 1500, causing ambiguity. A District-wide figure is still top-down with no analysis of individual settlements' needs - the MTRA requirement should be at least 2800. 11,000 is too low and should be raised to at least 12,300 to allow market towns to meet their needs. The allocation of 4000 to Winchester on the basis of its proportion of population should be reconsidered and would require loss of car parks and high densities. There needs to be an assessment of the delivery of Whiteley and Barton Farm to ensure adequate land supply and the draft National Planning Policy Framework seeks an additional 20% housing provision.
Southcott Homes		No	Agree with the broad distribution but the figures should be expressed as minima rather than a ceiling. The total requirement is lower than the South East Plan requirement, which is still the statutory plan. The strategy is heavily reliant on two major sites and should include flexibility to enable other locations to cover any under-delivery, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for an extra 20% to be identified.
North Whiteley Consortium			The overall requirement and apportionment to the South Hampshire Urban Areas should be increased to support the PUSH economic growth strategy. The South East Plan requirement of 6740 dwellings should be used.
Huxley (UK) Ltd			Broadly support the distribution as set out in table 3. However consider the 15,000 new dwellings for the Market Towns and Rural Area low as the rural economy and area is dependant on new development to remain sustainable.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Support the overall strategy of allocating development between Winchester, South Hampshire and the rural areas and recognition of the need to conserve the National Park and its setting. The impact of major allocations in South Hampshire on the National Park should be considered.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Support the rejection of the zero net migration model and agree 11,000. Note the rejection of the economic-led model but would like a clear statement that housing growth will be aligned to sustainable business growth. 4,000 dwellings for Winchester appears in line with projections, but support the Winchester BID's concerns.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		Support the proposed distribution of housing, but future policy should ensure that Royal Mail operations in these areas are not compromised.
Curdridge Parish Council	Gosling		Question the number of houses proposed at Whiteley and their distribution. More housing is allocated to the South Hampshire Urban Areas than the Housing Technical Paper says is needed, so the Whiteley development could be smaller and should be relocated as an expansion of the existing settlement, not another new settlement.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		No comment.
	Jezeeph		The requirement for Winchester town should be increased as its strong economy requires a more positive approach, in accordance with the draft National Planning Policy Framework. There is no evidence base to support the reduction of the PUSH target to 5,500 and there is an over-reliance on two major developments. The market towns and larger villages are exceptionally sustainable locations which could accommodate more development.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		The District target is not justified and seems to be based on 10 year old studies. There is no indication of whether migration is beneficial. Agree with the distinction between the PUSH area and the rest of the District but the same assumptions should not be applied to both areas. The assumptions are flawed and incorrect, e.g. Denmead is larger than Alresford (paragraph 4.13). The breakdown between the spatial areas is arbitrary and not justified in the Housing Technical Paper, with the 1500 for Market Towns and the Rural Area just the balance of the District total. Don't necessarily disagree with the change to the plan period or overall housing number but these are major changes which have been included with little explanation or comment.
	Nicholson		No information to question the figures but they should be reviewed from time to time and reduced if possible. Question the adequacy of water supply.
	Nobles		Not clear when the start date is, as Denmead has had a lot of development recently which should not continue.
	Paskins		Don't have access to the data but the numbers appear excessive.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Save Barton Farm Group	Slattery		The housing allocation of 4000 for Winchester is excessive. 11,000 for the District is very high and the Housing Technical Paper acknowledges it needs to be updated. The Winchester figure should be reduced to the capacity of the town - 1500-2500. The consultation is premature because it does not take account of the further research, the National Planning Policy Framework, the economic update, the Census results and the update of the Town Vision.
	Smith		No comment.
Winchester City Residents Association	Thomas		Sceptical about the 11,000 requirement which seems not to take account of the recession.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		The figures are acceptable and the rejection of 'zero net migration' option is supported. Note the economic-led model was rejected and would be concerned if economic growth were constrained, but support the figure of 4000 for Winchester.
Hursley Parish Council	Warwick		N/A
	White		The housing figures need to be updated. The allocation for Winchester is disproportionately high when the priority should be to protect the town's heritage and character. The requirement for Winchester should be based on the capacity of the built-up area.
English Heritage	Williams		From the evidence provided, it is not possible to ascertain whether the scale and broad distribution of development is the most appropriate, but it does not appear an unreasonable basis to start, subject to application of suitable environmental policies. The plan be supported by a sustainability appraisal that takes full account for the potential for impact upon the historic environment.
	Wyatt		The South Hampshire figure of 5,500 dwellings relies on strategic allocations at Waterlooville and Whiteley. The Whiteley allocation has very significant ecological constraints (SPA, RAMSAR, SAC, SSSIs) and measures will be needed to mitigate the potential harmful effects. Sufficient land will be needed, beyond the current consortium's control, otherwise 3000 dwellings may not be delivered, with effects on infrastructure provision and viability. Land at Fairthorne Grange should be included within the development area and is unconstrained.
Bargate Homes			11,000 is inadequate and does not take account of the draft National Planning Policy Framework requirement to meet the full housing requirement (affordable and market). It is below the South East Plan requirement, which was itself lower than the evidence of need at the time suggested. Affordable housing needs are 8840 dwellings over 20 years whereas 40% of 11,000 would only provide 4400, resulting in additional unmet need. The urban capacity of Winchester is over-stated as it relies on developing town centre car parks and densities of 75 dwellings per hectare, which would harm the character of the town and its attractiveness. The capacity is more likely to be about 1500 and the remaining 1000 should be accommodated elsewhere in the District.

Appendix 1

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			Welcome the retention of the three spatial areas and extension of the plan period to 2031. The overall housing requirement is too low and the affordable housing-led projections are dismissed without adequate justification. A figure below the South East Plan requirements would hinder growth, contrary to the draft National Planning Policy Framework, so a figure of at least 13,500 should be used.
Orchard Homes			11,000 is inadequate and does not take account of the draft National Planning Policy Framework requirement to meet the full housing requirement (affordable and market). It is below the South East Plan requirement, which was itself lower than the evidence of need at the time suggested. Affordable housing needs are 8840 dwellings over 20 years whereas 40% of 11,000 would only provide 4400, resulting in additional unmet need. The urban capacity of Winchester is over-stated as it relies on developing town centre car parks and densities of 75 dwellings per hectare, which would harm the character of the town and its attractiveness. The capacity is more likely to be about 1500 and the remaining 1000 should be accommodated elsewhere in the District.
Winchester College			Support the proposed level of housing for Winchester although the justification, based on a pro-rata distribution is questionable and ignores the role and housing needs of the town. The Housing Technical Paper says housing shouldn't simply be allocated on a pro-rata basis and acknowledges Winchester's role and sustainability. It would be appropriate for the figure to be increased and the settlement boundary to be expanded. Winchester College has land surplus to its requirements which could be made available for housing.

Appendix 2

Question 2: Tables 4 and 5 identify the amount of retail and employment development that is required for the whole of the Winchester District up to 2026/2031.

Do you agree with amounts and distributions suggested? If not, why not and what evidence do you have in support of that view that we could look at?

Are there any other key land uses that should be quantified and specified for any of the three spatial areas of the District?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichboorne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	Some new B2 floorspace may be needed if the distribution of B2 activity is not in the right place. Need to take account of on-line shopping and home-working.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	Broadly agree, but query whether available workspace is in the right place, e.g. to cater for start-up business. Need to be mindful of the impact of online shopping and home-working (don't feel they are currently adequately reflected).
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	When mentioning M27 corridor developers must consider local communities and not route large amounts of commercial traffic through residential areas, access should be part of the construction plans
Freelance	Kessler	Yes	A vision needs to be established before embarking on these questions.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
Trehaven Group Ltd	Nelson	Yes	Broadly support the figures and they should not be downgraded simply because of the recession. There will be peaks and troughs over the 20 period and growth should not be constrained by basing targets on current economic indicators. Government policy promotes economic growth and the figures should be viewed as a baseline, not pre-recessionary. Agree with the focus of employment land on the M27 corridor given the PUSH strategy, but the amount allocated to Winchester seems questionable given the constraints applying. The requirement for the rural area should be sub-divided to take account of the National Park. The M3 corridor south of Winchester is a good location for employment provision, being outside the National Park and with good transport links, and could help meet targets for the M27 corridor and Winchester.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	Will we have to fit the projected floor space into the rural areas? Should recreational or sporting use be considered as a land use?

Appendix 2

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Simmonds	Yes	In general agreement with the question. There must be tighter controls over development conditions, so as to avoid creep.
BBD LTD		Yes	Broadly support the figures and they should not be downgraded simply because of the recession. There will be peaks and troughs over the 20 period and growth should not be constrained by basing targets on current economic indicators. Government policy promotes economic growth and the figures should be viewed as a baseline, not pre-recessionary. Agree with the focus of employment land on the M27 corridor given the PUSH strategy, but the amount allocated to Winchester seems questionable given the constraints applying. The requirement for the rural area should be sub-divided to take account of the National Park. Denmead is a good location for employment provision, associated with the Parklands Business Park, the Parish Council is supportive of small business or a nursing home.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)		No	Question the accuracy of the figures when the economic study has yet to be updated. It would be premature to base decisions on these figures. In addition, employment opportunities should be provided in the MDAs, encouragement given to redevelopment of existing retail areas, take account of home working and virtual shopping, and enhance the distinctive retailing in the market towns.
	Brinkman	No	Winchester Town has the capacity to absorb the 13.5 Ha employment space allocated for rural areas. The 20Ha allocated to Winchester Town should be met through an edge of town Knowledge Park at Alredford Road or a convenient piece of Green Belt such as Matterley Bowl.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	No	This section should be re-visited. In rural areas the promotion of the local economy and reduction of travel miles should play a prominent role and account taken of public sector and MOD cuts.
	Davidson	No	Investment should be injected into Waterlooville's shopping area. Many of Denmead's shops are currently struggling.
	English	No	Market forces should be used to force more even spread through country.
	Garfath	No	The figures are based on pre-recession predictions and do not take account of the likely length of the recession and public spending cuts. Need a balanced approach to promote employment in rural areas, not along the M27 corridor.
	Gillham	No	The retail requirements are based on projecting forward past trends and fail to take account of the post-recession situation. These trends will not re-emerge and the only safe basis for planning is not to plan for additional floorspace for the next 5 years and review the trends after this period. The economic projections have the same problems and rely on unfounded population and growth predictions. Plans for Places should not use the 2007 study figures and the projected 20 hectares of employment land in Winchester could accommodate some 60,000 people.
	Gray	No	There is no need for more retail outlets in Denmead due to its proximity to Waterlooville where there is a range of shops, etc and these are more affordable.

Appendix 2

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The updated background paper is not yet available. There should be an economic analysis of the 3 spatial areas and less focus on the need for jobs, as opposed to the needs of employers, local people and farmers.
	Hayter	No	The additional employment provision is grossly excessive compared to the growth in economically active and the requirement should be allocated for mixed housing/ commercial use and divided into 5 year phases.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	No	Disagrees that the figures are fully justified. A larger share, particularly industry, should be along the M27 corridor making use of good access. Increases in Winchester should be limited, and tailored towards the tourist industry, small admin/IT or university related business. The area lacks a decent sized international conference/concert venue. There should be improved access to Southampton Airport. More facilities should be provided for those who live in Winchester and commute to London for work.
	Hutchison	No	The 2007 economic study forecasts now look very optimistic, especially the increases in 'government and other services' and 'financial and business services'. Car parks would not need to be replaced if redeveloped due to changes in commuting. New offices can be multistorey and the 2007 study underestimates the potential of brownfield land. There should be mixed use development, not zoning for single uses. There is no need for employment land allocations beyond the settlement boundary - buildings within the boundary should be sufficient.
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	No	We would question whether the projected retail floorspace requirements make adequate allowance for the growth in online shopping, which is likely to reduce the need for increased shopping floorspace but increase warehouse/ distribution land requirements We are also disappointed that no reference is made to the safeguarding of high quality agricultural land.
	Kettell	No	There is no need for a range of retail outlets in Denmead and this would not be viable.
	Lawes	No	There is no reference to flows into/out of the District for work, retail and recreation so the context is not clear, but it seems perverse to suggest so much retail/industrial floorspace with so many vacancies in shops and industrial premises. Should coordinate planning over a larger area and improve public transport to existing economic activity outside the District.
	Porter	No	Winchester does not need to expand to provide more retail or industrial units. The suggestion that doing nothing is not an option is just seeking to justify increasing the size of Winchester but with excellent development and upgraded infrastructure it could be an oasis of desirability.
	Pugh	No	Denmead does not need any more retail outlets as it would create over-competition and future vacancies. Waterlooville is easily accessible for a wide range of shopping opportunities at more affordable prices.
	Sansom	No	The need for retail and associated employment is low due to its location close to Waterlooville.

Appendix 2

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Slattery	No	Need to balance land requirements for housing against land for agriculture, energy supply, green economy, tourism and recreational space. Employment and retail should be located close to existing housing to reduce commuting. The retail projections are too high and Winchester should have small shops with local retail facilities in the other settlements.
	Slattery	No	The figures are based on dated economic assumptions and should be informed by the update underway. Silver Hill will provide additional retail. Support the innovative ideas presented at the CWT/WinAcc Vision meeting.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	No	Land allocations are high, as offices can have high densities, and should aim for less car parking. Concern raised over emissions from new buildings, particularly on greenfield sites. New employment should be close to public transport options, not along motorway corridors.
	Wardle	No	The current shopping facilities in Denmead are good. It is a compact retail centre offering a good range of shops. It is easy to use the larger shop choice of supermarkets in Waterlooville which is only 2 miles away. The addition of a supermarket in Denmead is unnecessary and would mean loss of local shops.
City of Winchester Trust		No	The retail requirements are over-estimated, with no extra convenience floorspace required to 2026 and a maximum of 12,450 sq m for comparison (detailed retail report submitted). The updated economic study is expected to show substantially reduced land requirements, particularly in Winchester. The SQW results included a 'Winchester shift' assumption which should no longer be included and may compete with the PUSH economic strategy. There is potential to expand the knowledge and creative sectors in Winchester but this will need less land than traditional business.
Bargate Homes			The studies used only assess need to 2026 and in accordance with South East Plan housing provision. They cannot simply be extended to 2031 and housing numbers should be increased significantly anyway.
North Whiteley Consortium			The retail figure for Whiteley seems high taking account of the recent Whiteley Village proposal. Limited retail units are anticipated in a local centre as part of the North Whiteley development. There is no need for further strategic employment provision in conjunction with North Whiteley, as the existing capacity at Solent 1 and 2 will meet anticipated employment needs.
WCBP Ltd and The Church Commissioners			Insufficient account is taken of the government's growth agenda, as set out in the Plan for Growth and draft National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Enterprise Partnership and its growth objectives should also be taken into account. Welcome the updating of the economic studies.

Appendix 2

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		There is a need for business starter units and a flexible approach in line with the draft National Planning Policy Framework, with units sized to aid economic recovery. The Winchester land requirement of 20.9 hectares is insufficient and there needs to be more acknowledgement of start-ups and creative industries. The creation of a business zone for Andover Road is vital and Barton Farm should go forward as a business zone. Housing development should be aligned with the economic strategy.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		Recognise the need for additional retail and employment land, which should not prejudice existing businesses and may need to include some 'sui generis' uses.
The Shedfield Society	Ford		We do not have the expertise to comment on this section
	Hare		The evidence studies on which these needs are based extend to 2026 so it is flawed to simply extend them forward to 2031. If the housing requirement is increased, as suggested, the requirement for commercial development will need increase.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		The office and high technology trends seem very high. An updated study is needed for retail.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
	Jezeeph		There is a discrepancy with the housing figures which go to 2031 whilst the commercial figures only go to 2026 and need to be updated. There should be provision for small starter business units and for care accommodation and retirement villages. There is a clear need for Winchester to expand to accommodate the necessary development and to meet its economic potential.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		The figures and assumptions made are not supported by the figures and the spatial areas change in the tables. The retail projection appears overstated in the light of retail closures. Concerned about the increase in B1 and B8 requirements for rural areas due to apparent lack of demand and impact of HGVs.
	Kerr		The economic and retail studies were undertaken prior to the recession and current forecasts would result in a reduction. The impacts of internet shopping and home working seem to be omitted and there is no analysis of brownfield sites in and around Winchester town centre.
	Long		Agree with the distribution, but the quantities should be increased to take account of the extra 5 years in the plan period.
Highways Agency	Mendoza		The Core Strategy should aim to reduce commuting by creating a better balance between employment/retail and housing. Developments close to the strategic road network have the greatest potential to generate traffic impacts which may lead to safety and/or capacity concerns.
	Nicholson		Not in a position to question the figures but farming needs to be considered as a land use. Car parks are needed, as are allotments.
	Nobles		Question whether the development will be in the right areas due to cuts in local businesses and defence.

Appendix 2

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Parker		Difficult to judge, but should avoid warehouses and storage lying empty and need to include sporting and recreational facilities.
	Paskins		Don't have access to the data but the numbers appear excessive.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.
Save Barton Farm Group	Slattery		The consultation should be postponed until the updated economic study is available. No account seems to have been taken of the change in the retail market or on-line retail.
	Smith		No comment.
Winchester City Residents Association	Thomas		Sceptical about the projections and disagree with the retail figures for Winchester, which project an increase twice the size of the Silver Hill redevelopment. This is unrealistic given the economic situation. The requirements are pre-recession and there should be emphasis on the need for live-work units. There is no mention of school/college playing field requirements, which should be safeguarded from development.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Support the recognition of the need for starter units and impact of rents and rates. Concerned that the land requirements for Winchester are insufficient, particularly for creative industry start-ups. The possible business area around Andover Road, Winchester should not be rejected and support arguments for linking housing and employment.
	Welch		Agree with the distribution, but the quantities should be increased to take account of the extra 5 years in the plan period.
	Welch Family		Agree with the distribution, but the quantities should be increased to take account of the extra 5 years in the plan period.
	White		The figures are pre-recession and need to be reviewed before important decisions on Winchester are made. Account should be taken of on-line retail trends and economic factors.
Orchard Homes			The studies used only assess need to 2026 and in accordance with South East Plan housing provision. They cannot simply be extended to 2031 and housing numbers should be increased significantly anyway.
Persimmon Homes			No comment.

Appendix 3

Question 3: Table 7 list the various land uses required within Winchester Town and suggests potential sources. Have we missed any particular requirements or sources of development opportunities?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Winchester Fit for the Future Campaign	Back	Yes	The suggestions do not take account of current and future sports and leisure needs. The Core Strategy is an opportunity to address under-provision, look at options to replace aging sports and leisure infrastructure, draw on the Olympic legacy, and make a major contribution to the Community Strategy's objectives. The City Council should work with local partners to plan a new sports and leisure centre in Winchester. There are a number of possible sites and funding sources (detailed paper submitted).
	Bell	Yes	N/A
	Brinkman	Yes	It would be interesting to create "live above the shop" potential in and around Winchester. This could be located along the Stockbridge Road in period Terraced streets or in a Mews located parallel to the High Street from St. Cross towards the bottom of Town.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree with the distribution which should include 4000 dwellings at Winchester whatever the outcome of the Barton Farm appeal.
	Embrey	Yes	Objects to Barton Farm
	English	Yes	Focus away from commercial and industrial development, and on to improvement of Winchester's tourism industry. The city's historic infrastructure is unable to cope with additional commerce, industry or housing.
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	No comment.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	The analysis seems reasonable.
	Hare	Yes	Table 7 fails to identify greenfield land as a potential source to provide Winchester's needs, despite the acknowledgment that the town needs to expand. Therefore greenfield sites need to be identified as a source.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
	Hutchison	Yes	Must maintain a compact, high density city and improve less attractive parts with mixed use developments. More student accommodation is required, so that HMOs can be returned to family housing. Plans must extend no further than 2016, in line with draft NPPF.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	Yes	We cannot identify any other development opportunities within the Winchester settlement boundary. We believe that the land requirements for social infrastructure provision such as open space, health centres, schools and other community facilities should be quantified and specific provision allocated for them.
Freelance	Kessler	Yes	There should be acknowledgement of market forces and the London effect of commuting, with the aim of ameliorating the imbalances of this.
	Macintosh	Yes	40 dph is too low a density to apply in the circumstances of impending peak-oil, housing shortage and credit-crunch. WCC should be looking at 60 dph upwards.
	Nicholson	Yes	The County Council will be selling many buildings. Car parks need to be retained, especially Chesil surface car park. Use Bushfield Camp and parts of Badger Farm for retail, business park and housing. Allotments are needed.
	O Donoghue	Yes	Winchester's special heritage is important to its economy and should not be destroyed. The housing requirements suggest 1 person households, which does not seem credible. Cuts to public sector jobs will affect the need for 4000 dwellings in Winchester. Could cater for local need, not just desire to live here. Need to encourage small retail outlets to give Winchester a unique strategy. The removal of Bushfield Camp is not explained. Expansion of higher education is a flawed strategy due to reduced demand following increases in student fees.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	Will the use of surface car parks for development deter shoppers and visitors?
	Simmonds	Yes	In agreement, but concerns are raised over the public transport reductions coupled with ageing populations.
	Slattery	Yes	Must make better use of land, with higher density housing and business, such as land at Bar End, Winnall and Andover Road. Prioritise development within walking distance of the City centre and avoid development of land liable to flooding.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	Employment opportunities should be focused in the city centre and around the railway station - not in out of town sites like Bushfield Camp.
	Charrett	No	The evidence based assessments are likely to change or be wrong. The Council should not accept what other bodies instruct it to do. Winchester has a special character which demands unique treatment and the City Council should argue that this demands special treatment and exemption from government rules.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Orchard Homes	c/o agent	No	Agree that not all development can be accommodated within the urban edge but the capacity of the built-up area is over-estimated. The assumptions of 75 dwellings per hectare are excessive and should be reduced to 50 dph to take account of the historic character of Winchester. Agree car parks can accommodate uses other than housing, so the estimate of their contribution should be reduced. Windfall allowances should not be included but a 10% non-implementation adjustment should be made, reducing capacity to 1000-1500 dwellings. Agree that trying to accommodate the various needs within the town would harm its character but the size of the necessary extension is under-estimated.
CALA Homes	Emett	No	It is unrealistic and unreasonable to assume a density of 75 dph throughout the built-up area of Winchester. The assumption that all SHLAA sites and planning permissions will be implemented is highly optimistic and the 'other redevelopment opportunities' include public car parks which are not available and whose loss is likely to be resisted. There should be no allowance for unidentified sites. The capacity range of 1500-2500 is inconsistent with the sources listed (1700-1875).
	Garfath	No	Disagree 4000 houses are needed, the previous government's housing forecasts are being reviewed. There are numerous brownfield sites and there should be smaller developments in satellite villages. Public transport should be improved, funded by selling some car parks.
	Garfath	No	The consultation should be on whether 4000 is needed not how to provide it. The figure is based on pre-recession projections and is unrealistically high. There is no logic for allocating 36% of the requirement to Winchester and it ignores finite limits on transport facilities and will make it less attractive to use town centre land.
	Gillham	No	This question invokes the wrong-headed assumptions behind questions 1 and 2, given the post-2008 realities.
	Goodwin	No	The approach to development should be based on protecting the landscape setting of Winchester, preserving the historic heritage and protecting green areas. Developments should only be within the settlement boundary, avoid over-development, minimise traffic increases, provide housing for local people and promote small retail units.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The interdependence of Winchester and surrounding settlements is not adequately recognised. Employment land provision needs to take account of the different roles of Winchester and the PUSH area and the inter-relationships.
	Hayter	No	Move HCC, WCC and Police HQ to Bushfield, build over railway lines, level ancient cemeteries and use for open space. Highly unlikely that all the needs can be provided within the current boundaries without significant harm to the City.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	No	Traffic, circulation and access must be improved before any of the rest will work. Tourism is vastly underdeveloped, and shopping and its support services should be better. It is agreed that some city centre car parks would be better developed, although some must remain. To compensate, some existing single story car parks like Chesil Street Ground, Colebrook Street, North Walls or River Park could be made two storey. Agreement that Winchester boundary can increase but this should not be through a single increase like Barton Farm. Through in town/brown field sites, and Bushfield Camp, Barton Farm should be limited to less than half of the proposed 2000, situated at its Southern end only. Empty office space should be utilised and adapted before any new space is constructed. It should not be allowed to be left empty (Consider lowering rates first).
	Howland	No	Far too many for our roads and infrastructure.
	Howland	No	The 4000 figure for Winchester is not properly justified in the Housing Technical Paper. It does not take account of the pressure for housing resulting from the National Park or the loss of major Winchester employers. The conclusions on land requirements for Winchester are all seriously overstated and should be changed.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	No	N/A
	Marriott	No	Housing expansion should be restricted to the needs of current residents.
	McCulloch	No	N/A
	Nancekievill	No	N/a
	Newby	No	Does not agree that Barton Farm is suitable for such a large development.
	Porter	No	Do not agree that 4000 dwellings are needed for Winchester, otherwise the uses appear reasonable.
City of Winchester Trust		No	Densities considerably higher than 75dph can be achieved in many town centre locations and there should be intensification of land for employment uses. Higher densities are more difficult in suburban areas, where it would be unrealistic to plan for 75 dph, although higher densities should be an objective, especially on larger sites. The SHLAA does not list all car parks which have potential for development, including those adjacent to the Station. Areas at Andover Road, Bar End and Winnall should be investigated for high density development, as presented at a recent CWT/WinAcc event. Land at Woolverstone, Berewecke Road has potential for redevelopment and there are likely to be other similar sites. The value of trees and gardens is recognised in the Natural Environment White Paper and the draft National Planning Policy Framework introduces a new designation of Local Green Space. Green space, gardens and trees should be planned into higher density development. Land for education, community buildings and other infrastructure must be provided.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Persimmon Homes		No	The approach to allocating 4000 dwellings to Winchester is just an arithmetic approach and unsound. Winchester cannot accommodate this number without harming its special character and the retention of surface car parks is important to its retail role. The requirement for Winchester should be reduced and reallocated to the Market Towns and Rural Area.
Bargate Homes			Greenfield sites should be recognised as a source of housing, especially given the conclusion that Winchester needs to expand.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			Support higher densities and regeneration of rundown areas but concerned about the high housing allocation for Winchester. The housing numbers need to be reduced and the City of Winchester Trust/WinAcc have identified opportunities for high density development. Local government employment is reducing creating vacant properties. The allocation for Winchester is disproportionate to the rest of the District and there should be dispersal to other settlements to retain facilities and young people. Oppose the use of greenfield reserve sites.
WCBP Ltd and The Church Commissioners			Agree Winchester is a sustainable location and that economically-led growth is essential. Agree that a 'do nothing' approach is not appropriate and would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework. Agree that there is inadequate scope for growth within the settlement boundaries and that expansion is needed.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Winchester provides essential functions for National Park residents which should be protected and have managed growth. Winchester cannot extend into the National Park and the impact of other potential urban extensions on the Park need to be considered.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Table 7 should refer to health and education land use requirements as well as access and infrastructure. Hampshire County Council would like to work with the City Council to develop a revised parking strategy to identify car parks which could be redeveloped, progress a traffic management study and inform land use policies. This should take account of the opening of the South Winchester park and ride and any provision at Barton Farm.
	Caspari		The need for Southampton University to expand its accommodation should be acknowledged and there may be a need for more student accommodation. Agree Winchester is a sustainable location and should meet its development needs. The Core Strategy should recognise and assist the growth aspirations of Southampton University. Agree the 'do-nothing' approach is not realistic and that there is a need to extend the settlement boundary, without which the pressure for growth will lead to significant problems.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		The figures for land requirements need further consideration and the 4000 dwellings should be increased. Support the integration of development at Andover Road with Barton Farm.
The Shedfield Society	Ford		No Comment

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
The Theatres Trust	Freeman		There is no mention of cultural facilities/activities (which is different to cultural heritage). Winchester has a good cultural offer and this should be maintained and developed, recognising the benefits for business, visitors and residents.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside		No comment.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		There is no reference to additional schooling or healthcare requirements.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		Recommend consideration of building over car parking to make better use of land already available e.g. HCC offices.
	Jezeff		The use of car parks for housing would be shortsighted and harm the town's vitality and viability.
	Kerr		The Winchester requirement should be for 4000-6000 houses whatever the outcome of Barton Farm.
	Leighton Davis		No estimates are attributed to 'currently unidentified sites' or 'increased densities'. Development over a number of smaller sites than Barton Farm, would bring about fewer adverse impacts on Winchester. Too much pressure on secondary schools resulting from the Barton Farm development.
	Leighton Davis		The figures are 'guesses' at what will be required over the next 20 years. The figure of 4000 houses cannot be satisfactorily justified at this time. Does not support the Barton Farm proposal.
	Long		Agree no sources are missed, but don't agree they should all be included. No car parks should be included, nor developemnt at 75dph. Greenfield sites should be released allowing for lower densities - agree continued infilling would be more harmful. There is over-reliance on the contribution of SHLAA sites, which do not necessarily deliver the expected number.
	Nobles		No comment.
	Paskins		Attempting to acheive unrealistic targets by infilling gardens, car parks and open spaces would result in enormous loss of amenity.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.
	Sealey		Development should be contained within the existing boundaries by means of dispersing new housing across the city. Building at high density and the utilisation of car parks would seem sensible particularly if associated with improved public transport links, cycle and pedestrian facilities. Development of the Cattle Market car park is recommended due to its size and that the use appears to have declined significantly over the last year or so. There is little reference to the need for recreational space to support an increase in housing. Some greenfield development beyond the city boundary for these purposes would be acceptable.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Save Barton Farm Group	Slattery		There is a need for open space and green infrastructure. Vacant or derelict buildings should be reused and employment is reducing, resulting in more vacant space. Land at Bar End should be used and windfall sites should be taken into account.
	Slattery		Support the CWT/WinAcc ideas for land at Bar End, Winnall and Andover Road. Higher densities and use of empty buildings should be encouraged and greenfield land outside the settlement boundary protected.
	Smith		No comment.
Winchester City Residents Association	Thomas		Disappointed that the suggestion of redeveloping publicly owned housing on outlying estates for private housing has not been taken up. This represents an obvious opportunity to provide an increased number of dwellings and should be considered to avoid greenfield development.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Support the need for employment land, which may exceed 14-20 hectares, and the proposal for 4000 houses. Barton Farm integrated with business development at Andover Road would be an exciting and sustainable solution.
	Welch		Agree no sources are missed, but don't agree they should all be included. No car parks should be included, nor developemnt at 75dph. Greenfield sites should be released allowing for lower densities - agree continued infilling would be more harmful. There is over-reliance on the contribution of SHLAA sites, which do not necessarily deliver the expected number.
	Welch Family		Agree no sources are missed, but don't agree they should all be included. No car parks should be included, nor developemnt at 75dph. Greenfield sites should be released allowing for lower densities - agree continued infilling would be more harmful. There is over-reliance on the contribution of SHLAA sites, which do not necessarily deliver the expected number.
	White		The focus shoul be on preserving Winchester's heritage. Farm diversification could provide employment. There is a need for open space and green infrastructure so access to green wedges is important. Local government is contracting and office space will become available.
English Heritage	Williams		Concur with the vision for the town (paragraph 5.5) and that without some greenfield development it is most unlikely that the special character of the town could be maintained given the levels of development now being considered. Continued intensification could lead to loss of the very characteristics that are so important to the success and distinctive character of the City. The fact that the estimate of capacity is within such a large range (1,500-2,500), suggests that much more detailed work will be required.
Winchester Town Forum	Winchester Town Forum		The Forum expresses its concerns regarding the current evidence, which set out the economic growth, retail and housing need in the document, and underlines the importance of Cabinet closely scrutinising that evidence and the latest consultants' economic review report. The references to Bushfield Knowledge Park should be set out separately from the improvement / redevelopment of Winnall and Bar End employment areas, as the sites were not interdependent. More detail should be added under the 'Access and Infrastructure' heading in Table 7 to specify infrastructure needs, such as primary education.

Appendix 3

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			The built-up area capacity estimate is over-optimistic and the assumptions about 75 dwellings per hectare in the town centre fail to take into account the historic character of the town centre. Support the reuse of vacant employment land/buildings, but the capacity of the built-up area is likely to be around 1000-1500.
Orchard Homes			Greenfield sites should be recognised as a source of housing, especially given the conclusion that Winchester needs to expand.
Winchester College			Winchester College has some land surplus to its requirements which could be made available for housing. A number of sites are identified in the College's Campus Conservation and Development Framework which are considered suitable and should be considered.

Appendix 4a

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

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

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4a

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

Appendix 4b

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

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

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 4b

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

Appendix 5

Do you agree that our strategy to deliver the majority of the development requirement for the Winchester District portion of the PUSH area should be to focus on large urban extensions at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley? If not, what alternative do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	This increases the possibilities for well designed communities.
Boarhunt Parish Council	Billingham	Yes	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements. The MDA developments should be completed or the land put to positive use for employment and housing or agriculture and biofuel supply.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree, but the impact on existing nearby communities should be minimised and offset.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	These areas are under development already.
	FURBY	Yes	Overall in agreement, but urban extensions should not be in Curbridge where it is recommended that buffer zones are placed to protect areas of scientific interest and ecosystem value. Suggests that developers contribute financially to school roads, sports facilities and youth services.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	No comment.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	Feel one of the developers at West of Waterlooville is prepared to listen but the other isn't. Prefer to see Denmead removed from the PUSH area and given protective status. Development in Denmead Parish as part of West of Waterlooville should count as Denmead's contribution towards PUSH housing targets.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Access should be better planned along M27 corridor to improve the pressure currently suffered on the junctions to and from M27. Agrees that this area is well suited to growth in Hampshire. Would like to see Hedge End SDA progressed - opportunity for housing, infrastructure and industry should be maximised.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	Yes	N/A
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	N/A

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	N/a
	Nicholson	Yes	Agree provided the loss of farmland is kept to a minimum.
	Parker	Yes	N/A
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
	Simmonds	Yes	So long as the needs of local people are fully considered, no strong views are held about an area with which the respondent is not familiar.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	They must have appropriate transport provision to minimise carbon emissions
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner	Yes	N/A
	Wardle	Yes	Agreed that it is better to focus the larger urban extensions at Whiteley and West of Waterlooville but I understand Woodcroft farm was originally in the PUSH plans.
Eastleigh Borough Council	Wright	Yes	Eastleigh Borough Council accepts the principle of further development north of Whitely. However, the Borough Council is concerned about the potential impact of this on local roads in Eastleigh Borough, in particular through Botley. There are already problems of congestion and poor air quality arising from current volumes of traffic passing through the village. These are having a significant impact on the quality of life there and on the attractiveness and commercial viability of the historic village centre. The Borough Council wishes to draw attention to the existing long-standing proposal for a Botley Bypass, for which a route is reserved in both the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review and the Winchester District Local Plan (saved policies). It is also a proposal of the recently revised Local Transport Plan, and is likely to be maintained as a proposal in the forthcoming local development framework/ local plan for Eastleigh Borough. The Council is of the view that the development north of Whitely should contribute towards the construction of this bypass.
	Brinkman	No	It is not sustainable to extend a predominately residential area with no town centre. These 5000 houses should be developed in a new town in the countryside within the PUSH area, for example in a forest area for screening and building materials.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Critcher	No	Support the Curbridge Preservations Society's comments. Consider the North Whiteley urban extension would be illegal in terms of both English and International law. It would have a harmful impact on a Special Protection Area due to its size and proximity and is similar to the Thames Basin Heaths area, where development was restricted due to the effect on ground nesting birds. The Curbridge Nature Reserve and Upper Hamble should have the same protection and other protected species would also be affected, e.g. dormice. It will also be a breach of PPS9. The housing requirement for the PUSH part of the District is 3350 dwellings and if 2500 are delivered at Waterlooille and 5500 at North Whiteley this means 6650-7750 are allocated (including the MTRA area). This is 95% of the non-Winchester requirement or 198%-231% of the PUSH requirement in 25% of the District's area.
	Davidson	No	The major development areas are defined as West of Waterlooille Whitely. The smaller MDA at Woodcroft Farm on which part of the Denmead PUSH area is located has been omitted.
	Dugdale	No	Support comments by Curbridge Preservation Society. North Whiteley will cause serious flooding and congestion problems and blight the local area. A much smaller development could still alleviate infrastructure problems and there are other ways of improving access and education. It is unreasonable to propose the majority of housing in one area and there are problems with EU directives and traffic.
	Elms	No	Support the Curbridge Preservations Society's comments. Consider the North Whiteley urban extension would be illegal in terms of both English and International law. It would have a harmful impact on a Special Protection Area due to its size and proximity and is similar to the Thames Basin Heaths area, where development was restricted due to the effect on ground nesting birds. The Curbridge Nature Reserve and Upper Hamble should have the same protection and other protected species would also be affected, e.g. dormice. It will also be a breach of PPS9. The housing requirement for the PUSH part of the District is 3350 dwellings and if 2500 are delivered at Waterlooille and 5500 at North Whiteley this means 6650-7750 are allocated (including the MTRA area). This is 95% of the non-Winchester requirement or 198%-231% of the PUSH requirement in 25% of the District's area.
	Garfath	No	The figures are based on pre-recession projections and should be reduced to take account of the National Park. Development should be spread around the villages rather than destroying the character of Waterlooille and Whiteley.
	Gray	No	The smaller MDA at Woodcroft Farm on which parts of Denmead PUSH area is located has been omitted.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The abandonment of the Hedge End SDA will increase pressure around Winchester and the amount of development in Chandlers Ford and Eastleigh should also be considered.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Hayter	No	Agree the strategy in principle but neither urban extension includes the retail and employment infrastructure assumed in the respective studies and it is unlikely this number of jobs could be provided.
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Holmes	No	Not convinced that North Whiteley won't have detrimental effects on very nearby SPA, SSSI and SINC interests. There are also uncertainties in relation to West of Waterlooville, particularly from recreational disturbance and transport emissions. Would like to see a Habitat Regulations Assessment of Plans for Places in accordance with the requirements to assess projects likely to affect European sites.
	Horn & Son	No	The housing numbers for PUSH should be more flexible with phasing or allowance for smaller sites in the Market Towns and Rural Areas to make up shortfalls in the early plan period. Major sites are now more difficult to deliver and there should be a contingency of smaller sites to maintain development.
	Kerr	No	Part of the West of Waterlooville development will be within Denmead Parish and should count towards its requirements. Denmead should be excluded from the PUSH area as it is a rural village.
	Kettell	No	The smaller MDA at Woodcroft Farm on which parts of Denmead PUSH area is located has been omitted.
	Landmark Development AG	No	There are limited opportunities for development around Whiteley other than to the north, which limits flexibility to deal with any delays. A smaller reserve site should be allocated which could be brought forward quickly to maintain land supply. Land east of Whiteley Lane should be considered for such an allocation.
Curbridge Preservation Society	Murray	No	Strongly disagree with the North Whiteley urban extension, which would be illegal and ultra vires. It would have a harmful impact on a Special Protection Area due to its size and proximity and is similar to the Thames Basin Heaths area, where development was restricted due to the effect on ground nesting birds. The Curbridge Nature Reserve and Upper Hamble should have the same protection and other protected species would also be affected, e.g. dormice. The area is liable to flooding and development would exacerbate this, along with the effects of climate change and rising sea levels, which SUDS would not overcome. The housing requirement for the PUSH part of the District is 3350 dwellings and if 2500 are delivered at Waterlooville only 850 more are needed but 6650-7750 are allocated (including the MTRA area). This is 95% of the non-Winchester requirement or 198%-231% of the PUSH requirement. The vehicular accesses are within 400m of the SPA and the development will greatly increase traffic on the local road network and cause problems. Previous consultations (for the South East Plan) all included North Whiteley as an option, pre-judging the situation.
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a	No	Don't dispute the principle of focussing development on Waterlooville and Whiteley but there should be a higher number in the existing settlements within PUSH, including Colden Common. Directing more growth to these settlements would support the PUSH economic growth strategy and the draft National Planning Policy Framework as well as providing greater flexibility.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Pugh	No	The major development areas are defined as West of Waterlooville and Whiteley. The smaller MDA as Woodcroft Farm where part of the Denmead PUSH area is located has been omitted (seeResponses to CORE Strategy P45 para 6.14 by more than 100 Denmead Residents.)
	Sansom	No	Disagree that the majority of the development for the PUSH area should be limited to the MDAs at West of Waterlooville and Whiteley. Should also consider Woodcroft Farm, Denmead as Havant Borough Council also have land adjacent to the site. 100 responses to Core Strategy suggested this.
	Smith	No	Whiteley should not be targeted once more, leading to loss of green space etc. Whiteley causes havoc regarding queues on the Motorway links etc. and has not been considered in relation to safer links and highway structures.
	Welch Family	No	West of Waterlooville and Whiteley are unlikely to deliver the expected housing given Waterlooville's history of delays. More housing should be directed to Winchester, as a sustainable hub.
	Wilson	No	Support the Curbridge Preservations Society's comments. Consider the North Whiteley urban extension would be illegal in terms of both English and International law. It would have a harmful impact on a Special Protection Area due to its size and proximity and is similar to the Thames Basin Heaths area, where development was restricted due to the effect on ground nesting birds. The Curbridge Nature Reserve and Upper Hamble should have the same protection and other protected species would also be affected, e.g. dormice. It will also be a breach of PPS9. The housing requirement for the PUSH part of the District is 3350 dwellings and if 2500 are delivered at Waterlooville and 5500 at North Whiteley this means 6650-7750 are allocated (including the MTRA area). This is 95% of the non-Winchester requirement or 198%-231% of the PUSH requirement in 25% of the District's area. .
Persimmon Homes		No	The proposed level of housing fails to meet the South East Plan requirement of 6740 dwellings. It cannot be assumed that Winchester's housing target will be reduced, given other shortfalls in the PUSH area (e.g. SDAs and Portsmouth). Settlements such as Denmead could accomodate some of this growth.
Bargate Homes			No objection in principle to development of Waterlooville and Whiteley, but concerned about delivery. Whiteley has environmental constraints which suggest it cannot deliver 3000 dwellings. Locations for providing the shortfall should be considered, such as Waltham Chase.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			Winchester should oppose the Fareham SDA and not allow land in its District to contribute green infrastructure. Support retention of a long-term gap with the SDA which should remain as open countryside and extend to land within Fareham Borough. Infrastructure must be properly planned for the West of Waterlooville MDA. Concerned about the impact of North Whiteley on the surrounding countryside and the scale of development should be re-evaluated.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
North Whiteley Consortium			Support the focussing of new development in the PUSH part of the District on a new urban extension at North Whiteley. This can help to improve Whiteley's self-containment. With regard to the impact on wildlife habitats, assessments would accompany any planning application.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		There need to be clear statements regarding infrastructure, protection of villages and rural areas and public transport. These developments will contribute to District housing requirements but also need to be aligned with the economic development strategy.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		If the majority of development requirements are to be accomodated through a large urban extension it is essential that infrastructure is provided in a timely manner.
Curdrige Parish Council	Gosling		The Whiteley proposal should be revisited in view of the environmental designations nearby and to make it a smaller expansion of the existing settlement, not another new settlement. This would be more sustainable socially and in terms of infrastructure. Remain concerned about the traffic impact of the PUSH developments as a whole and Whiteley Way will exacerbate the problems. There will need to be other improvements and traffic calming.
	Hare		No objection to these developemnts but they are unlikely to be delivered in full within the plan period. There is a need to look at the likely shortfall and reallcate it to other sustainable locations such as Bishops Waltham.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		This strategy is sensible to help maintain urban and rural diversity.
Fareham Borough Council	Jewell		Agree the provision of timely infrastructure for Whiteley is key, but the Core Strategy should set out what is needed and when, not leave it for the planning application. Although the Infrastructure Study lists the infrastructure needed there is no reference to the possible role of Rookery Avenue or the Yew Tree Drive bus link. Support the provision of new primary and secondary schools at Whiteley and agree the primary school should be in the first phase of development. If North Whiteley is to be a strategic allocation more detail will be needed of its precise boundaries and there should be ongoing liaison with Fareham Borough Council. Agree there is scope for some green infrastructure within Winchester District and the need for close working on the SDA Area Action Plan. Note that the Plan period has been revised to 2031, there will be a need for flexibility to accomodate any revised housing apportionment for the PUSH area.
	Jezeeph		Many authorities in PUSH are reducing their housing targets and the proposals for 5,500 in Winchester would reduce the total further, well below the new PUSH target of 74,000. The strategy focusses too much development in the M27 corridor and should encourage more development in the Market Towns and Rural Area.
	Long		West of Waterlooville and Whiteley are unlikely to deliver the expected housing given Waterlooville's history of delays. More housing should be directed to Winchester, as a sustainable hub.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	May		The North Whiteley development would increase the population of Curbridge by 8750% and result in a significant detrimental effect on the Special Protection Area. It is therefore unlawful and would harm protected species without an overriding public interest or need. The PUSH area only requires 3350 dwellings but the South Hampshire area is being targeted for 5500 (or 6650-7800 with the Market Towns and Rural Areas). Therefore 95% of the non-Winchester town requirement is being squeezed into 25% of the District's area which is unsustainable. The North Whiteley extension should be abandoned or another site used to avoid the environmental and legal risks.
Highways Agency	Mendoza		The Highways Agency has worked with the developers of West of Waterlooville to agree appropriate mitigation measures for A3(M) junction 3 and is working with the developers of North Whiteley to determine a suitable package of mitigation measures. Without appropriate mitigation measures at North Whiteley unacceptable further congestion could be created at M27 junctions 7, 8, 9 or on the links. Further detailed analysis will be needed to demonstrate delivery of this site in advance of the next stage of the Core Strategy. The impact of the Fareham SDA and other developments in South Hampshire will undoubtedly place challenges on the strategic road network which will require sustainable transport measures as part of a transport delivery strategy.
	Nobles		Development in this area should focus on West of Waterlooville and Whiteley whereas Denmead should be in the rural area.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		Do not agree with large urban sprawls but cannot give a better suggestion.
Southern Water	Solbra		Southern Water will plan to provide the necessary strategic infrastructure but it is important that the rate of development is coordinated with infrastructure provision. Local improvements should be funded by development. Comments on the constraints at Waterlooville and Whiteley have been made on the Infrastructure Study and should be taken into account to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided.
The National Trust - London & South East Region	Stubbs		The proposed North Whiteley allocation will impact on the Hamble River and Solent Maritime SPA/SAC and these areas need to be protected. Any development proposal must be accompanied by measures to avoid harmful impact and mitigate wider impacts. An Appropriate Assessment will be needed to fully assess the implications of the development and this should form part of the evidence base and be available before any strategic allocation is finalised. Cannot comment on the impacts on the River Hamble until further work is carried out and made public and a series of caveats need to be addressed.

Appendix 5

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
RSPB	Temple		Work is ongoing to develop a comprehensive assessment of the current and future impacts of recreational disturbance on the Solent European Sites - 'The Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project'. findings are due to be published later this year. this could have serious implications for the delivery of housing in the District, particularly North Whiteley allocation which is situated within the immediate proximity of the SPA. Due to its proximity to the SPA, this allocation could have impacts on the European sites interests also and in combination with other housing in the District and other solent authorities. therefore need to consider the scope of measures that will need to be implemented as part of the scheme to avoid/mitigate the effects of increased recreation and other urban pressures on the SPA.
	Welch		West of Waterlooville and Whiteley are unlikely to deliver the expected housing given Waterlooville's history of delays. More housing should be directed to Winchester, as a sustainable hub.
English Heritage	Williams		Acknowledge this strategy is quite well advanced and do not suggest an alternative.
	Wyatt		The North Whiteley developer consortium should include all landowners that will be affected directly or indirectly by the development. It is misleading to refer to the consortium of developers.
	Wyatt		The South Hampshire figure of 5,500 dwellings relies on strategic allocations at Waterlooville and Whiteley. The Whiteley allocation has very significant ecological constraints (SPA, RAMSAR, SAC, SSSIs) and measures will be needed to mitigate the potential harmful effects. Sufficient land will be needed, beyond the current consortium's control, otherwise 3000 dwellings may not be delivered, with effects on infrastructure provision and viability. Land at Fairthorne Grange should be included within the development area and is unconstrained.
North of Fareham Consortium			The Fareham SDA will contribute to housing choice and economic opportunity for Wickham and Knowle and has various advantages. Accept the need to maintain the distinct character of settlements within Winchester District but object to the presumption against formal open space within the green infrastructure in Winchester District. The options for GI should be robustly assessed and subject to consultation and can serve as buffers between the SDA and Wickham and Knowle. Welcome the involvement of the City Council and local residents in the masterplanning process.
Orchard Homes			No objection in principle to development of Waterlooville and Whiteley, but concerned about delivery. Whiteley has environmental constraints which suggest it cannot deliver 3000 dwellings. Locations for providing the shortfall should be considered, such as Denmead.

Appendix 6

Do you agree this revised vision more appropriately reflects the aspirations for this area and the key common elements raised through Blueprint - supporting appropriate development while maintaining rural character and settlement identity? If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)		Yes	N/A
South Downs Society	Ankers	Yes	N/A
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	N/A
	Du Boulay	Yes	The level of growth seems appropriate (although the figures for the settlements add up to more than 1500 dwellings). Welcome the recognition of the differences between the level 2 settlements and that growth will be determined on the basis of local needs.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	Shedfield Parish comprises three villages each with a unique character - maintaining the gaps between them is crucial for protecting the rural character of the area.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	Support the vision.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	Strongly support the revised vision in paragraph 7.11 (but have not seen the new 'tools' mentioned).
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	Yes	N/A
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	Agree, particularly the maintenance of rural character whilst supporting appropriate development.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	In strong agreement with the vision. Stresses the importance of continuing engagement with communities.
The Wickham Society	Hoare	Yes	N/A
	Hollis	Yes	N/A

Appendix 6

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	Yes	Do not feel this strategy is currently adopted and local councillor's views must be taken into account if it is to succeed, along with evidence and work produced locally. Wish to raise questions about the 4 levels in the Core Strategy Preferred Option and how they are reviewed and revised.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	N/A
	Kerr	Yes	Any development shortfalls should not be redistributed to the rural locations. 1500 dwellings appears reasonable but the totals for the larger settlements exceed this.
	Long	Yes	N/A
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	Yes	Broad support, particularly for the maintenance of rural character and identity. There are some reservations about what may be considered 'appropriate development'.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	But also need to protect farms and settlement character and limit supermarket expansion.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman	Yes	N/A
The Dever Society	Robertson	Yes	N/A
	Seaward	Yes	N/A
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	Additional employment should be focused on serving local employment needs and not attract employees from distant locations thus generating considerable additional car traffic and carbon emissions. This means using the Community Infrastructure Levy to pay for public transport access.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner	Yes	N/A
	Wardle	Yes	Agreed that it is essential to maintain the rural character of the smaller settlements by keeping growth to that required to house the elderly and the families of local residents. The retention of green areas close to the centre of the villages can promote a healthy lifestyle by use of the land for walking, riding etc.
	Welch	Yes	N/A
	Welch Family	Yes	N/A
Bewley Homes		Yes	Broadly support the vision, but it is important that the objectives to maintain settlement identity are balanced with the need for sustainable growth, particularly in the key settlements of Alresford and Bishops Waltham.

Appendix 6

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Southcott Homes		Yes	Broadly support the vision, but it is important that the objectives to maintain settlement identity are balanced with the need for sustainable growth, particularly in the key settlements of Alresford and Bishops Waltham.
	Brinkman	No	The Market Town and Rural Areas should be left to as little development as possible, as extra traffic driving from and to new areas and traditional suburban houses never suit rural idyllic areas, therefore there should be some constraints on the design of any new houses built in these areas.
	Darrock	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but inadequate housing is allocated to the villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. The position of Otterbourne in the settlement hierarchy should be reviewed as it scores well on sustainability criteria, and settlement boundaries should be retained to ensure adequate housing is provided.
	Davidson	No	Development at Kidmore Lane must not go ahead, so as to preserve community wellbeing and maintain open spaces for enjoyment and wildlife.
	Garfath	No	The discussion groups were orchestrated and the views have been largely ignored, so the views of local people are not reflected.
	Gray	No	The aspirations in Table 8 don't happen locally - much has been improved at Waterloooville and is used by Denmead residents. The countryside at Kidmore Lane should be preserved to promote the rural character of Denmead, improve health and well-being, and for horses to be exercised.
	Hare	No	The vision will fail to meet the needs of the area because it makes inadequate provision for development. It will not meet market or affordable housing needs and should reduce the pressure on Winchester by redistributing development to the market towns.
	Harvey	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but inadequate housing is allocated to the villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings outside the National Park. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. The proposed criteria-based policy needs to be positive towards development and if settlement boundaries are retained they must allow adequate housing.

Appendix 6

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Hayter	No	The vision is appealing, but based upon the the Taylor Review's conclusion that allocations in market towns should be sufficiently large to provide their own infrastructure it is wishful thinking that 20 – 25 new dwellings pa in Bishops Waltham could fund an indoor sports and leisure centre, more youth clubs & facilities, improved transport links or local employment. (Blueprint Responses).
	Howard	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but inadequate housing is allocated to the villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. The position of medium-sized villages like Meonstoke in the settlement hierarchy should be reviewed, and settlement boundaries should be retained to ensure adequate housing is provided.
	Hunt	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but inadequate housing is allocated to the villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. The position of medium-sized villages like Sparsholt in the settlement hierarchy should be reviewed, and settlement boundaries should be retained to ensure adequate housing is provided.
	Kettell	No	The aspirations in Table 8 don't happen locally - much has been improved at Waterlooville and is used by Denmead residents. The countryside at Kidmore Lane should be preserved to promote the rural character of Denmead, improve health and well-being, and for horses to be exercised.
	Piper	No	The market towns and rural areas should continue to develop and the vision should refer to the opportunity to improve the built environment by redeveloping outworn sites and buildings.
	Pugh	No	The aspirations in table 8 are already met for Denmead residents through the development of facilities in Waterlooville which are supported and used by Denmead residents. There is a pressing need to preserve the countryside at Kidmore Lane which is at the heart of the character of rural Denmead. The village's open countryside is used for health and leisure pursuits, which fits with current Government health promotion and early interventions strategies for promoting healthy lifestyles.

Appendix 6

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Sansom	No	The aspirations in Table 8 have been in existence in Denmead for many years but have failed to materialise. Issues include: longer waiting times at the health centre; no public transport on a Sunday; VDS is ignored; no action to preserve the threatened countryside. A new village Hall must demonstrate that it is viable without increasing Council tax.
	Slattery	No	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
	Smith	No	Object to the strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area as it fails to reflect the full role of the market towns and local service centres. There should be two separate visions, one for the larger settlements and one for the smaller villages.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	Object to the strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area as it fails to reflect the full role of the market towns and local service centres. There should be two separate visions, one for the larger settlements and one for the smaller villages.
Persimmon Homes		No	It is not appropriate to apply the same vision to all the rural settlements. It should be recognised that additional housing is required which will need greenfield sites to ensure settlements can grow sustainably. The vision should recognise that market housing will be required to meet local needs (revised wording suggested).
Bargate Homes			The vision fails to make adequate provision for housing, both affordable and market, to meet future needs. The housing target should be increased and redistributed from Winchester to the Market Towns and Rural Areas, where appropriately designed housing can enhance the villages.
Huxley (UK) Ltd			It makes sense to allocate the majority of housing requirements to sustainable locations such as Winchester Town and the market towns. While greenfield extensions are inevitable, should develop existing brownfield sites first, to avoid unnecessary impacts on the countryside. This needs to be accompanied by the proportional growth in infrastructure and employment opportunities where required. The location of commercial sites will need to avoid amenity impacts and not prejudice the use of land for sustainable residential development. Greenfield development should be considered for both housing and commercial uses where sufficient land is not available within the settlement boundary.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Broadly agree subject to the need to maintain rural identity and align housing with economic development.

Appendix 6

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Horn & Son		Generally support the approach but there should be some flexibility in the 1500 figure to allow localist initiatives. The references to national guidance need to be viewed in the context of localism and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. Accessibility is given too much weight and should be deleted from the vision (paragraph 7.11) or qualified by adding 'and/or'.
Concept Town Planning Ltd	Jennings		Need to welcome tourism in the MTRA area. Must ensure that appropriate policy provision and support is in place to benefit from and enable appropriate economic growth within the tourism industry.
	Jezeff		Welcome the more positive wording of the vision but a greater population is required to support the facilities and shops in the towns and villages.
	Nobles		Each village should have a gap between it and the next village or town and the design of housing should fit in with existing houses.
	Smith		No comment.
English Heritage	Williams		The updated vision appears sound.
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			Welcome the vision but it should allow all areas to grow and evolve, which is possible whilst maintaining separate settlement identity.

Appendix 7a

Question 7a: Do you agree that New Alresford and Bishops Waltham are the main settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area and with the suggested amounts of new housing to be provided (around 20-25 dwellings a year to produce a total of 400- 500 new homes over 20 years)?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
The Grange Estate	.	Yes	Support the housing intentions and strategy to meet a range of housing needs.
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	N/A
	Challis	Yes	500 houses over 20 years may be absorbed if appropriately sited, probably largely to the South West, but roads and other infrastructure should be provided, including possibly a town by-pass which could also serve Sainsburys.
Upham Parish Council	Collins	Yes	N/A
	Daas	Yes	It is believed that around 20 dwellings a year can be adsorbed but these must be placed in infill sites where possible and not on greenfield spaces so that Bishops Waltham can maintain its gaps between other villages.
Alresford Society	Field	Yes	Support the housing target for Alresford, although it is difficult to see how it is derived. This is needed to avoid a drop in population due to falling household sizes, to counter the fall in economically active and growth in pensioners, to allow for affordable housing and to allow an increasing population for economic growth.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	No comment.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	Agree, but the word 'each' should be inserted to avoid ambiguity.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	N/A
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	In agreement. Both settlements have good facilities, and appropriate avaibalbe land to expand sympathetically.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	N/a

Appendix 7a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Long	Yes	N/A
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	Yes	The words "per settlement" should be inserted after "homes" in the last line for clarity.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	N/A
	Parker	Yes	But the level of housing for Bishops Waltham should possibly be less.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Yes	Support the approach to New Alresford and Bishops Waltham, including maintaining and strengthening the shopping and employment roles of the settlements and reducing the need to travel.
	Seaward Properties	Yes	Agree with the identification of New Alresford as a level 1 settlement and proposals for development to meet future needs. The creation of the South Downs National Park will enhance the role of Alresford as other development opportunities will be more limited. Therefore planning for anything less than 500 dwellings would be inappropriate.
	Simmonds	Yes	Yes, this seems to meet the needs of the respective local populations
	Wardle	Yes	N/A
	Welch	Yes	N/A
	Welch Family	Yes	N/A
	Brinkman	No	No, again these areas should be left alone and we should look at building new towns.
	Cook	No	There is no evidence to justify the numbers and there are alternatives. Denmead is a comparbale Parish and could presumably absorb more. Barton Farm should proceed and would help meet housing targets and reduce pressure on the market towns.
	Davidson	No	The total planned for the market towns is 400-500 over 20 years which is the same development rate as for the smaller settlements (150-200 each). The figures should reflect the size of the towns and villages.
Bishop's Waltham Parish Council	Edge	No	Bishops Waltham was originally allocated 500 dwellings but about 100 have now been built so the total should be reduced to 400. Need to retain the town's character. Denmead should be included as a main settlement as it has the same popualtion as Bishops Waltham and good services, as well as being a centre for several villages.
	Garfath	No	The figures are based on pre-recession projections and do not take account of the National Park. Development should be spread around the villages rather than destroying the character of Alresford and Bishops Waltham.
	Gray	No	The total housing proposed for Alresford and Bishops Waltham should be increased from 400-500 (200-250 each) as this is lower than the smaller settlements (150-250 each).
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The figures are difficult to reconcile because the totals add up to more than 1500. This creates confusion for the smaller villages.

Appendix 7a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Hare	No	The housing numbers are too low to meet housing need (market and affordable) and should be increased, especially for Bishops Waltham which is in the PUSH area.
	Hayter	No	'Main towns' is too vague and the allocated number is just the remainder after PUSH and Winchester allocations so takes no account of PPS1 and PPS3 sustainability requirements. Evidence of local housing needs suggests all 8 MTRA settlements should have a maximum of 150, with the remainder for local needs in smaller settlements, especially M3 corridor. The allocation for Bishops Waltham and Alresford assumes they provide all of the local cluster services when they don't. Bishops Waltham also has high out-commuting and poor bus frequency.
	Kettell	No	The total housing proposed for Alresford and Bishops Waltham should be increased from 400-500 (200-250 each) as this is lower than the smaller settlements (150-250 each).
	Lovejoy	No	The methodology for arriving at a figure of 400-500 dwellings for Bishops Waltham is flawed as it relies heavily on redevelopment sites within the settlement boundary, followed by greenfield releases. This phased release is impractical and there are many factors which could disrupt it and therefore harm the vitality and viability of the settlement. The development of strategic or major sites should not be precluded in this level of settlement. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Additional greenfield land releases would avoid over-development of the built up area and allow development to meet planning standards and provide infrastructure. Sites should be of 1-2 hectares and adjoining the settlement boundary.
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a	No	The allocation for Alresford and Bishops Waltham (400-500) is disproportionate in relation to the smaller market towns (150-250), which should have a greater provision.
	Sansom	No	Disagree with the total for both Market Towns being 400 -500 over the 20 year period which means 200 -250 each (10 -12.5 homes per year). given the size of these towns, their needs must be higher than the smaller communities who are expected to build 150 -250 each over 20 years with similar build rates of 7.5 - 12.5 homes per year.
	Slattery	No	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
	Smith	No	Some development should be provided but the numbers proposed are too high and concerned the only available areas would be greenfield. The criteria and statistics are wrong.

Appendix 7a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Bewley Homes		No	Agree Alresford and Bishops Waltham are the main settlements and sustainable locations for growth but the plan should require at least 500 new dwellings. Both settlements have capacity for this, in part through sustainable urban extensions which will also increase opportunities for affordable housing, community facilities and employment.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	The amount of housing in the market towns should be increased to at least 500.
Southcott Homes		No	Agree Alresford and Bishops Waltham are the main settlements and sustainable locations for growth but the plan should require at least 500 new dwellings. Both settlements have capacity for this, in part through sustainable urban extensions which will also increase opportunities for affordable housing, community facilities and employment.
Huxley (UK) Ltd			While the total of 400-500 new homes is supported, it is questionable whether this is sufficient to meet current needs and also to facilitate the necessary amount of affordable housing given the small average site size which comes forward. At the present time only larger sites are viable and the lower threshold or higher requirement set out in the Aspirational Policy Requirements will make the development of smaller sites unviable.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Acknowledge the role of Alresford and Bishops Waltham and agree the level of housing proposed, although they should not grow within the National Park area.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		The figures for Bishops Waltham need to be revisited in terms of infrastructure support, while Alresford has better links to Winchester and Alton.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		Appreciate that Alresford will contribute to housing needs, but if any sites around Royal Mail premises are identified for housing the new uses need to be sensitive to operational needs.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells		No comment.
The Wickham Society	Hoare		Most people in Wickham want a smaller amount of development than 150-250, as expressed in the Parish Council survey. There should be no more than 50 houses over a 10 year period, on brownfield sites and to meet local needs.
	Hollis		No comment
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
	Jezepeh		Support the figure of 400-500 dwellings but it is unrealistic to phase this on an annual basis. Swanmore is very sustainable with a secondary school, etc and should be considered for a higher level settlement.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		The allocation of 500 dwellings to Alresford and Bishops Waltham has no logic and the total for the Market Towns and Rural Area is 2200 rather than 1500. The market towns have less than half of the rural area population but are being asked to absorb a high proportion of the dwellings. 1500 is an 11% increase and on this basis Alresford should have 268 dwellings.

Appendix 7a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Kerr		Agree Bishops Waltham and Alresford should take the bulk of new homes for this area but this would leave 500-700 between all the other settlements, not the 900-1500 suggested. The other settlements requirement should be reduced.
	Nobles		Need to clarify whether this is 400-500 each.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		500 homes per year for Bishops Waltham would mean 20 years of misery fighting planning applications and would expand Bishops Waltham into a large town.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn		No view.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
Persimmon Homes			No comment.

Appendix 7b

Do you agree that the key elements that need to be addressed include:

- **maintaining and strengthening the shopping, service, tourism and employment role of these settlements;**
- **ensuring that greenfield releases are aimed mainly at supporting this role or meeting other local needs;**
- **protecting the adjoining National Park and other important aspects of the environment and setting of the settlements, or gaps between settlements;**
- **creating development opportunities by relocating/redeveloping certain uses or areas, provided important uses and facilities are re-provided in locations that will continue to serve the settlements;**
- **maintaining and where possible improving public transport provision;**
- **provision of adequate and timely infrastructure in conjunction with development and to address existing deficiencies.**

If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)		Yes	Agree but concerned bullet 2 is too loose regarding greenfield development (alternative wording suggested).
The Grange Estate		Yes	Support the housing intentions and strategy to meet a range of housing needs and protect the National Park. Do not support redevelopment/relocation of employment or education facilities, these should be centrally located and relocation may not be viable or deliverable.
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Upham Parish Council	Collins	Yes	N/A
	Daas	Yes	Greenfield releases should be a last resort - Bishops Waltham and its surrounding areas have identified pockets of brownfield sites which should be used for any housing concerns first. Space for employment should also be provided, which could be reallocated if the uptake is not there. Bishops Waltham is poorly serviced by public transport, including no Sunday service.
Bishop's Waltham Parish Council	Edge	Yes	Bullet 1 - agree, more local employment is needed, with small industrial units within cycling distance and on good road links. Bullet 2 - agree but only for employment needs, with new housing accessed from established roads. Bullet 3 - agree, need to limit housing and stables in the National Park and protect gaps. Bullet 4 - agree but only to meet a lack of existing provision. Bullet 5 - agree the need to improve current poor provision. Bullet 6 - agree, infrastructure needs to be planned in conjunction with development but concerned that housing numbers are being set but the sections on infrastructure and delivery remain blank.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A

Appendix 7b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	Agree, but retail development should be excluded from greenfield sites.
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	No comment.
	Hare	Yes	Agree these are the correct elements but these settlements would be better served with higher housing numbers.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	N/A
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	In agreement. Public transport is the key issue.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	N/A
	Kerr	Yes	N/A
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	To help achieve this need to avoid building on farmland and limit supermarket growth. Small villages need a few extra houses provided they are sensitively designed and not second homes.
	Nobles	Yes	N/A
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman	Yes	N/A
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd	Yes	Support the approach to New Alresford and Bishops Waltham, including maintaining and strengthening the shopping and employment roles of the settlements and reducing the need to travel.
	Sansom	Yes	The elements to be addressed seem adequate.
	Simmonds	Yes	Perhaps "Transport Infrastructure" could usefully be included in future issue of these elements
	Slattery	Yes	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	The key element is sustainable transport and minimising carbon emissions ? so we support maintaining and where possible improving access by sustainable modes of transport including public transport.
Southern Water	Solbra	Yes	Agree one of the key elements is the provision of adequate and timely infrastructure.
	Brinkman	No	Suggested new community within the National Park.

Appendix 7b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Garfath	No	Most elements are laudable except greenfield development and relocation of facilities to provide for development.
	Hayter	No	The elements take no account of the Market Towns and Rural Areas vision, in which local needs for housing has the largest land requirement. This is the main justification for greenfield releases, not 'relocating/redeveloping certain uses'. Policy framework should prioritise sites near town centres for the elderly, freeing up properties for young families.
	Pugh	No	The build rates for smaller communities in rural areas is the same as Market Towns. The demands for new housing will be higher for larger towns than for rural areas. Figures need to be revised to reflect sizes of categories of towns and villages.
	Seaward Properties	No	Agree with the key elements but a timely and comprehensive solution is not provided o the needs identified. There are few sites within the settlement and a greenfield allocation will be needed. The Core Strategy should indicate the direction of growth and plan for a package of measures so that these can be delivered in the plan period.
Bewley Homes		No	Broadly agree with the key elements but bullet 2 should specifically refer to greenfield releases for new housing, as well as other local needs, rather than inferring that new housing is a lower priority.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	The 1st bullet should mention housing, the 2nd bullet should refer to the role of the towns in meeting development needs of the wider area, and the 3rd bullet should not include reference to gaps.
Southcott Homes		No	Broadly agree with the key elements but bullet 2 should specifically refer to greenfield releases for new housing, as well as other local needs, rather than inferring that new housing is a lower priority.
Huxley (UK) Ltd			Strongly support the creation of development opportunities by relocating or redeveloping certain uses or areas within the settlement boundaries of the Market Towns provided that important uses and facilities are re-provided in locations that will continue to service settlements. In Alresford in addition to some housing being on greenfield sites additional commercial land can be provided on greenfield land. There is still space to accommodate housing within the settlement boundary and these opportunities should be maximised. Would like Huxley (UK) Ltd's site to be considered, along with surrounding commercial land, for residential development.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Endorse the need to conserve and enhance the service role of these settlements while protecting the National Park.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Bullet 4 is a key element to be addressed as part of changing public service provision. Operational County Council property may become surplus to requirements and be available for redevelopment, with proceeds reinvested in public services.
	Challis		The National Park boundaries should be sacrosanct with no development other than parking facilities. The scrap yard in Garfield Road should be relocated and developed for elderly persons' housing. The town centre should be tourist friendly, with pedestrianised High Street, links to the Palace and Ponds and a railway footpath to Botley.

Appendix 7b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Agree subject to housing being linked to economic development.
Royal Mail Group	c/o agent		Support maintaining the employment role of market towns such as Alresford, future policy needs to safeguard employment land. If the Alresford Delivery Office is considered suitable for development, alternative premises will need to be identified.
	Cook		The objectives are reasonable but should include promoting development for local housing needs, affordable housing and older people. Greenfield development has been rejected by previous consultations and there is adequate land within the settlement boundary. Land at Arlebury Park is needed for recreation space and should be removed from the SHLAA. Exception sites are needed for local housing needs and there should be priority for 2-3 bed dwellings.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells		No comment.
Alresford Society	Field		Welcome the priority for 2-3 bed dwellings. High priority needs to be given to providing housing that is truly affordable. Welcome housing being in the built-up area in the short-medium term as there is strong opposition to greenfield development in Alresford. The only greenfield development that would be accepted is for an educational campus, not housing or commercial uses which should be excluded.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding		No comment as Twyford looks to Winchester for higher level services.
The Wickham Society	Hoare		Concerned that future development should not destroy the character of Wickham or overload infrastructure. Wickham's sewerage system is at capacity and there are problems with traffic management.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
	Jezepeh		There is inadequate consideration of the aging population and every settlement should make some provision for the elderly.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		Agree with the elements except the reference to greenfield site releases which are not necessary to meet Alresford's needs. Alresford has a small land area, pressing needs for open space and is opposed to greenfield development. There is a need for 2-3 bed dwellings for the aging population and there is evidence of high migration into Alresford from this sector. It is not necessary to provide for commercial development that does not support local people - the two largest employers provide few local jobs and the most environmental damage. Small towns are an effective nursery for innovative small businesses. There is a need to relocate industry of the centre of Alresford but retain it in the Alresford area. The economic situation shows the need for flexibility over definitive allocation or centralisation of sites. Support development for local housing needs. There does not appear to be a need for additional retail space in Alresford but it is imperative that existing space is retained.

Appendix 7b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews		Most Itchen Valley residents are very satisfied with Alresford and value its atmosphere. More or larger shops would harm its character.
	Parker		Do not support additional shopping (bullet 1) or greenfield development (bullet 2). Bullets 3, 5 and 6 are very important. Bullet 4 depends on the opportunities and locations.
	Smith		Bishops Waltham has various shops and services which would change to meet development requirements based on incorrect statistics.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			Welcome the recognition that greenfield releases will be needed, as well as the redevelopment opportunities within built-up areas.
Persimmon Homes			No comment.

Appendix 8a

Question 8a: Do you agree that Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, and Wickham are locally important service centres which should provide in the range of about 150 – 250 new homes each over 20 years?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		Yes	Support the figure of 150-250 but it is a wide range and needs to be considered in the context of each settlement. In Wickham the SHLAA identifies very few opportunities within the settlement and many outside so the upper figure of 250 is suggested.
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
Upham Parish Council	Collins	Yes	N/A
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Would accept 200 dwellings over 20 years provided this includes the housing at Little Frenchies Field and is preferably on brownfield land, within the settlement boundary and accords with the Village Design Statement.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	The lower end of the scale is acceptable (but the totals add up to more than the 1500 required), assuming developments at Little Frenchies Field, Old River and infilling will be counted.
	Hallett	Yes	Denmead,s contribution should be at the lower end of the range in view of the large contribution (doubling in population over the last 30 years) made to Winchester City"s quota. The number should include the highly unpopular Little Frenchies Field development of 80 dwellings.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	N/A
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Agrees. Kingsworthy could easily absorb the numbers suggested.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	N/A

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	McCulloch	Yes	Provided that all proposed development occurs on brownfield sites and there is no expansion of the built up area. Farm land to the north and around Kings Worthy should be protected to reinforce the rural village feel.
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Oliver	Yes	Wickham has an ageing population and requires more housing suited to young families. The primary school is under threat from the new school being provided by North Fareham SDA that will attract Knowle children away from Wickham. Only providing for local needs, ie homes for the elderly and social housing will not enhance the community.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
	Simmonds	Yes	Local character must not be damaged by 'convenient' house building.
	Wardle	Yes	Yes but not all the areas may sustain the same amount as each other. Increasing the Whiteley and Waterlooville numbers would reduce the level for all these areas.
Chalkbank Estates Ltd		Yes	The approach would appear to be effective in terms of the housing needs of the smaller settlements, but far greater emphasis needs to be applied to linking any housing generation to the sustainable development of local workplace and employment facilities and encouraging local infrastructure improvements.
n/a	Alcock	No	150-250 dwellings is too low for Waltham Chase and too small to support the greenfield releases needed to support its facilities and employment areas. Waltham Chase has good facilities, services and public transport but has few brownfield opportunities so viable greenfield sites are needed. The housing allocation should be increased to 200-300 and emphasise small dwellings and housing for the elderly. The development of strategic or major sites should not be precluded in this level of settlement. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Future land releases should be sites of 1-2 hectares adjoining the settlement boundary.
Wickham PC	Bennett	No	Wickham will be affected by the Fareham development and therefore only 100 extra houses should be built on greenfield land within the Village, which must consist of medium sized private market housing. Wickham has more social rented and affordable houses than any other settlement which gives the Village an unbalanced social and age mix. It must be released from the requirement of a 40% proportion of affordable housing in new development.
	Brinkman	No	No, because again a new town would be more suitable. Designed with community, residents and nature in equal measure rather than adding on to urban sprawl.

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Clay and Mrs C Freemantle	No	150-250 dwellings is too low for Colden Common and too small to support the greenfield releases needed to support its facilities and employment areas. Colden Common has good facilities, services, employment and public transport but has few brownfield opportunities so viable greenfield sites are needed. The housing allocation should be increased to 200-350 and emphasise small dwellings and housing for the elderly. The development of strategic or major sites should not be precluded in this level of settlement. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Future land releases should be sites of 1-2 hectares adjoining the settlement boundary.
	Davidson	No	The total planned for the market towns is 400-500 over 20 years which is the same development rate as for the smaller settlements (150-200 each). The figures should reflect the size of the towns and villages.
	Du Boulay	No	The community has expressed a wish for a lower level of development in Wickham due to its small size and proximity to the Fareham SDA. There is scope to reduce the Wickham requirement within the overall figures for the market towns and rural area. There should be allowance for brownfield development, sites within the settlement boundary and the recent exception site, as well as any greenfield developemnt necessary. Development should be phased over the 20 year period.
North Chase Action Group	Evans	No	Waltham Chase should not be classified as a service centre as it has little employment, shops, services or facilities and is a dormitory village. There are serious drainage problems which need to be resolved before any further development. Waltham Chase should remain rural and will be affected by traffic from the Fareham SDA.
	Garfath	No	The figures are based on pre-recession projections and should be reduced to take account of the National Park. It is not possible to assign a level of development to these villages until the figures are updated..
	Gray	No	The total housing proposed for Alresford and Bishops Waltham should be increased from 400-500 (200-250 each) as this is lower than the smaller settlements (150-250 each).
	Hare	No	The overall level of housing provision is too low and the targets for these settlements should be increased to better reflect their role, and the fact that some fall in the PUSH area.
	Harman	No	150-250 dwellings is not enough dwellings for Swanmore's needs and some large garden areas on the edge of the settlement boundary should be released to help meet housing needs. The figure is too small to support these releases. Swanmore has good facilities and services and is served by public transport but has few brownfield opportunities. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Future land releases should make full use of existing large gardens adjoining the settlement boundary.

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Residents of Forest Close, Waltham Chase	Higgins	No	Waltham Chase should not be classified as a service centre as it has little employment, shops, services or facilities and people travel to Wickham or Bishops Waltham for most needs. Waltham Chase should not be considered separately from other villages in Shedfield Parish.
	Hollis	No	The Wickham Parish Council meeting showed that development of this scale is not supported. Development should be mainly affordable/social housing for local residents and within the current settlement boundary.
	Kerr	No	If Bishops Waltham and Alresford provide 800-1000 dwellings the other larger settlements should only provide 500-700 to meet the 1500 requirement. Existing permitted developments in Denmead should count towards its requirements.
	Kettell	No	The total housing proposed for Alresford and Bishops Waltham should be increased from 400-500 (200-250 each) as this is lower than the smaller settlements (150-250 each).
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a	No	Agree Colden Common should be classed as a locally important service centre but the housing number for the District and these settlements should be increased to facilitate sustainable growth. The figure for the Market Towns and Rural Area should not be a ceiling. Tried to work with the Parish Council and disappointed it has not engaged. Development should not be restricted by the availability of brownfield sites, with selective release of greenfield sites to allow larger-scale mixed use developments to meet local needs for affordable housing, facilities and business development.
	Nicholson	No	Not convinced so many houses are needed.
c/o agent	Peebles and Machin	No	150-250 dwellings is too low for Waltham Chase and too small to support the greenfield releases needed to support its facilities and employment areas. Waltham Chase has good facilities, services and public transport but has few brownfield opportunities so viable greenfield sites are needed. The housing allocation should be increased to 200-300 and emphasise small dwellings and housing for the elderly. The development of strategic or major sites should not be precluded in this level of settlement. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Future land releases should be sites of 1-2 hectares adjoining the settlement boundary.
	Piper	No	The housing requirement for Colden Common should be increased by 20% as suggested in response to question 1, to 180-300.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman	No	Disagree that Waltham Chase and Swanmore are service centres but agree Wickham is. Waltham Chase has no services to speak of and poor public transport. Shedfield Parish should not be split up and Shedfield and Shirrell Heath should have their share of development.
	Pugh	No	The build rates for smaller communities in rural areas is the same as Market Towns. The demands for new housing will be higher for larger towns than for rural areas. Figures need to be revised to reflect sizes of categories of towns and villages.

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Sansom	No	Disagree that the figures for smaller communities are to be the same as the larger market towns of 12.5 homes per year.
	Slattery	No	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
	Smith	No	Welcome the recognition of the role of local service centres but housing provision should not be so limited and should be at least 250-300 per village.
	Smith	No	Waltham Chase is not a service centre and Shedfield Parish should not be split up as Shedfield and Shirrell Heath also have local needs. The statistics used are wrong, with Parish and settlement figures interchanged, leading to the wrong settlement scoring. There has been a lot of development in Waltham Chase, which cannot sustain the development proposed. Don't agree that Swanmore should be in this category either.
	Welch	No	The requirement should be reduced to 100-150 over 20 years as these settlements are not as sustainable as Winchester and Alresford. The balance should be added to Winchester.
	Welch Family	No	The requirement should be reduced to 100-150 over 20 years as these settlements are not as sustainable as Winchester and Alresford. The balance should be added to Winchester.
Shedfield Parish Council	Wheadon	No	The definition of a "locally important service centre" is unknown and there is doubt that Waltham Chase fits into this category.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	Welcome the recognition of the role of local service centres but housing provision should not be so limited and should be at least 250-300 per village.
Persimmon Homes		No	Support identification of Denmead as a local service centre but the figure of 150-250 dwellings over 20 years is too low to meet the needs identified through Blueprint. Further market housing is needed to meet the needs identified and maintain Denmead's service role. The SHLAA shows there are greenfield sites available. Assume that Little Frenchies Field is excluded from the requirement, which should be increased to 250-300.
Bargate Homes			Agree these are locally important centres but more housing will be needed to meet affordable housing needs and provide infrastructure improvements. Also, some settlements are within the PUSH area so should have additional housing to contribute to the PUSH economic strategy.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Welcome the recognition of the needs of the smaller rural settlements, these provide a range of services which need protection and assistance, while avoiding significant growth.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Agree.

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Clay		150-250 dwellings is too low for Colden Common and too small to support the greenfield releases needed to support its facilities and employment areas. Colden Common has good facilities, services, employment and public transport but has few brownfield opportunities so viable greenfield sites are needed. The housing allocation should be increased to 200-350 and emphasise small dwellings and housing for the elderly. The development of strategic or major sites should not be precluded in this level of settlement. The settlement profiles should identify sites for the development needed to bridge the gap before the Development Allocations DPD. Future land releases should be sites of 1-2 hectares adjoining the settlement boundary.
	Critcher		Too high a proportion of the housing requirement is directed to the PUSH part of the District resulting in sustainability issues in the southern part of the District
	Elms		Too high a proportion of the housing requirement is directed to the PUSH part of the District resulting in sustainability issues in the southern part of the District
Kingsworthy Parish Council	Fairbrother		Kings Worthy does not have good public transport and if the number of houses proposed is to be accommodated a more comprehensive public transport system is needed.
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs		1500 dwellings should be the maximum for the Market Towns and Rural Area.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
	Jezepeh		Some of these settlements can accommodate more as they are less constrained, so the requirement should be at least 250 dwellings.
	Long		The requirement should be reduced to 100-150 over 20 years as these settlements are not as sustainable as Winchester and Alresford. The balance should be added to Winchester.
	Maclean		The target for Wickham should be reduced as it is so close to the Fareham SDA. Residents want to see smaller developments on brownfield sites. Some brownfield developments are about to happen and should be included in the figures. Development should be spread over the 20 year period.
Curbridge Preservation Society	Murray		Too high a proportion of the housing requirement is directed to the PUSH part of the District resulting in sustainability issues in the southern part of the District and inadequate affordable housing provision in the north.
	Nobles		In Denmead infilling will provide 150-250 over 20 years so no large development sites are needed. There should not be social housing next to private as this causes problems (see West of Waterlooville).
Wickham Parish Council	Oliver		Support a maximum of 100 additional dwellings for Wickham. If any are needed outside the settlement boundary they should be to the north of the village.
	Parker		These settlements should be treated separately as they all have different needs. Swanmore is still a village and 150 should be the maximum.
	Peters		Opposed to further housing in Denmead, which is no longer a village and has inadequate services and amenities.

Appendix 8a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn		No view
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
	Welch		The requirement should be reduced to 100-150 over 20 years as these settlements are not as sustainable as Winchester and Alresford. The balance should be added to Winchester.
	Wilson		Too high a proportion of the housing requirement is directed to the PUSH part of the District resulting in sustainability issues in the southern part of the District
BBD LTD			The categorisation is overly focussed on the services available, with no distinction between settlements inside or outside the National Park or the road hierarchy. Support the figures for employment provision in the rural area but there are constraints on providing it in Alresford and Bishops Waltham. Denmead offers opportunities for new employment development to balance housing. This will require land outside the settlement boundary, which could be provided adjacent to the Parklands Business Park.
Orchard Homes			Agree these are locally important centres but more housing will be needed to meet affordable housing needs and provide infrastructure improvements. Also, some settlements are within the PUSH area so should have additional housing to contribute to the PUSH economic strategy.

Appendix 8b

Question 8b: Do you agree that the key elements that need to be addressed include:-

- **emphasising the need to maintain and improve local facilities and public transport provision;**
- **enabling small-scale business developments, particularly for local start-up businesses;**
- **promoting development suited to local housing needs, particularly for affordable housing or housing for older people;**
- **conserving local features which are important in giving the settlements their character, particularly those identified in Village Design Statements or the District Landscape Character Assessment.**
- **protecting the adjoining National Park and identified gaps between settlements;**

If not, what changes do you suggest and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		Yes	Agree with the need to improve local facilities, public transport, affordable housing and protection of the National Park. There should also be a presumption in favour of sustainable development in these sustainable settlements but a greater number of dwellings will be required to achieve these benefits and make developments viable.
	Bell	Yes	N/A
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	n/a
	Brinkman	Yes	N/A
Upham Parish Council	Collins	Yes	N/A
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	N/A
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
	Garfath	Yes	N/A
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	Agree, but there should be clear policies to prevent the coalescence of settlements with neighbouring towns and villages.
	Hayter	Yes	In practice generally 150 will be sufficient or there will be none remaining for the smaller settlements considered in Q.9
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	N/A
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Public transport is the fundamental issue, but also working up meaningful partnerships with communities.
	Hollis	Yes	Strongly agree with all the points.

Appendix 8b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Providing affordable housing is very important, and maintaining the current character of settlements is also important.
	Longcroft-Wheaton	Yes	Strongly support the last two bullets on the importance of conserving Denmead's character and the gap.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	But need to include food production and avoid development of farmland.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
	Simmonds	Yes	Although proximity of adjoining National Park may cause decisions to be reviewed more often than perhaps envisaged at the outset of this study
	Slattery	Yes	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	The key element is access to sustainable transport.
	Wardle	Yes	N/A
	Wheaton	Yes	Strongly agree with bullets 4 and 5.
Chalkbank Estates Ltd		Yes	The Council appears to have addressed the broad requirements of the smaller settlements, but far greater emphasis is needed on promotion of workplace and employment provision (including expansion of existing) and promotion of infrastructure and facilities.
Wickham PC	Bennett	No	The village must be released from the need to provide additional affordable housing as it has a much higher percentage than any similar settlement which is affecting the deprivation of the Village. There is a need to attract young working families to rebalance the social mix and to help support the school.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The role of each settlement differs and several have limited function as service centres and the level of housing appears unrelated to their facilities.
	Hayter	No	This level of housing is unlikely to improve local facilities or infrastructure and should take account of non-car connections to higher level centres.

Appendix 8b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Henry	No	Overall agreement, but the CS should acknowledge explicitly that development sites need no longer be confined within the old settlement boundaries previously defined by the Winchester District LP. The Core Strategy should make it clear that the suitability of development sites in these localities will be determined and prioritised by paying particular emphasis to the planning policy criteria set out in para 8B. This is based on the fact that the old settlement boundaries are in some cases long out of date and an unnecessary constraint to sustainable development in these localities. The suggested clarification would also maintain consistency with the approach taken in Blueprint towards the remainder of the settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Areas. (viz: para 7.31)
	Piper	No	There should be more emphasis on delivering housing in Colden Common. The strategy should assess the commercial property stock and allow for residential redevelopment and environmental improvements. Colden Common is well supplied with employment land and the Apex Centre has potential for redevelopment for housing.
	Pugh	No	The build rates for smaller communities in rural areas is the same as Market Towns. The demands for new housing will be higher for larger towns than for rural areas. Figures need to be revised to reflect sizes of categories of towns and villages.
	Sansom	No	agree the elements listed need to be addressed; however to date little or no notice is taken of the Village Design Statement regarding the appearance and character of new buildings to blend with those close by or their encroachment into the countryside.
	Smith	No	Welcome the recognition of the role of local service centres but the strategy should provide for further greenfield development to meet local and wider needs. There should be a new bullet point referring to the settlements meeting wider development needs, the 3rd bullet should be reworded to refer to housing for local and wider needs including affordable housing (wording suggested), and the 5th bullet should not include reference to gaps.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	Welcome the recognition of the role of local service centres but the strategy should provide for further greenfield development to meet local and wider needs. There should be a new bullet point referring to the settlements meeting wider development needs, the 3rd bullet should be reworded to refer to housing for local and wider needs including affordable housing (wording suggested), and the 5th bullet should not include reference to gaps.
Persimmon Homes		No	1st bullet should emphasise the need to maintain local facilities through additional housing. 3rd bullet should promote appropriate levels of housing, including affordable and elderly person's. 4th bullet - care should be taken in referring to Village Design Statements, which may need revisiting in the light of the new strategy.
South Downs Society	Ankers		Welcome the recognition of the needs of the smaller rural settlements, these provide a range of services which need protection and assistance, while avoiding significant growth.

Appendix 8b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Agree that relocating or redeveloping some uses needs to be addressed as part of changing public service provision. Operational County Council property may become surplus to requirements and be available for redevelopment, with proceeds reinvested in public services.
Colden Common Parish Council	Best		3rd bullet point should be amended to say 'including' for affordable housing, rather than 'particularly'.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Agree with the elements provided housing development links with a sound economic development strategy.
North Chase Action Group	Evans		The key elements for Waltham Chase should be to: improve local facilities, enable homeworking by improving broadband and encouraging mixed use of the Morgans site; assess real housing needs; create a feature to give the village character; and protect the National Park and gaps.
Kingsworthy Parish Council	Fairbrother		Rural bus services must at least be maintained. An evening service for Kings Worthy could be viable if linked to another settlement (e.g. South Wonston).
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs		Bullet 3 should refer to small scale development within existing village boundaries and Village Design Statements or other SPD.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman		Bullet 3 should refer to small scale development within existing development boundaries and village design statements. Bullet 4 is vital and should 'list' important local features. Densities should revert to previous rural levels as recent developments have been too high density with insufficient parking. There should be better design and research on the size of family dwellings needed. Bullet 5 - the reference to gaps is essential particularly in the light of proposed major developments. Suggest a new bullet (6) regarding adequate and timely infrastructure provision - Denmead's infrastructure is reaching capacity with problems relating to traffic, foul and surface water, open space, broadband and public transport.
Residents of Forest Close, Waltham Chase	Higgins		Support improvements to facilities and public transport. Concerned about where any business developments would be. There should be housing developments to cater for young people who want to stay in the area and for older people. Question the settlement profile for Waltham Chase as the figures are for the Parish. Flooding is a problem in the area and problems need to be investigated. Gaps between settlements should be preserved.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
	Jezepeh		It is unclear how small scale business would be facilitated. It is important to provide a range of housing types and the limitation to wholly affordable housing schemes fails to address all needs. Public transport provision needs to be more flexible, for example combined with postal services.
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a		Generally agree with the elements but additional housing is needed to secure these aims, particularly for affordable housing, facilities and business. Selective release of greenfield housing should be included.

Appendix 8b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Nobles		Should be more bungalows and 2 bed properties for single residents with room for carers, disabled facilities, and more parking for residents. Flint walls and green spaces should be retained and more public transport provided.
Wickham Parish Council	Oliver		Development in Wickham should be phased over the 20 year period, resolve the current shortfall of open space and contribute to community infrastructure. Regard should be had to the proximity of the Fareham SDA and its impact on Wickham. Wickham has a high proportion of social housing and needs family sized market housing. Policies should recognise this and require social housing for local (not District) needs.
	Parker		All important except business development which is not necessary in Swanmore and should only be small scale.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		Waltham Chase has drainage problems and there should be no further development until this is investigated. There should be no new business development.
	Smith		Agree with the need to maintain and improve local facilities and public transport in Waltham Chase, but only with a small amount of development. The village hall is struggling and the bus service is being cut which would change the settlement score. Already have many business premises and there should not be more heavy industry due to effect of lorries. The affordable housing data is inaccurate as there are not 1391 people in need in W Chase. There are drainage problems which have been taken up with the Environment Agency.
Southern Water	Solbra		There should be an additional criterion requiring provision of adequate and timely infrastructure. Local infrastructure requirements in Wickham have been previously discussed and this information should be taken into account.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
Shedfield Parish Council	Wheadon		Agree with the key elements, but with following comments: - Need to be more specific about the nature of business developments and wish to safeguard against increased HGV traffic servicing these businesses; local housing needs should be for local people. Another element to consider is drainage as problems have been identified through out Waltham Chase (e.g Bull Lane and Lower Chase Road). Need to undertake an investigation of the water table before any development takes place. There is also concern about adequate infrastructure being in place to support the proposed scale of development.

Appendix 9a

Question 9a: Do you agree that the suggested criteria-based approach is the right one for the various smaller towns and villages? ?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Barron	Yes	Agree with the criteria based approach for smaller towns and villages as this is more flexible to allow the appropriate amount of development. Otterbourne is suitable for additional development and land off Main Road is promoted.
	Bell	Yes	Concerned that the criteria should be strong enough to allow the settlement boundaries to be removed and that the criteria be consulted on.
Compton and Shawford Parish Council	Bell	Yes	Important that each individual settlement be judged on its own merits.
	Brinkman	Yes	N/A
Hursley Parish Council	Brooks	Yes	Agree with the need for appropriate development in accordance with a parish plan/design statement. Need to be cautious about putting the desires of developers before community needs. Development must be sensitive to largely agricultural areas such as Hursley.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Agree and feel this applies equally to Denmead.
	Davidson	Yes	N/A
	Fennell	Yes	In agreement, but urges the retention of settlement boundaries, particularly in Conservation Areas. Many Village Design Statements's require new development should not extend beyond the built-up area of the settlement or must be within existing development boundaries. Important to maintaining linear configurations which currently exist in many of the villages. This proposal could erode that.
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
	FURBY	Yes	Agrees that development should reflect settlement size, but does not agree that increasing Curdrige from 1000 to 4000 homes is proportionate, and does not adequately protect the village. Concerned over the safety implications of the Whiteley relief road, suggesting traffic calming measures and pedestrian refuges as an option. Requests more pavements, particularly along Lockhams Road, Curdrige Lane and The Plantation to increase pedestrian and cyclist safety. Also requests tighter access restrictions for HGVs.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A

Appendix 9a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	N/A
Denmead Village Association	Goodman	Yes	N/A
Curdridge Parish Council	Gosling	Yes	Agree a criteria-based approach is appropriate but it should include criteria relating to business/industrial development, particularly the construction and the use of farm and other buildings and yards (wording suggested).
	Gray	Yes	N/A
	Hayter	Yes	Agree criteria based approach
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	N/A
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Good dialogue and understanding required between all parties for these issues to be moved forward.
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Villages which have produced Design statements demonstrating the character of the place and aspiration of the residents should be a criteria. Any extension of village envelopes which could lead to sprawl and intensification of commercial development that is inappropriate to the countryside should also be rejected.
	Kerr	Yes	Agree providing the housing provided contributes to the target for the Market Towns and rural Areas to reduce the development requirement.
compton down society	long	Yes	Criteria 2 should take account of sustainability and character of the settlement, and any history that might apply from previous Public Inquiry Inspectors reports - eg. Preservation of 'spacious' and 'semi-rural' character of Compton Down, and its lack of facilities. Criteria 3 - Any site specific development should be based upon the Local Area Design Statement should be undertaken only with consultation from the community. Criteria 5 should include continuing ratification of the WCC's Local Area Design Statements' - any updating of the statements should be done so in collaboration with the community.
	Long	Yes	N/A
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	N/A
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
West Meon Parish Council	Predeth	Yes	The criteria-based approach will be appropriate, subject to the detail of the criteria meeting the needs of West Meon.
	Pugh	Yes	N/A
	Sansom	Yes	n/a
	Simmonds	Yes	Agreed!

Appendix 9a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Slattery	Yes	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
	Wardle	Yes	N/A
	Welch	Yes	N/A
	Welch Family	Yes	N/A
Shedfield Parish Council	Wheadon	Yes	N/A
Chalkbank Estates Ltd		Yes	The Council's approach would appear to be effective to the needs of the smaller settlements but far greater emphasis is needed on local work facilities together with protection and encouragement of existing small businesses, which should be a focus of future development.
Upham Parish Council	Collins	No	Agree in principle, but must retain village boundaries.
	Darrock	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but the criteria-based approach is insufficient to provide adequate housing in the smaller villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. Settlement boundaries should be retained and reviewed to ensure they allow adequate housing.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	It should be explicitly stated that the smaller villages have no strategic function.
	Harvey	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but inadequate housing is allocated to the villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings outside the National Park. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. The proposed criteria-based policy needs to be positive towards development and if settlement boundaries are retained they must allow adequate housing.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	No	Question to what degree planning officers can override local opinion. Concerned about the term 'flexibility' in paragraph 7.33 and how this could be interpreted.

Appendix 9a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Howard	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but the criteria-based approach is insufficient to provide adequate housing in the smaller villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. Settlement boundaries should be retained and reviewed to ensure they allow adequate housing.
	Hunt	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but the criteria-based approach is insufficient to provide adequate housing in the smaller villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings. All the 1500 allocation is needed to provide the proposed housing in the higher level settlements and the previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated. Villages should have more housing so that affordable housing can be provided, rather than relying on exception schemes, and the previous 'local connection homes' policy should be reinstated. Settlement boundaries should be retained and reviewed to ensure they allow adequate housing.
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	No	May agree if it were not so vague. Criteria should be well defined and change needs to be gradual.
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	No	The approach is ill defined, and runs the risk of allowing inappropriate development. Change in small communities must be incremental. In Criteria 1 it is unclear whether all settlements are covered or just the larger ones, as in the old LP many smaller settlements were regarded as countryside. It is hoped that Criteria 2 includes open space provision (rather than just financial contribution) so as to avoid high densities within villages. Criteria 3 lacks the clarity of the old 'settlement boundary' approach. It should not be site specific, as this implies prior consent to develop. Within Criteria 4, the term 'benefit the community' is too vague and subject to a variety of interpretations. Agreement with limitations on the scale of development as this is one of the major complaints by local people. Criteria 5 Conservation Areas SSIs etc and their settings need to be given special consideration.
Trehaven Group Ltd	Nelson	No	The categorisation is overly focussed on the services available, with no distinction between settlements inside or outside the National Park or the road hierarchy. Support the figures for employment provision in the rural area but there are constraints on providing it in Alresford and Bishops Waltham. The opportunity offered by settlements along the M3 corridor south of Winchester has not been recognised. These settlements have excellent transport links, a combined population of over 2000 and a range of services. The criteria-based approach is not appropriate for these settlements, which should be level 2 settlements with recognition of their ability to make commensurate employment provision.

Appendix 9a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Smith	No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but the criteria-based approach is insufficient to provide adequate housing in the smaller villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings and be separate from the requirement for the larger villages.
	Smith	No	The criteria based approach is based on incorrect statistics which interchange between the Parish and villages. Local village boundaries should be maintained.
Mapledean Developments Ltd		No	Support the strategy of further development in market towns and local service centres but the criteria-based approach is insufficient to provide adequate housing in the smaller villages. The amount of development in the smaller villages should be specified - at least 1000 dwellings and be separate from the requirement for the larger villages. The previous Levels 3 and 4 should be reinstated and settlement boundaries should be retained and reviewed to ensure they allow adequate housing.
Persimmon Homes		No	The approach is not clear and open to interpretation about the levels of market housing provision to meet local needs. There should be a separate housing figure for these settlements.
	Baxter		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Agree, subject o the need to protect town and village identities and balance housing and economic development.
Itchen Valley Parish Council	Darley		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
Chilcomb Parish Meeting	Fordyce		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
	Gottlieb		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
Northington Parish Council	Hatchley		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
	Hollis		No comment.
	Horn & Son		Generally support the criteria-based approach but these should not be over-prescriptive regarding localist initiatives.
	Jezeph		The criteria-based approach has some merits but experience with policy H.4 shows they can be restrictive. Settlement boundaries offer greater clarity and certainty.
Itchen Stoke and Ovington Parish Council	Kavanagh		Future policy should allow modest development in the villages. A flexible approach is needed, whether there is a settlement boundary or not.
	Nobles		About right.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		Generally agree, but village boundaries should be retained.

Appendix 9a

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
The Dever Society	Robertson		Don't feel there is enough information to comment on whether a criteria-based approach is better than the settlement levels proposed in the Preferred Option. The previous approach was sensible and provided guidance and safeguards which the criteria-based approach may not. This is particularly true of the smaller settlements which should continue to be classified as part of the countryside rather than having an assessment based on criteria.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn		No view
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
Cavendish and Gloucester PLC			Support the criteria-based approach and removal of settlement boundaries to allow all settlements to determine and meet their needs. The criteria should not be restrictive or rule out greenfield development. Small settlements need to evolve and can contribute to housing supply.

Appendix 9b

Question 9b: Do the matters listed cover the right things that should be used to judge what types and how much development is appropriate? If not what other items should be included and why?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Bell	Yes	Character should be respected and design statements and VDSs be given significant weight.
Hursley Parish Council	Brooks	Yes	Agree, but with any substantial development consideration will be needed of: traffic speed/volume; traffic impact of business development; retention of beneficial commercial uses; pressure on school places; the importance (but infrequency) of public transport.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	These should also be used in respect of Denmead.
	Davidson	Yes	N/A
Bishop's Waltham Parish Council	Edge	Yes	N/A
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	N/A
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside	Yes	N/A
Tichborne Parish Council	Gibbs	Yes	N/A
	Gray	Yes	These appear appropriate.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Including the preservation of existing facilities and services.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Otterbourne Parish Council - Chairman Planning & Highways Committee	Jones	Yes	Service infrastructure particular water and sewage should be considered. Access and traffic problems should also respect local residents opinions before allowing development
	Kerr	Yes	These criteria should also apply to the other Market Towns and Rural Area settlements. It is important for the local community to be able to influence the quality of development.
	Kettell	Yes	The matters listed appear appropriate.
	Long	Yes	N/A
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nancekievill	Yes	n/a
	Nicholson	Yes	But need to resist supermarkets which effect tourism and other enterprises.

Appendix 9b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	N/A
West Meon Parish Council	Predeth	Yes	The matters appear to cover the main headings and the Parish Council would want to be closely involved in the detail of these as they apply to West Meon.
	Sansom	Yes	Appear appropriate for Denmead.
	Simmonds	Yes	Although account should be taken of any other factors, not previously allowed, which may arise in the future
	Slattery	Yes	Employment and housing should be dispersed amongst the settlements to permit people to live and work in the areas they grew up in. Broadband will help increase rural employment and rural bus services are essential for school children. Gaps between settlements are essential and brownfield sites should be used first. Shops, services, tourism and employment are key to all towns thriving. Avoid development in flood risk areas.
	Welch	Yes	N/A
	Welch Family	Yes	N/A
Chalkbank Estates Ltd		Yes	The criteria based approach is likely to be too narrow where smaller settlements have become less sustainable due to loss of local facilities.
	Brinkman	No	An assessment on architectural character should development go ahead. There is a principle in Switzerland where by local residents vote on their preferred design from a number of entries from local architects. The preferred Architect is encouraged to build again to create some consistency and harmony amongst the local built environment.
Upham Parish Council	Collins	No	Parish Plans and Village Design Statements must play an important role.
	Fennell	No	The third point should be amended to "Defining acceptable locations for development to contain settlements within the built-up area of the settlement in order to prevent damage to their settings". Reference is made throughout to Parish Plans but there is no reference to Village Design Statements.
	Furby	No	Disagrees that village boundaries are no longer needed, as this is important for fostering sense of belonging and identity, and also for preserving clarity over rural/urban difference. Identity is important for Whiteley and Curdridge.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	The 2nd bullet should be amended to refer to the maximum level of development in relation to the size/form of the settlement, which would give each community freedom to plan for more/less development and remain in conformity with the Core Strategy.
	Hayter	No	Delete bullet 1 - the criteria will define the settlements. Replace bullets 2-4 with a requirement to be infilling in a frontage contiguous with existing development. Add criterion on size of agricultural dwellings, which should replicate existing policies.
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	No	Local data should be considered such as Village Design Statements, Conservation Area Appraisals and Housing Needs Surveys, as well as infrastructure provision.

Appendix 9b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Upper Itchen Valley Society	Matthews	No	Bullet 1 is not clear about which settlements are included; bullet 2 should require open space provision (not contributions); bullet 3 is not as clear as settlement boundaries; bullet 4 is vague; bullet 5 should refer to SSSIs and conservation areas.
	Oliver	No	Proximity to other service centres should be a key fact to support development in neighbouring villages. Villages such as Bishops Waltham and Wickham rely on a fairly wide catchment to keep their services viable. Expecting all villages in the catchment to use public transport to reach the centres is unrealistic and short car journeys should be accepted as a fact of life necessary to keep centres vibrant.
	Smith	No	Incorrect statistics are used.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Hampshire County Council aims to bring forward affordable housing through its Project 500 initiative. It is helpful to signal local need and support for affordable housing in rural settlements.
	Baxter		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Agree, but need a clear link between housing and a sound economic development strategy.
	Cook		The commercial ownership of land adjacent to the Southdowns Estate at Old Alresford is a concern, and there is a lack of affordable housing, mains drainage, public transport and speed controls. Bighton and Gundleton wish to remain unspoilt but there remains a need for housing for local families.
Itchen Valley Parish Council	Darley		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.

Appendix 9b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Chilcomb Parish Meeting	Fordyce		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.
Curdridge Parish Council	Gosling		Agree a criteria-based approach is appropriate but it should include criteria relating to business/industrial development, particularly the construction and the use of farm and other buildings and yards (wording suggested).
	Gottlieb		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.
Northington Parish Council	Hatchley		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges		The criteria should refer to the need for increased affordable public transport.
	Horn & Son		The criteria should be for guidance only. The 4th bullet should give greater weight to Neighbourhood/Parish Plans than the Core Strategy and this point should be a qualification not a bullet. Reliance on localism would be preferable to a list of criteria.
	Jezepeh		It will difficult to determine whether sites are within a settlement or not and only a settlement boundary can give clarity. It is unsatisfactory to rely on Neighbourhood/Parish Plans as only a small part of the community are involved. One settlement's interests may conflict with another's so the planning authority should undertake this work.

Appendix 9b

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Itchen Stoke and Ovington Parish Council	Kavanagh		Account should be taken of: existing land use (reuse of existing buildings preferred); effect on existing properties; the type of accommodation; the quality of the architecture and the plot size. Organic growth, architectural variety and affordable housing are encouraged. Growth should be modest and not overwhelm the character of the villages or surroundings. Smaller units are needed and design statements should be taken into account where they have been produced. There is a desire to promote economic activity and improve broadband speed, phone services and public transport.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		Support the elements in paragraph 7.33 which should be extended to recognise that many villages want small developments for local people.
	Nobles		Future development should fit in with existing housing and have adequate parking.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn		No view
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Seems reasonable.
Shedfield Parish Council	Wheadon		Broadly in agreement. Concerned that the bullet point "Consideration of the impact of proposals on the environment, infrastructure and setting of the settlement" includes consideration of drainage.

Appendix 10

Question 10: Are there any other strategic topics that should be included in the Core Strategy that apply to the District generally, rather than to any of the three spatial areas, and why do you think these should be covered?

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
South Downs Society	Ankers	Yes	Need to address concerns about equestrian developments in the countryside to prevent inappropriate facilities. Special policies will be needed for the South Downs National Park.
Environment Agency	Bean	Yes	Each of the topics in paragraph 8.7 would warrant a policy in the final Core Strategy. Further consideration should also be given to water quality and groundwater resources. Early consideration of wastewater disposal is recommended (in consultation with Southern Water) and water efficiency measures are essential to limit the impact of new development. The Water Framework Directive could have implications for capacity in the plan period. 80% of the District is defined as a principal aquifer and Source Protection Zones cover 46% of the District making groundwater protection and water conservation essential. Winchester is one of the most sensitive Districts in the region in terms of groundwater and this should be recognised in the Core Strategy.
Thames Water	Bell	Yes	There should be a policy covering provision of water and sewerage infrastructure (detailed policy and explanatory text wording suggested). The water companies' investment programmes are based on 5-year Asset Management Plans but the Community Infrastructure Levy could be used to fund shortfalls in water industry funding, e.g. to improve flood protection levels.
	Brinkman	Yes	The district should be self sufficient and sustainable, possibly using space within the National Park, i.e. a green energy park in the National Park to serve the district. Nodal strengthening using cultural, community and historical buildings and sites of interest in order to strengthen settlements in the district.
Denmead Parish Council	Daniells	Yes	Proper provision of recreation land, open space and protection of biodiversity across the District, not just in the National Park.
	Davidson	Yes	Development of land specified in the approved SE Plan must be exhausted before building on other land eg PUSH area within Denmead's eastern boundary at Woodcroft Farm
Alresford Society	Field	Yes	The Core Strategy needs to address the issue of gypsies and travellers. Disappointed that the issue of supporting local businesses receives little attention as these are very important in Alresford.

Appendix 10

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
The Shedfield Society	Ford	Yes	There should be a District wide policy that encourages cooperation between adjacent planning authorities. There should be a robust policy on enforcement of conditions. Condition "creep" is rife.
	Gray	Yes	Land specified in the South East Plan (including Woodcroft Farm) must be developed before other areas are released.
Wonston Parish Council	Hedges	Yes	The affordability gap needs to be highlighted as it leads to inappropriately high densities. Rural isolation can be a problem for people without a car.
(Chairman, L&H Parish Council)	Hickman	Yes	Concern raised over how many facilities needed for gypsies and travellers. Strategic issues like schools, health services, police/security which cannot be addressed in district or village plans should be addressed.
	Hollis	Yes	N/A
Sparsholt Parish Council	Holloway	Yes	Relationships must be established between planning committees, officers and local opinion for the proposed policies to work. A review of how the planning processes work in practice is equally important as the policies and the appeal process for a Parish Council is non-existent.
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Holmes	Yes	Yes to achieve a high quality environment the issues of Air quality also need to be considered in addition to those listed. With regards to the issues of Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity the Trust would welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss with you on our aspirations for the area.
Winchester Baptist Church	Jackson	Yes	See our response to Q2 and Q3: • the Core Strategy needs to ensure that plans are in place for meeting health care and other social needs for both current and new residents, and that these plans are co-ordinated with housing development • policies need to be put in place to safeguard high quality agricultural land.
	Kerr	Yes	Please take account of comments and produce a concise precis of future documents. Affordable housing should be allocated to people with a close relationship with the local area.
Freelance	Kessler	Yes	Walking and play, open space and transport are key to Active Communities. Street design is a key part of open space provision, and walking needs to play a part in the transport agenda. Landscape character and green infrastructure can be enhanced with tree planting. Density, street design, layout and access are key to sustainability.
	McCulloch	Yes	N/A
	Nicholson	Yes	Farming.
South Wonston Parish Council	Peal	Yes	Rights of Way should be included in open space as providing opportunities for exercise, promoting health and wellbeing.
	Pugh	Yes	Development of land specified in the approved SE Plan must be exhausted before encroachment onto other areas becomes necessary. EG PUSH area within Denmead's eastern boundary at Woodcroft Farm.
	Simmonds	Yes	Due account and prioritisation should be given to factors such as budgetary reductions, increasing age, and the associated change of age-spans within the proposed allowance for an increasing population requiring accommodation.

Appendix 10

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Slattery	Yes	Suggestions and comments made in response to other questions.
Chair of WinACC Transport Group	Slinn	Yes	'Climate Change' is missing. There is also little written about the growing need for housing for the elderly, and the nature of the employment to be encouraged in Winchester has not been described.
	Sloan	Yes	Rural traffic conditions, particularly associated with equestrian related transport problems (pothole, eroded verges etc) are not covered.
Southern Water	Solbra	Yes	The Core Strategy should cover the need for adequate infrastructure provision, coordination/phasing of development with infrastructure, protection of amenity for sensitive development, and promotion of water efficiency.
	Wardle	Yes	Develop land specified in SE Plan first before encroaching further into the rural areas eg PUSH area of Denmead boundary at Woodcroft farm.
Bewley Homes		Yes	Content with the schedule of topics.
Southcott Homes		Yes	Content with the schedule of topics.
Portsmouth Diocesan Board of Finance		No	A policy on density should be included to help achieve the required housing. Different densities should be applied, with higher densities in Winchester and the most sustainable settlements.
	Garfath	No	Plans for Places is full of ambiguities and based on outdated statistics. This should be corrected and genuine discussion invited. No MDA should be agreed until this is done.
Twyford Parish Council	Harding	No	Plans for Places seems to be for the larger settlements and Parish Councils should be encouraged to prepare plans for the villages. There is no indication of monitoring of the effectiveness of existing policies.
	Hayter	No	Need policy framework to prioritise sites near town centre facilities. Need more sheltered housing, with affordable on settlement peripheries. Provide frameworks for localism and Community Infrastructure Levy. Conflicts between employment study requirements and some policies. Need policies on design and density.
	Horn & Son	No	Localism should be a strategic topic in the Core Strategy with a separate policy to avoid locally supported initiatives being seen as a departure from the plan (wording suggested).
	Landmark Development AG	No	The need for specialised accommodation for the elderly should be considered and a new policy added. There is an ageing population which will grow in size and various research reports indicate a need for appropriate accommodation. The need for new facilities locally should be investigated by Hampshire County Council. Land east of Whiteley Lane, Whiteley would be suitable as a care village if not required for residential development.
Land Owners of Upper Moors Road, Colden Common	n/a	No	Housing delivery (market and affordable) and greenfield releases should be added to the topics to be addressed.

Appendix 10

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Sansom	No	Development of land in the South East Plan must be exhausted before encroachment onto other areas becomes necessary. e.g. Push area within the eastern boundary of Denmead at Woodcroft Farm and also the land at West of Waterlooville MDA that the SE Plan identified to bring the overall total housing numbers to 17000 with appropriate infrastructure.
Bargate Homes			No comment.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			There should be a policy to encourage cooperation between adjacent planning authorities. There is too much reference to the River Itchen when the Meon defines the character of much of the area and should not be threatened by development.
Hampshire County Council	Ayling		Studies show a need for extra care accomodation with affordable and private tenures. Extra care housing can be required in association with larger-scale developments and research suggests 45-60 unit schemes are the optimum size.
	Caspari		Plans for Places fails to recognise the context or take adequate account of the government's pro-growth agenda and should provide land to enable business growth and housing supply. It fails to acknowledge the M3 Local Enterprise Partnership which covers Winchester and has various economic priorities.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Chestnutt		Infrastructure should now include broadband and Hampshire should have high speed broadband to help business sustainability and growth. This needs to be built into infrastructure requirements. The development strategy should take account of the draft National Planning Policy Framework, Localism Bill and other related policies.
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	de la Rue		There does not appear to be any reference to gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. it would be sensible to use the South East Plan Partial Review Panel Report conclusions and include a policy based on this in the next vesion of the Core Strategy.
	Foster		Adequately sized garages (min 10'x18') should be required to avoid unsightly and congested residential streets. There should be at least 2 spaces per 3 bed dwelling and 3 per 4 + bed, with parking provided underneath houses and commercial property where possible.
Swanmore Parish Council	Garside		No comment.
Tichboorne Parish Council	Gibbs		No comment.
Denmead Village Association	Goodman		The LDF should not be rushed before the Localism Bill is passed or plans for Denmead can be influenced by a new Parish Plan (which is being looked at for Denmead). Plans for Places will underpin a suite of major documents which are too complicated for ordinary members of the public to understand so a precis of them is needed. There should be greater discretion over affordable housing with close local links being a key criterion.
	Hare		No comment.

Appendix 10

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Winchester Action On Climate Change	Hutchison		An essential issue to be addressed is the need for energy efficient buildings and the use of sustainable materials. New developments should also include on-site renewable energy production means.
	Jezeff		Provision for the aging population should be made, with a policy covering nursing homes, specialist facilities and retirement villages.
New Alresford Town Council	Kavanagh		There should be reference to public transport and there is a danger that by restricting economic development in rural areas and market towns public transport use will decline. Positive steps are required to restore a balanced age range and economic development in the villages.
	Long		Strategic and local gaps should be removed, reflecting the removal of strategic gaps from the South East Plan. Local gaps conflict with government advice and have been drawn too widely e.g. Winchester-Littleton Gap.
Curbridge Preservation Society	Murray		The District is not meeting its statutory obligations to protect the Upper Hamble SPA and should produce a development framework jointly with Eastleigh and Fareham Borough Councils to protect this important area.
	Nobles		Denmead is a short cut to Winchester and there will be 6000 more cars from West of Waterlooville.
Waltham Chase Women's Institute	Portman		No comment.
Winchester Business Improvement District	Turner		Pleased that the emerging employment strategies are to be explored further and Winchester BID is keen to be part of this.
	Welch		Strategic and local gaps should be removed, reflecting the removal of strategic gaps from the South East Plan. Local gaps conflict with government advice and have been drawn too widely e.g. Winchester-Littleton Gap.
	Welch Family		Strategic and local gaps should be removed, reflecting the removal of strategic gaps from the South East Plan. Local gaps conflict with government advice and have been drawn too widely e.g. Winchester-Littleton Gap.
City of Winchester Trust			An essential issue to be addressed is the need for energy efficient buildings and the use of sustainable materials. New developments should also include on-site renewable energy production means.
Orchard Homes			No comment.
Persimmon Homes			No comment.

Appendix: 11

General Comments

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			Support Parish and Local Plans, along with brownfield development, the highest appropriate density, retention of settlement boundaries and gaps, better collaboration to provide services, use of exception sites for affordable housing, and high energy standards for new buildings.
Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)			Winchester District has a special and important character and this should be enhanced for the benefit of local communities. Concerned about the implications of the draft National Planning Policy Framework which has an emphasis on economic growth and lack of countryside protection.
Colden Common Parish Council	Best		The Colden Common Settlement Profile should include 'Within the built environment highly valued green ways which maintain rural character and wild life corridors and footpaths' within the 'What Makes Colden Common Special' section. The 1st bullet under 'Main Opportunities' should refer to 'a range of' housing, not just affordable housing. The 'Challenges' section should refer to ensuring that future development does not harm the character of the settlement, rather than affordable housing; supporting the population of the village generally, rather than an aging population; refer to 'developing' services rather than supporting them; and refer to maintaining the character of the village 'within the settlement'.
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	Curtis		No comment.
St Swithun Street & Symonds' Street Resident's Ass	Gawling		No comment
Natural England	Gittins		No comment.
The Wickham Society	Hoare		Welcome the intention to produce locally-derived housing targets, and to retain gaps between the Fareham SDA and nearby settlements.
Crawley Parish Council	Holloway		No comment.
Winchester Action On Climate Change	Hutchison		Plans for Places is a sensible and encouraging document.

Appendix: 11

Organisation	Surname	Response	Comments
	Jezepeh		It is unsound to proceed on the basis that the South East Plan will be abolished as the evidence base that underpinned it remains. Also, the consultation should have awaited the Barton Farm appeal decision, which has fundamental implications for development in the District.
	Maclean		Generally very happy with Plans for Places and pleased the views of residents have been sought.
Highways Agency	Mendoza		Note that the Infrastructure Study has been amended in accordance with the Highway Authority's comments and suggest that the timescales for delivery and gaps in funding need to be clearly outlined so that the Core Strategy policies can be 'effective' as required by PPS12.
English Heritage	Williams		Disappointed that the evidence on historic environment (paragraph 3.3) only refers to Winchester City and Its Setting when there is a wealth of material in the historic environment record and conservation area appraisals. The settlement profiles could be misinterpreted as it is unclear what the distinction is between 'heritage sites' and 'conservation area or listed building'. Heritage assets outside settlements are not accounted for and conservation areas not identified on the keys. The Sustainability Appraisal will need updating and more information on historic environment included.
City of Winchester Trust			Plans for Places is a sensible and encouraging document.
The Coal Authority			No comment.