

CABINET

14 October 2009

WINCHESTER DISTRICT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY  
ASSESSMENT (SHLAA) – RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Zoe James    Tel No: 01962 848 420 email  
zjames@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

CAB 1522(LDF) – Winchester District Local Development Framework – Review of Urban Capacity Study and Proposed Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 11 September 2007

CAB 1773(LDF) - Winchester District Development Framework – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Initial Results, 16 December 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Production of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was agreed by the Cabinet (Local Development Framework (LDF)) Committee in September 2007. Work was finalised on the draft SHLAA and reported to the LDF Committee in December 2008. The draft SHLAA was published for consultation between the 4 March and 15 April 2009.

The main issues raised and proposals on how these should be dealt with in the SHLAA study are set out within this report. The full summarised results of the consultation are provided within Appendix 1.

These results are relevant to the options for development which are being considered as part of the preparation of the LDF Core Strategy, and for the potential release of Local Reserve Sites. The SHLAA must help the LDF to identify sufficient deliverable housing land to meet the Council's housing allocation in the South East Plan. These sites must be in accordance with the policies and development strategy in the emerging Core Strategy; in particular the proposed Settlement Hierarchy.

A number of comments have been received on the draft SHLAA and there has also been an advisory visit from the Planning Inspectorate (PINs), which have all helped to clarify how the SHLAA should be progressed. As a result, a number of the sources of housing supply have been brought into question and this has resulted in a substantial reduction in the number of dwellings originally estimated through the SHLAA. Consequently, there will need to be allocations of land outside the settlement boundaries and potential greenfield sites must therefore now be considered and identified within the SHLAA.

The main reductions in supply result from the removal of the small sites allowance and the re-phasing of sites to take account of comments and evidence about their deliverability. These changes have not been made lightly, but it is very evident that 'deliverability' is an increasingly important issue and one which will be tested very thoroughly. If the SHLAA is found wanting in these areas it could undermine the soundness of those parts of the LDF which have been informed by it. Furthermore, the SHLAA would be subject to very robust examination at any planning appeals concerning land availability so it is imperative that it can withstand this.

This focus on deliverability has the inevitable consequence of limiting local discretion as to what may be included. We could, for example, challenge the view on the likelihood of a contribution from windfall sites – and so seek to reduce the need for new allocations – but to do so without being able to show they were deliverable would risk the SHLAA being seen as insufficiently robust to support our Core Strategy.

Members are recommended to agree the way forward for completing the SHLAA in the light of comments received and this will help to inform the way forward for the Core Strategy and the Annual Monitoring Report.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the review of the deliverability and capacity of sites within the draft SHLAA (as summarised in Appendix 2) be endorsed and the other changes summarised in paragraph 4.2 be made, and that a second stage of the SHLAA is produced to sieve potential sites outside current settlement boundaries.
2. That the results of this further work are reported back to Cabinet in the form of a revised SHLAA, prior to publication.

## CABINET

14 October 2009

### WINCHESTER DISTRICT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (SHLAA) – RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

#### DETAIL:

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Government advice (PPS3) requires the Council to make adequate provision for housing development by ensuring a supply of 'deliverable' housing sites (defined as available, suitable and achievable within 5 years) as well as a further supply of 'developable' sites for years 6-10 and 11-15 of the plan. This requirement applies to the Local Development Framework, which needs to ensure adequate land is allocated for its plan period, as well as on-going monitoring where the Council is required to demonstrate a 5-year supply of development land. In order to achieve this, a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is needed, which assesses the likely future supply of deliverable housing land.
- 1.2 For this first SHLAA a detailed assessment was needed. The SHLAA is an important element of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which must be submitted to Government by 31 December 2009 and which will include 'trajectories' showing how housing land will be provided over the LDF period. The progress of sites within the SHLAA will then be updated annually for future Annual Monitoring Reports. At any point in time the Council should be able to demonstrate that it has a 5-year supply of housing land, or the measures it is taking to release land to ensure that it can ensure such a supply.
- 1.3 The production of the SHLAA, in accordance with the Government's published guidance, was agreed by the Cabinet (LDF) Committee meeting in September 2007 (report CAB1522 [LDF] refers). This has proved to be a major task which has been ongoing since then, but it is a very important contribution to the evidence base for the Core Strategy and to meeting the housing requirements within the District. Following a report to LDF Committee in December 2008 on finalising the draft SHLAA, a meeting of the SHLAA stakeholder group was held on 11 February 2009 to review the draft SHLAA prior to its publication.
- 1.4 The draft SHLAA was subsequently published for consultation between the 4 March and 15 April 2009, following approval by the LDF Committee on the 16 December 2008 (report CAB 1773 [LDF] refers) and finalisation in consultation with the Planning and Access Portfolio Holder. Appendix 1 to this report presents a summary of the results of the public consultation, which resulted in a total of 47 individuals or organisations making representations on the SHLAA. The draft SHLAA can be viewed on the website at:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/EnvironmentAndPlanning/Planning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/EvidenceBase/General.asp?id= SX9452-A7846FE1&cat=8141>

- 1.5 A draft Assessment of the Need for Local (Housing) Reserve Sites (LRS) was also published for consultation at the same time as the SHLAA, following its approval by Cabinet on 4 February 2009 (CAB1790 refers) and finalisation in consultation with the Planning and Access Portfolio Holder. Report CAB1902, also on the agenda of this meeting, deals with comments on the draft LRS Assessment.

## 2 SHLAA Consultation – Key Issues Raised and Recommended Response

- 2.1 The following sections provide a summary of the main issues raised through the consultation on the draft SHLAA and the resulting officer recommendations in response to these. More detailed summaries of the issues raised through the consultation are provided in Appendix 1. The issues and responses are set out in the order of the SHLAA document, reflecting the 10 key stages of producing the SHLAA. Not every stage was subject to comments, so the issues below start at Stage 4 and do not cover stages which were not commented on.

### Stage 4: ‘Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed’

#### Selection of sites

- 2.2 A number of comments were made on the way in which sites had been selected for the SHLAA, with some respondents suggesting that the way sites had been filtered out of the SHLAA needed to be clarified. Additional constraints were suggested, including undesignated landscape features and consideration of the impacts of climate change on flood zones.
- 2.3 It is recommended that the SHLAA is amended to make the site selection process more transparent, although the factors considered are felt to remain sound. Tree Preservation Orders were taken into account, but it would not be appropriate to exclude sites on the basis of unprotected landscape features, as these are unlikely to be a significant constraint to development. If features become protected it will be possible to reflect this in updates of the SHLAA. Also, some of this information may be too detailed to be considered for this evidence base study. Some of the comments relate to sites outside settlement boundaries, which were not considered in the draft SHLAA, but which it is now recommended should be assessed. Therefore it will be possible to take these comments into account when considering these sites through the recommended stage 2 work on the SHLAA (see paragraph 2.9 below).
- 2.4 The Environment Agency made a number of detailed comments and is generally satisfied with the Council’s approach, but advises that sites within Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) should be excluded from the SHLAA. The draft SHLAA already identifies flood risk as a potential constraint and the

assessment sheets for each site identify whether any site is within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. There are only a limited number of SHLAA sites within Zones 3a and 3b and a judgement has already been made on the extent to which this would constrain development. If it is a significant constraint the sites have been excluded from the SHLAA, so the sites remaining will be only partly within these flood areas, or adjacent to them. Nevertheless, it is recommended that this be refined as suggested by the Environmental Agency to identify sites in Zone 3b and exclude them unless there is specific evidence of their development potential.

- 2.5 In relation to 'rejected' sites, it is agreed that information on these should be made available, but to list these within the SHLAA document itself would make it considerably longer. This would not be appropriate given its length already, but the information could be made available on the web, with perhaps an indication on the maps for each settlement of any sites that did not meet the selection criteria. In response to the comment by New Alresford Town Council, the suggested sites were all considered and the above information would help show which were rejected and why. The suggestion that sites in multiple ownership should be included would risk 'undeliverable' sites being added. Therefore the existing approach of not including such sites unless they are clearly capable of being delivered should be maintained. The other issues raised in this section are too detailed to be addressed through the SHLAA and should instead be recorded on the site forms and addressed at the site allocations stage, where relevant.

#### Exclusion of sites outside settlement boundaries

- 2.6 One of the main issues raised in the consultation was that sites outside the current defined settlement boundaries had not been considered and that this is contrary to the guidance published by the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Planning Advisory Service. The initial stage of the SHLAA was aimed at identifying housing sites within current policy boundaries (settlement boundaries) so as to establish the existing housing potential within built up areas, before identifying greenfield sites. However, as it is clear that some new greenfield development will be needed to meet the South East Plan's housing requirements, it is recommended that greenfield locations should now be examined. The SHLAA needs to show that sufficient dwellings can be delivered from all sources (brownfield or greenfield) to meet the housing requirement, whether these are from within existing settlements, on large strategic allocations, or through allocations in the settlements according to the settlement hierarchy.
- 2.7 This approach is in line with guidance which states that current policy can be used to evaluate sites (DCLG, 2007), but the guidance does stipulate that the SHLAA should not be limited by current policy, particularly where enough housing sites cannot be identified. It is, however, important that the SHLAA is only used to identify potential sites rather than to allocate them, as this needs to be done through the LDF. It is therefore proposed that the SHLAA should identify constraints to development around settlements within the higher levels

of the emerging settlement hierarchy and use this to sieve the sites which have been promoted through the 'call for sites' made in early 2008 or through the Core Strategy consultation. This is likely to leave more potential sites than would be needed and any actual allocations would be made through the Development Management and Allocations Development Plan Document, as part of the LDF process.

- 2.8 The Council has received an advisory visit from the Planning Inspectorate and this referred to the SHLAA, due to its importance. The Inspector's advice confirms that the SHLAA does not need to assess 'non-runner' sites. Therefore it is not necessary to include every site, whether within or outside settlement boundaries, but the SHLAA should set out the criteria it has used to include/exclude sites.
- 2.9 Therefore it is apparent that further work is needed on alternative sites outside the settlement boundaries, both to address the requirements of PPS3 and DCLG guidance as well as to demonstrate the potential for the additional greenfield development which will need to be allocated through the LDF. It is therefore recommended that a second stage of the SHLAA is carried out to sieve those greenfield sites submitted to the Council which lie adjacent to the Core Strategy's defined 'urban areas' and Level 1 and 2 settlements and to assess which may have potential for future allocation, taking account of constraints.

#### Stage 6: 'Estimating the housing potential of each site'

- 2.10 Many of the challenges made to specific sites in the draft SHLAA focused on how the density and capacity of the site was estimated. Some comments recommended that 'density multipliers' are used to estimate capacity, such as those set out in work by Llewelyn-Davies in 2000. Table 2 of the draft SHLAA set out the density assumptions that were used and there were few objections to these. However in some cases the density assumptions were varied for particular sites, for example where they were in areas of low density development or involved a mix of uses. The respondents who question the density assumptions have themselves made their own assumptions based in site-specific factors and it is therefore concluded that the most realistic approach is to apply the densities in Table 2 but adjust them to take account of the nature and location of the sites.
- 2.11 The estimated site capacity has been re-assessed in every case where it was challenged (see Appendices 1 and 2), sometimes resulting in a change to the estimated capacity. Account has been taken of site characteristics, recent planning applications/enquiries and any other information that can help provide a realistic capacity estimate. Any sites which subsequently fall below the 5 dwellings threshold have now been discounted.

## Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed

### Deliverability

- 2.12 Deliverability is split into 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability'. General comments received on this topic related to the restricted capacity of the strategic road network (comments from the Highways Agency). This is a key issue and transport consultants have been appointed to assess the impact of the Core Strategy's proposals. This is concentrating on the Core Strategy's strategic site allocations but is also considering the potential development proposed for various levels of the settlement hierarchy. This work is nearly complete and has not identified any particular issues with accommodating non-strategic levels of development, such as proposed through the SHLAA. Therefore, suitable mitigation will need to be determined as and when sites are allocated rather than in the SHLAA, although any access issues would be flagged up as a key constraint in the SHLAA's site forms.

### Suitability (Stage 7a)

- 2.13 The consultation raised concerns about whether the Council had used the correct information to assess the suitability of sites, such as the appropriate existing character and density of the surrounding area when making a decision on the deliverability of the site. Following the submissions on individual sites, the site assessments have been reviewed to check they have used all the relevant information and to take account of the new information received through the consultation. In addition, the sites have also been assessed against the policies in the emerging Core Strategy.
- 2.14 One comment suggested that infrastructure provision was not adequate for further development in Waltham Chase and queried whether a proposed 'exception site' had been taken into account. Consultation on the Core Strategy has not revealed any significant infrastructure constraints and exception sites are outside settlement boundaries and were therefore not included in the draft SHLAA (but would be considered at stage 2, see paragraph 2.9 above).
- 2.15 Several comments question the inclusion of existing or proposed open space land. Defined important open areas (Local Plan Policies RT.1 and RT2) have been recorded as a constraint on the site assessment sheets and only a few sites have been included and then only if it was considered that the policy requirements could be met in conjunction with some development. This issue has therefore been taken into account in reassessing the sites.

### Availability (Stage 7b)

- 2.16 A number of people questioned the assumption made in the draft SHLAA that where a landowner has not responded to the letters sent by the Council enquiring whether there was any intention to develop the site, then that site can be deemed available. A nil response was considered an 'unavailable' site by many respondents. In addition DCLG Guidance states that 'Where it is

unknown when a site could be developed, then it should be regarded as not currently developable...' (paragraph 34).

- 2.17 This issue was discussed during the recent Planning Inspectorate advisory visit and, although not referred to specifically in the Inspector's advice, the Inspector did refer to an examination he had carried out where this issue was considered. In that case (Tandridge Core Strategy) the Inspector considered the issue of the 'reasonable prospect' of sites coming forward and concluded that: 'whilst a site's suitability and achievability can be ascertained from site surveys and other assessments, the reasonable prospect of its availability is much more difficult to assess where there is no hindrance to its developability (as here) other than the landowners' intentions. This is because landowners' intentions beyond the short-term (i.e. the first five years) are often unknown, even to themselves. In addition, the very identification of a site for development can trigger landowner or developer action, thus creating a 'self-fulfilling prophecy'. *Therefore, if a landowner has not said categorically that they have no intention of selling their site or that it should not be included for other reasons, then I believe it has a reasonable prospect of being available in the second or third of the five year PPS3 periods.*' (italics added)
- 2.18 It is therefore recommended that sites can be included within the second or third 5-year period of the SHLAA even if the landowner has not responded to contact by the Council. However these sites should not be included within the first 5-year period and sites which the landowner has said they have no intention of developing or selling should be excluded. The timing of all sites has been re-assessed to address this point (see Appendix 2). The question of whether sites need to have planning permission to be considered 'available' was also raised by some respondents, but it is clear from the above (and from the Planning Advisory Service's 'Frequently Asked Questions' note on SHLAAs) that sites do not necessarily have to have planning permission to be considered available, especially where they are expected during later SHLAA periods.

#### Achievability (Stage 7c)

- 2.19 Some respondents refer to the viability of development, especially on high-value and low density suburban sites. These comments are particularly aimed at the 'broad locations', which are dealt with below. General market advice has been taken from the Council's Estates Division which suggests that individual sites are generally likely to be viable (bearing in mind their estimated capacity of at least 5 dwellings) provided they do not have any significant constraints. Such constraints would be recorded on the assessment sheets and, if significant, the site would be rejected.
- 2.20 The timescales for the SHLAA have changed as time has elapsed. The Planning Inspectorate's advisory note suggested that the 5-year periods need to coincide with the period covered by the Core Strategy (to 2026). However, it is also necessary to consider the availability of sites at present, so a base date of April 2009 is used for the first 5-year period. The 5 year time periods



have been adjusted to 2009-2014; 2014-2019; 2019-2024. The SHLAA will need to be updated annually in accordance with the CLG Guidance and will be used to help inform the housing trajectory in the Annual Monitoring Report, which will enable the 5-year periods to be updated to fit with the Core Strategy's plan period.

#### Stage 9: 'Identifying broad locations'

- 2.21 Broad locations were used in the draft SHLAA to highlight general areas (mainly of low density suburban development) where individual properties may come forward for redevelopment. Some respondents highlighted a potential for double counting with the small sites allowance, as sites coming forward in broad locations would possibly also fall under the 5 dwellings site size threshold and therefore would be classed as small sites. Also many owners of properties within the broad locations objected to the fact that they had not been directly consulted and indicated that they had no intention of intensifying development on their land. The use of gross, rather than net, additional capacity was also questioned.
- 2.22 As a result of the consultation, the Planning Advisory Service's FAQs advice, and the informal advice from PINs, it is now clearer what 'broad locations' are intended to cover. These are areas where development is being actively promoted, such as an area of search for a large greenfield development or a part of a settlement where policies promote infilling or redevelopment. Neither the Local Plan or emerging Core Strategy actively promote development in the areas identified as broad locations in the SHLAA, so it is recommended that broad locations within settlements are taken out of the SHLAA. Where specific sites within the former broad locations have permission or are otherwise considered deliverable they have been added to the SHLAA as identified sites (see Appendix 2).

#### Stage 10: 'Determining the windfall potential'

- 2.23 A number of respondents have suggested that the small sites allowance is effectively windfalls and point to DCLG guidance that windfall sites should not be included in the first 10 years of the assessment. Although the SHLAA argued strongly that the small site allowance is different from a windfall allowance and reflects development that would not otherwise be taken into account, the Planning Inspectorate's advice has been very clear in confirming that PINs would view the small sites allowance as windfalls and therefore that it is not acceptable. The Inspector's advice note refers to the possibility of allowing for windfalls in the final 5-year period but, even then, a clear case would be needed. The Inspector also refers to the possibility of holding some sites in reserve so that windfall development can be taken into account and this will need to be considered in the Core Strategy or other DPDs.
- 2.24 However, it is clear that anything equating to a windfall allowance should be removed from the SHLAA and the early periods of the housing trajectory as it would not be accepted as a deliverable source of housing. If windfall sites do

occur, the Council can take this into account in its completions data and adjust the remaining housing requirement accordingly.

### 3 Impact of Recommended Amendments

- 3.1 The 20-year District-wide South East Plan requirement has been reduced from 12,740 dwellings (Secretary of State's Proposed Changes) to 12,240 through the Plan's adoption in May 2009. Slightly less housing therefore needs to be found to meet the Council's housing requirement. However, the comments received on the draft SHLAA, including the Inspectorate's advisory note, suggest that this included some sources of supply which are challengeable or overestimated the additional land available. Therefore the recommendations above will lead to reductions in the number of dwellings which it is estimated are available within existing settlement boundaries.
- 3.2 New information on planning permissions and potential housing sites has also been taken into account, which has sometimes introduced additional sites. It is also recommended that sites outside settlement boundaries are assessed so that the Council can demonstrate that it can meet its housing requirement from a combination of all sources. This work has yet to be undertaken.
- 3.3 The following table shows how the SHLAA figures would be altered by the changes being recommended.

Table 1 – Effect of Recommended Changes

	1 <sup>st</sup> 5 year period		2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year period		3 <sup>rd</sup> 5 year period	
	PUSH	Non-PUSH	PUSH	Non-PUSH	PUSH	Non-PUSH
Estimated number of dwellings involved						
<b>Original SHLAA estimate</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>110</b>
Sites now with planning permission	-23	-55	-7	-38	0	0
Removal of Broad Locations	-14	-24	0	-140	-57	-53
Adjustments to time periods	-36	-182	+15	+149	+21	+9
Amendments to site capacities	-5	-38	-11	-41	-22	-16

New planning permissions since March 09	+28	+94	0	0	0	0
<b>Amended SHLAA estimate</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>50</b>

- 3.4 It can be seen that the recommended amendments result in a significant decrease in the 1560 dwellings on SHLAA sites and 856 dwellings promoted through the Small Sites Allowance put forward in the draft version. This reduction in the SHLAA figures within existing settlements indicates that stage 2 of the SHLAA work will need to identify potential sites for the provision of further dwellings to meet the requirements of the South East Plan. It is considered that the majority of sites within the settlement boundaries have been identified. Therefore the second stage of the SHLAA would need to identify deliverable sites outside settlement boundaries (likely to be greenfield sites), unless policies are changed to more actively promote increased densities, or land which is currently protected for other uses (e.g. employment sites, facilities and service, car parking) is released.
- 3.5 It should also be noted that the LDF must also incorporate flexibility for it to be able to address risks to delivery. It is therefore important that the SHLAA (which is not an allocation document and which does not pre-determine any planning application) identifies more sites than is necessary to meet the requirements of the SE Plan.
- 3.6 Amending the SHLAA figures to bring them into line with government guidance and current practice also has repercussions on the Assessment of Local Reserve Sites which was published for consultation alongside the SHLAA. These implications are considered in report CAB1902, also on the agenda of this meeting.
- 4 Conclusion
- 4.1 The SHLAA confirms that the LDF will need to allocate substantial new areas of land for development, as expected when the Core Strategy Preferred Option document was consulted upon.
- 4.2 Comments on the SHLAA have been taken into account and a number of adjustments are recommended to the sites identified in the draft document. In addition, it is recommended that work is extended to identify potential areas for future allocations outside settlement boundaries. The main recommended changes are as follows:-
- a) The consultation raised some valid points regarding conformity with Government guidance that should be taken into account, otherwise this part of the evidence base could undermine the soundness of the Core Strategy and DPDs which it underpins.

- b) Additional information on some of the SHLAA sites has been provided and has been taken into account in re-assessing the estimated capacity of sites within settlement boundaries (see Appendices 1 and 2).
- c) The calculation of estimated capacity has been revised where an estimate of gross dwelling capacity was mistakenly used instead of net dwellings.
- d) The Core Strategy Preferred Option only identifies strategic housing allocations and proposed housing numbers for the different settlements within the potential settlement hierarchy (Preferred Option Policy MTRA2). The SHLAA needs to show there are potential deliverable sites within and around these settlements as part of the Evidence Base and further work is required to confirm the deliverability of the strategic allocations. The first stage of the SHLAA has not identified enough deliverable sites within settlement boundaries to meet the housing requirements. However, sites will not be allocated through the SHLAA, but through the Core Strategy (strategic sites) and Development Management and Allocations DPD.
- e) The draft SHLAA covered three 5-year periods, from 2006 – 2021. This accords with the advice in the Practice Guidance (to consider 3 x 5-year periods) but does not include the full period which the Core Strategy will cover (2006-2026). It is recommended that the SHLAA start date should be revised to April 2009, to reflect the current year, with further updates annually until the periods coincide with the Core Strategy's 5-year periods (to 2026).

4.3 The SHLAA needs to be finalised so that it can be used to inform the next stage of the Core Strategy, the Annual Monitoring Report and the calculation of a 5-year housing land supply. The original Core Strategy programme envisaged publication of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy in January 2010. However, with the need for further work on various matters raised by the Planning Inspectorate's advisory note, the programme needs to be revised and this will be the subject of a report to the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee on 20 October 2009.

## 5 RELEVANCE TO CORPORATE STRATEGY

5.1 The LDF is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Council's vision through the outcomes set out under various Corporate Strategy headings.

## 6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Resources for undertaking work on the LDF and the SHLAA have been approved as part of the budget process.

## 7 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 7.1 The SHLAA is a key element of the evidence base for the LDF. Although it will be the Core Strategy rather than the evidence base that is tested by the Inspector during the public examination, it can be expected that the SHLAA will be subject to close scrutiny. This is confirmed by the fact that the Inspectorate's advisory note referred to the SHLAA. However, provided the recommended additional work and changes are undertaken, it is concluded that there is no significant risk of the SHLAA undermining the soundness of the Core Strategy.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Questionnaires and comments received in response to publication of the draft SHLAA and requests for landowners' intentions for sites, held on file in Strategic Planning.

### APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – Summary of Consultation Results.

Appendix 2: Summary of Review of Site Deliverability and Capacity

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<p><b><u>Selection of sites</u></b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Method of site selection is unclear.</li> <li>• The Council should include information on excluded sites.</li> <li>• Sites should be selected on a consistent basis.</li> <li>• Level 1 and 2 targets are unnecessary and lead to an overprovision and overestimation of the amount of greenfield land needed for housing development</li> <li>• List of criteria used to reduce original sites to 154 should be provided.</li> <li>• Sites with more than one owner should be taken into consideration as large sites are frequently sold to developers to facilitate financing them and should be included in the SHLAA</li> <li>• Trees not yet designated as TPOs, but which may be significant in the landscape should be considered as a potential constraint E.g. Barton Farm ridgeline, avenue along Andover Road.</li> <li>• Flood risk zones 2 or 3 should be reassessed in the light of more stringent criteria for Climate Change predictions and the sequential test used.</li> <li>• What steps have been taken to check sites where owners could not be located/identified?</li> <li>• The SHLAA does not acknowledge the work of NATC and Alresford Society in identifying sites to meet local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swanmore Parish Council</li> <li>• Itchen Valley Parish Council</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Save Barton Farm Group</li> <li>• Alresford Society</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites within Flood risk zones 2&amp; 3 will need to satisfy both the sequential and the exceptions test (including demonstrating avoidance, substitution, control and mitigation). Sites adjacent to flood zones may need further investigation into effects of climate change</li> <li>• Sites within 20m of a main river or have a main river running through would need adequate buffer strips on either side of the river which could reduce housing capacity. Developers may also need to look at the feasibility of de-culverting sections of main river. The Agency would object to any culverting, but would seek to remove culverts on these sites. Development at sites within 20m of a watercourse would need an appropriately sized buffer zone.</li> <li>• Sites which have water drainage issues may require further investigation to ensure there is no increase in surface water flood risk to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties; this could reduce site capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites in Source Protection Zone 1 (close to groundwater abstraction points for public water supply, watercress farming and aquaculture), could be a potential contamination/deterioration risk and stringent pollution prevention measures for surface water drainage are needed. Adequate sewage infrastructure (mains drainage) must be in place prior to granting planning permission.</li> <li>• Sites on or adjacent to solution features in the underlying chalk (swallow/sink holes) can be an engineering hazard and contamination pathways to groundwater</li> <li>• Sites which have limited depth to groundwater are likely to have hydraulic continuity with nearby watercourses. Proposed operations must therefore not adversely affect flows or levels, or directly discharge effluent to nearby watercourses.</li> <li>• Welcome allocations on contaminated land where there is an opportunity to investigate and if necessary remediate possible contamination risk sources. NB. PPS 23 requirements.</li> <li>• The Council must work with water companies and the Agency to ensure there is sufficient capacity in sewerage systems and at the waste water treatment works (WWTW) to accept an increase in flows, particularly relevant to R. Itchen (SAC) where there will be changes to the limits of discharge consents as a result of the Review of Consents; it is unlikely to accommodate any growth outside these limits.</li> <li>• The Barton Farm development should be able to be accommodated within the discharge consent license for the improved Harestock WWTW, but the Council should consult with Southern Water at an early stage to confirm this (current infrastructure at the works may need upgrading).</li> <li>• Discharges to ground are being reviewed as part of the Groundwater Directive; Southern Water will be able to advise on potential impacts to capacity.</li> <li>• Land Drainage consent will need to be sought from the Agency for works or structure in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the bank of a designated 'main river'. Development which includes an obstruction to flow of any ordinary watercourse will need prior consent from the Agency.</li> <li>• The Agency are generally opposed to any development within a designated site and Natural England will also need to be consulted on any future planning application on these sites.</li> <li>• Constraints and opportunities for these sites may need to be reassessed when the PUSH Green Infrastructure Study is released.</li> </ul>	

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<p><b><u>Selection of Sites</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the prioritisation of brownfield, vacant and derelict sites and the use of Public Sector Land and bringing mixed use schemes forward on employment land. Empty homes and living above the shop should be included and recommend former MOD sites are used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save Barton Farm Group</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Broad Locations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practice guidance makes it clear that broad locations should only be used if after the review of the assessment there are insufficient sites identified.</li> <li>• PPS3 states that they should not be identified in the first 10 years. The SHLAA identifies broad locations for the first 6-10 years.</li> <li>• Existing value of properties within broad locations needs to be assessed as this will affect viability.</li> <li>• Need to assess net additional dwellings, not gross.</li> <li>• These types of sites are notoriously difficult to assemble and deliver as a whole</li> <li>• more likely will come forward as smaller sites which have already been accounted for through the ‘small sites allowance’ (double counting).</li> <li>• Landowners have not been consulted and therefore the sites are not available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> <li>• Bewley Homes</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Exclusion of sites outside the settlement boundary</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA ignores W. of Waterlooville Reserve and N. Whiteley provision.</li> <li>• Sites outside the settlement boundaries should not have been excluded as contrary to §16 of the DCLG Guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swanmore Parish Council</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Adam Welch</li> <li>• Holmes and Sons</li> <li>• Bewley Homes</li> <li>• Winchester College</li> </ul>



Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turley Associates – Apex Centre</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> <li>• Carterjonas</li> <li>• Barton Willmore</li> <li>• New Alresford Town Council</li> <li>• Laney Properties Ltd</li> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> <li>• LxB (Winchester) Limited</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Deliverability: Impact on Strategic Road Network</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the Strategic Road Network is suffering from congestion. HA would have serious concerns if any additional traffic were to be added the strategic network or their junctions, without careful consideration of mitigation measures.</li> <li>• The M3 South of J9 will not have any capacity improvements before 2014 at the earliest, future capacity improvements are uncertain.</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>General deliverability issues</u></b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of SHLAA sites have constraints which have not been taken into account and which could affect delivery including current market conditions, land assembly, access, character and density which reduces the number of dwellings deliverable within the first 5 years from 618 to 346 in the non-PUSH area.</li> <li>• A number of SHLAA sites have constraints which have not been taken into account and which could affect delivery including current market conditions, land assembly, access, character and density, and includes sites where owners have not responded which reduces the number of dwellings deliverable within the first 5 years.</li> <li>• Current planning policies should not narrow the scope of the assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<p><b><u>Suitability</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites should not involve loss of any playing field unless the site meets one of the five circumstances in Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy.</li> <li>• Additional dwellings in Waltham Chase will put unreasonable further demands on the infrastructure in Shedfield Parish. The proposed (exception site) at Mount Pleasant and infill developments need to be taken into account.</li> <li>• Some sites are not suitable based on Local Plan policy (those safeguarding community facilities, public open space, employment sites and those within floodplains)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England</li> <li>• Shedfield Parish Council</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Availability</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHLAA sites do not have planning permission and are therefore not available now.</li> <li>• where landowners have not responded; there is little prospect of these sites coming forward</li> <li>• Sites should have no legal or ownership problems. The SHLAA does not follow this; sites are included where the landowner has expressed no intention to develop, as well as sites within multiple ownership subject to a restrictive covenant.</li> <li>• The SHLAA should not assume that all sites with planning permission are likely to come forward particularly in the current economic climate.</li> <li>• WCC should include a flexibility or non-implementation rate within its sources of supply and applied to the existing consents and SHLAA sites based on past performance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Turley Associates – Apex Centre, Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> <li>• Savills</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Achievability</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The capacity estimates do not take the value of the existing property into account; the Council should seek expert advice on economic viability. Sites such as those in Southdown may subsequently not be viable or achievable.</li> <li>• A large number of sites are in low-density suburban, edge of settlement locations which need to be sympathetically developed; the estimated capacity on these sites is too high;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Estimating Capacity</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land</li> </ul>

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net developable area should be used to estimate capacity using density multipliers (e.g. from URBED and Llewellyn Davies).</li> <li>• On mixed use sites, the density assumptions should have been applied to an area identified as available for housing development.</li> <li>• Para. 2.25 on estimating housing potential needs more explanation on steps taken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments</li> <li>• Save Barton Farm Group</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Small Sites Allowance</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under PPS3 §59 and practice guidance Windfall allowance should not be included within the first 5 years of land supply and only in the first 10 years land supply in exceptional circumstances. There are no local circumstances to justify windfall.</li> <li>• The SHLAA makes an assumption that larger sites will come forward which will accommodate fewer dwellings (due to change in market from flatted development). This creates a risk of double counting exacerbated by the potential for the developments on larger sites to yield less than the 5 dwelling threshold (windfall).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Savills</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Small Sites Allowance</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome small sites allowance which has been a significant source of sites, although it is inconsistent to make a small sites allowance for sites &lt;5 dwellings, yet not for windfalls.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save Barton Farm Group</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Timescales for Delivery</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some sites identified for delivery within the first 5 years are in flood zone 3 and due to the sequential test, may only be developed after those in lower flood zones and within the first 5 years.</li> <li>• Only 2 years of the first 5 year period remain and many sites do not have planning permission – the estimated capacity is therefore too high.</li> <li>• The phasing of large sites is too optimistic as there are existing issues to be resolved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Site promotions</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turley Associates - Apex centre</li> </ul>

Comment	Organisation/individual who commented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apex Centre</li> <li>• Pitt manor</li> <li>• Reserve site at Spring Gardens, New Alresford should be released.</li> <li>• Site north of Well House Lane</li> <li>• Holmes Nursery Site in Littleton.</li> <li>• Culver Cottage, and Land to the rear of 68 Kingsgate Street and Moberly's Boarding House; 78 &amp; 79 Kingsgate Street, Wellington House and Wellington Cottage; Blackbridge Yard, College Walk.</li> <li>• The Dean Industrial area and to the south of Arle Gardens as a small exception site – owners have been consulted.</li> <li>• Corner of Grange Road and Jacklyns Lane by Ellingham Court – have not consulted on this.</li> <li>• Possible exception sites: Spring Way (currently Reserve Site), School Playing Fields and Arle Gardens.</li> <li>• land North of Well House Lane</li> <li>• Francis gardens</li> <li>• Little Frenchies Field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> <li>• Trustees of the Titchborne Estate</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Holmes and Sons</li> <li>• Winchester College</li> <li>• New Alresford Town Council</li> <li>• LxB (Winchester) Limited</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Hampshire County Council Estates</li> <li>• Smart Futures, Chichester</li> </ul>

The following organisations/individuals made comments on these sites.

Comments made by	Site number	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	Site: 286	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Local Plan Inspectors report: site must make provision for a mixed development and include parking for the church and open space.</li> <li>• Achievability: 2011-2016 as an application has yet to be submitted.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 31 to 15</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England</li> <li>• Mrs Payne</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site:305	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would result in the loss of a sports facility, and would conflict with Sport England's Planning for Sport and Active Recreation Planning Policy</li> <li>• This would conflict with PPG 17and WCC Open Space Strategy</li> <li>• The site is not wholly owned by Winchester College, but land would have to be acquired from the rear of the Queens Inn. Development also depends upon replacing the tennis courts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winchester College</li> </ul>	Site:305	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should be properly recorded as 'Winchester College Tennis Courts, Norman Road and land rear of the Queen Inn'.</li> <li>• The College is likely to promote only parts of the site for housing.</li> <li>• The public house should be recorded as an additional adjacent use.</li> <li>• The agent has no record of a listed building adjacent to the site.</li> <li>• it is likely that the tennis courts would be replaced off-site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winchester College</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:320	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no current employment on the site, nor any listed building. The site is not within the National Park (adjoins it). Only part of the site is within the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• The estimated housing capacity should be recorded as 6 (as on the current planning permission).</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laney Properties Ltd.</li> <li>• Paul Underhill</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:324</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• application in for 6 units, decision awaited.</li> <li>• The proposed density of 10 dph would only result in a net gain of 35 units, not 110.</li> <li>• Site is actually in Headbourne Worthy and has been the subject of several large scale planning applications.</li> <li>• Constrained by low density character of the area, access.</li> <li>• The site is within multiple ownership and there is no clear intention to develop. Individual properties would fall below the SHLAA threshold and therefore including them would lead to double counting.</li> <li>• High land values mean that sub-divisions/small scale development may be unviable.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to flood zones and may therefore need further investigation into effects of climate change.</li> <li>• The Agency would ask for adequate buffer strips on either side of the river which could reduce housing capacity. Developers may also need to look at the feasibility of de-culverting sections of main river.</li> <li>• The site has limited depth to groundwater and is likely to have hydraulic continuity with nearby watercourses.</li> <li>• application for 62 units refused on 07/01/09</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 329</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Site is within a sensitive semi-rural part of the village. Other applications have been refused and dismissed at appeal due to potential serious harmful effects on the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• Availability: The site is in multiple ownership.</li> <li>• Achievability: An outline application is currently being considered. Delivery is unlikely between 2006-2011 (more likely 2011-2016).</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 58 to 45</li> <li>• Application in for 62 units, decision awaited.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 334</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• application in for 28 units, decision expected May 09</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 381</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site currently in employment use (would need to overcome policy E2) and therefore assume no more than half the site would be developable, and history of refusals indicate delivering 13 units on the site would be difficult.</li> <li>• 206-2011 estimate is ambitious (more likely 2011-2016).</li> <li>• Planning application for 14 units refused on 15/02/07</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 385</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Development of site would result in the loss of a facility. TPOs on site may also limit the development potential.</li> <li>• Availability: The owner is looking to dispose of site to a developer and not progress a planning application themselves. There is no certainty the site will therefore be developed.</li> <li>• Achievability: There is no developer and policy constraints suggest that 2006-2011 timescale unrealistic. A 2011-2016 at the earliest is more realistic.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 13 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 399</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application for 10 units refused, awaiting appeal decision.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 427</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Site comes under policy S.10 where B1 use should take the majority of floorspace in the mixed use scheme. In the WCC Economic and Employment Land Study the site is 'fit for purpose for employment use'. Policy E.2 is also relevant (Inspector concluded the site policy should include 'flexibility to ensure redevelopment includes a level of employment appropriate to Sutton Scotney.</li> <li>• Application for 57 dwells was refused due to over development, with other constraints the amount of residential development should be reduced to 30 dwellings.</li> <li>• Availability: It can not be assumed the site is still available as although there was interest, there is no information on the owners/developers current intentions.</li> <li>• Achievability: Delivery is unlikely between 2006-2011 (more likely 2011-2016).</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 54 to 30</li> <li>• Application for 2 live/work and 55 dwellings refused 01/07/08</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 458</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability: The site is subject to a covenant with the owners of Harfield to allow only one dwelling on the land; the site is therefore not readily available to accommodate additional dwellings.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:463</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• application for 22 units refused 02/03/07</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:466</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer interest is unknown; it may therefore not be available. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:475</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is constrained by multiple ownerships and cannot be released now. Flooding is also a constraint and therefore the site may also not be achievable. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 483</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Access could be a problem as the site lies off what appears to be a narrow lane. A recent appeal decision allowed a net increase of 10 dwellings</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 15 to 10</li> <li>• Planning Application for 12 units refused on 23/06/08, appeal in progress.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savills</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site:485</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court Road, Kings Worthy</li> <li>• The site has had numerous failed planning applications and appeals due to impact on character.</li> <li>• Would need to increase the density significantly to make the development viable, which is unachievable in planning terms as it will impact on character.</li> <li>• There is too much value tied up in existing housing to make it viable.</li> <li>• The site has not been put forward by a development interest and therefore may not be available.</li> <li>• appeal on application for 58 units dismissed on 14/11/07</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Itchen Valley Society</li> <li>• Itchen Valley Parish Council</li> </ul>	<p>Site:488</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No decision should be made on this site until the South Downs National Park planning policies and procedures have been issued and reviewed against this property.</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten new dwellings on this site will damage the existing mix and density in Station Road and is not in accordance with the Village Design Statement.</li> <li>• The proposed density is out of character with the neighbouring properties</li> <li>• The existing house was built 1980 - it is unlikely to be demolished</li> <li>• There are no local facilities or services in the village and few job opportunities. Public transport is very limited and therefore the location is unsustainable.</li> <li>• The site has local historic interest.</li> <li>• Itchen Abbas has no mains drainage – Lack of sewage treatment facilities is a constraint.</li> <li>• There appear to be established trees on site which may restrict the capacity.</li> <li>• Planning permission appeal was dismissed for an additional development in 1995 as the subdivision of the plot would have been out of character (semi-rural, detached plots) with the area.</li> <li>• High existing land values may also restrict development. If a net increase of 7 units were deemed as acceptable, the 2011-2016 timescale could be achievable.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:497</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the constraints, the site is not available /achievable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 502</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Policy E2 is relevant which restricts residential on site; this coupled with number of trees in NE corner could restrict the developable area. Surrounding area consists of detached, low density units with large gardens.</li> <li>• Availability: The site has multiple owners, and development interest is 'unknown' (not confirmed expression of interest). The site is therefore not available.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 569</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: The requirement of the current car park on site should be considered and if it can be re-provided for if needed. The number of mature trees on site could limit development.</li> <li>• Availability: The developer interest is unknown and therefore not readily available.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site capacity – reduce the capacity from 10 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 659	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: access (narrow side roads at each end of the site) could constrain development, as could the narrow shape of the site. The existing parking would also have to be re-provided for elsewhere.</li> <li>• In order to accommodate the estimated capacity of 10 units, flats would have to be provided which may not be deemed appropriate and for which market demand has subsided.</li> <li>• Availability: WCC own the site; WCC have not expressed an interest in selling the land for development.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:889	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer interest is unknown and therefore not available; flooding is also a constraint. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clayfield Park Homes</li> </ul>	Sites: 888 & 889	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference to potential overland flooding as an additional constraint in the SHLAA form needs explaining as the sites are on high ground and well outside the EA's mapped flood risk areas.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:960	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an employment site, and development interest is unknown and therefore may not be available. There are also flooding constraints and therefore may not be suitable. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:1695	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is constrained by multiple ownerships and cannot be released now.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:1712	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not available due to the constraints and will not be delivered by 2013</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R.M. Lees</li> <li>• Bishops Waltham</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	Site:1719	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most parts of Bishops Waltham are much too crowded now.</li> <li>• If Bishops Waltham has to accommodate more people then sadly this must be a greenfield site.</li> <li>• The site is on or adjacent to solution features in the underlying chalk (swallow/sink holes) which can be an engineering hazard and contamination pathways to groundwater</li> <li>• The site is on or adjacent to solution features in the underlying chalk (swallow/sink holes) which can be an engineering hazard and contamination</li> </ul>

		<p>pathways to groundwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is within or adjacent to an AONB or designated site, SSSI, SINC, SAC etc. The Agency are generally opposed to any development within a designated site and Natural England will also need to be consulted on any future planning application on these sites. Constraints and opportunities for these sites may need to be reassessed when the PUSH Green Infrastructure Study is released.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:1725	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer interest is unknown it may therefore not be available. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>Swanmore Parish Council</li> </ul>	Site:1751	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swanmore Village Hall Car Park. Redevelopment of site would mean loss of important local facilities.</li> <li>Developer interest is unknown; it may therefore not be available. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Denmead Parish Council</li> <li>Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul>	Site:1783	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redevelopment of site would mean loss of important local facilities.</li> <li>Site is not available; Developer interest is unknown. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> <li>Pollution prevention measures for surface water drainage are needed as the site is within Source Protection Zone 1(close to groundwater abstraction points for public water supply, watercress farming and aquaculture).</li> <li>Possible site of swallow holes along chalk boundary</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site: 1801	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appeal dismissed on application for 11 units 20/03/06</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 1833	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitability: The site is amenity space for the school and therefore policy SF.7 applies (would need to re-provide space elsewhere). There are a number of TPOs on site and a cottage of potential architectural/historical quality. Links road is narrow and could create problems with access.</li> <li>Achievability: The site is not achievable as there is no mention of how the amenity space will be re-provided and the site is therefore not suitable or achievable.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denmead Parish Council</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	Site:1835	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC land adjacent to the Junior School and Old River is designated for recreational use and Denmead Parish Council would wish to see this status maintained.</li> <li>• Provides important amenity facilities within the village, loss would be unacceptable.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to flood zones and may therefore need further investigation into effects of climate change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site: 1903	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievability: The site is not achievable in the 2006-2011 timescale as an appeal has only recently been lodged. The 2011-2016 timescale is more appropriate.</li> <li>• Application for 31 units refused, appeal withdrawn.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site: 1913	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Given the sites sensitive location (within a Conservation Area, near listed buildings and located where it may affect important public views), the capacity should be reduced.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 13 to 11</li> <li>• Application for 14 dwellings refused, going to appeal.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winchester College</li> </ul>	Site:1950	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should be properly recorded as the Boat Club. The main land use should be recorded as Education; the additional use is “Sports facilities, formal recreation areas”.</li> <li>• The comment that Ref to “landscape issues” is unclear and should be omitted (particularly as reference no made in adjoining site 320).</li> <li>• Likely development would be for residential or College use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Alresford Town Council</li> <li>• Alresford Society</li> </ul>	Site:1966	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the inclusion of this site - Recognised by all as a potential site</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site:1966	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are mature trees around the boundary, which could restrict access, and he proposed capacity could affect the amenity value of neighbouring properties</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>		<p>(overlooking)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in developing is 'unknown' and the suite is therefore not readily available.</li> <li>• The site is within Source Protection Zone 1 (close to groundwater abstraction points for public water supply, watercress farming and aquaculture) and stringent pollution prevention measures for surface water drainage are needed.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to a SINC</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: There are a number of TPOs in the broad area. The character of the area is large plots with detached dwellings. The broad area is therefore not suitable for the level of development proposed (which would entail sub-division and infilling); there is likely to be significant local objection.</li> <li>• Availability: the area has multiple landowners and development interest is unknown.</li> <li>• Achievability: Broad areas should not be adopted in the first 10 years following adoption of the plan. Existing land values in the area are high, restricting development potential. The Preferred Option lists this as a level 4 settlement, limiting new development to small scale local connection homes (with enabling market housing where necessary). Due to high land prices, it is unlikely that local connection homes will be achievable.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 31 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Alresford Town Council</li> <li>• Alresford Society</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site: 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the development of this site, which has been refused by Planning Inspectors as an unsuitable subterranean site</li> <li>• RT2 designation; of more value as a green space than housing</li> <li>• The site is located on a steep cutting which would require extensive cutting and filling to develop for residential</li> <li>• The 2006-2011 timescale is ambitious as planning consent has not been granted</li> <li>• Application for 24 units refused 18/09/08</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Cattle market is owned by WCC who are not interested in developing. Developing the conservative club could only be considered as incremental development which may not be favoured by the Council. The site includes a building of local architectural and historic importance which if retained would restrict development further. The site is a community facility and policy SF.7 applies; the site is therefore not suitable.</li> <li>• Achievability: No application has been submitted proposing how Policy SF.7 will be overcome and the site is therefore unlikely to be delivered in the timescale 2006-2011.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 18 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Wonston Parish Council</li> <li>• Savills</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2017</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iterated in the Parish Plan and forthcoming VDS, garden infill should not be encouraged. Land near Downs Road and 64 &amp; 74 Down's Road</li> <li>• As reflected in the Parish Plan and forthcoming Village Design Statement, garden infill should not be encouraged.</li> <li>• The site is landlocked from the highway and would require a ransom to be paid if the site got planning permission.</li> <li>• Given the above and the value in the existing buildings, it is unlikely that this site will come forward in the plan period.</li> <li>• Highways engineers would not support new access onto Downs Road to the north.</li> <li>• The site has multiple owners and it is not known if each is interested in selling or developing their land. The council state that d</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2030</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: The density in the surrounding area is much lower than the Council accounted for; the site lies adjacent to a conservation area with TPOs and the density should therefore be reduced from 20dph from 30 dph.</li> <li>• Availability: No details on ownership are given and therefore it can not be assumed to be available.</li> <li>• Achievability: Land values are high in this area. Local resistance could also restrict development.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 12 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andy Trotter HCC</li> </ul>	Site:2039	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hampshire Constabulary HQ</li> <li>• Market demand [for apartments] is understood to be particularly weak, and the outline consent for this site is based predominantly on the development of apartments.</li> <li>• The Hampshire Constabulary HQ site remains a potential development site, but it is not a viable option in the current economic market and may not be deliverable within the timescale of the current SHLAA. The site should be allocated within the Development Management and Allocations DPD to establish the principle of residential development on site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> <li>• Colden Common Old School Trustees</li> </ul>	Site:2052	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer interest is unknown and the site is an existing education facility, it is therefore not available/achievable. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> <li>• This site is not owned by the Diocese, but by Colden Common Old School Trustees</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denmead Parish Council</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:2054	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides important amenity facilities within the village, loss would be unacceptable.</li> <li>• Site is not available; Developer interest is unknown. The site is not deliverable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 2062	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: part of the site is recognised in the VDS as important open space. In the VDS the three cottages and Church Farm are identified as making a special contribution to the area's architectural and historic interest which needs to be protected from demolition or unsuitable alterations and therefore it is likely they will need to be retained on site. The area is also covered by a Conservation area designation, tree cover along the top section and a nearby English Heritage Parks and Gardens designation. The 2005 Inspectors Report identified the site potential for small scale development. Accessibility is poor and the access road would have to be modified. The estimated capacity should use the net increase in dwellings taking account of existing dwellings on site.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 11 to 8</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2065</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the constraints, the site is not available /achievable by 2013.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2075</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability: The site is not readily available. The site has multiple owners and there s no indication on whether owners are interested in developing; the previous application did not include units 56-50 which indicates a lack of interest to develop. Access would have to be arranged through one of the dwellings fronting quarry road.</li> <li>• Achievability: 2011-2016 is not a realistic timeframe, 2021-2026 is more appropriate (currently outside the remit of this SHLAA). The provision of 10 units may not be financially viable given the costs of acquiring and developing this site; more units may be sought.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 0</li> <li>• Application for 31 units refused 29/04/04</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2077</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: The capacity needs to be adjusted to the amount not accounted for in the HCC figures (269) which is 38.</li> <li>• Availability: The site is not readily available as a compulsory purchase order has been authorised and a public inquiry is likely to take place later in 2009. The Council have allowed 7 years for this process and the timeframe should therefore be moved to 2016 – 2021 period.</li> <li>• Achievability: The slowdown in the economic climate could delay delivery.</li> <li>• Site capacity – Reduce from 39 to 38</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2081</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: The site is not suitable. Policy RT.1 and RT.2 apply, and make it hard to justify the loss of this space to residential. Developing the back garden section of this site presents problems with access (land locked) and would require access from one of the dwellings along Westman Road). Access to the site is restricted. In order to achieve suitable access, plot 4 or 6 along Westman Road may be required and would have to continue through the open space area to reach the back garden section. The site is also narrow, and due to the shape of the site it is likely that flats will need to be built to achieve the 30dph density; this could cause amenity issues such as overlooking.</li> <li>• Availability: The site has multiple owners and all landowners have not agreed</li> </ul>



		<p>that the site is available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievability: The site is also restricted by high development costs including the need to provide appropriate access and acquiring the back gardens.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 21 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site: 2084	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: Given access restrictions and TPOs, a realistic number would be a net increase of 10 units.</li> <li>• Availability: The broad area includes 11 separate landowners and the interest in developing is unknown and the site is therefore not available. Parts of the broad area are landlocked and could only come forward through coordinated development which would be difficult given the number of landowners and the access requirements.</li> <li>• Achievability: As a broad location, the site should not be identified in the first 10 years and is therefore not achievable in the 2011-2016 timeframe. Existing site values are high and therefore there's a lack of incentive for owners to develop the site.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce 15 to 0</li> <li>• application for 3 units refused 03/07/08, appeal in progress.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:2086	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sensitive location identified in the Chilbolton LADs</li> <li>• There is an appeal in progress that if allowed could allow delivery of the site before 2011. However, given the time needed and current economic climate this is optimistic.</li> <li>• Site capacity – reduce from 13 to 11</li> <li>• Appeal for 11 units held in January 2009</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 2103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: It is uncertain if the demolition of one unit would be sufficient to provide access. There are also a number of trees on site which could reduce the developable area. Flats would be needed to accommodate the 10 dwellings proposed with sufficient open/amenity space. The density of 45dph is in keeping with the area to the south of the site, but not to the north. The shape of the site could prove difficult to accommodate 10 dwellings plus the infrastructure needed. There are potential amenity impacts to the neighbouring properties. A</li> </ul>

more realistic density would be 30dph which should be recorded as the net increase in units (6).

- Availability: The site has been cleared to investigate it's viability and a feasibility study is being carried out, but it is unlikely that development will start in the next 18 months.
- Achievability: The site should be moved to the 2011-2016 time period.
- Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 6

- Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments

Site: 2104

- Suitability: Character and transport constraints will substantially limit development capacity and it is unlikely that 30dph is appropriate. A maximum of 20dph is more appropriate. Access is the main physical restriction; rights of way would have to be agreed by all residents along the road and as there are likely to be objections to the development of this site, this could be difficult. The main access junctions along Sleepers Hill are sub-standard and improvements would require the removal of protected trees. Access of Octavia Hill is a possibility. Mature trees could also reduce the development capacity of the site.
- Availability: One landowner has registered interest, but the site is recorded as multiple ownership. In any case the access onto Airlie Road would need to be agreed with all residents.
- Achievability: High land values are a consideration in this area, for a development to be viable, the number of units proposed would have to be sufficient to take account of providing suitable access.
- Site capacity – reduce from 17 to 10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mary Dunn, Alresford</li> <li>• Fran Wright, Alresford</li> <li>• Mr. R.M.Kennedy, Alresford</li> <li>• Mrs Vasanti Rogers, Alresford</li> <li>• John Hankin, Alresford</li> <li>• G.Rees, Alresford</li> <li>• W.J.Mayers and M. Mayers, Alresford</li> <li>• Mrs A.J. Thornycroft</li> <li>• P.R. Attenborough, Alresford</li> <li>• New Alresford Town Council (NATC)</li> <li>• Alresford Society</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2122</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not available. Respondents are owners of part of this site and have no interest in developing their properties.</li> <li>• Many respondents are landowners of 'broad-locations' should have been notified.</li> <li>• There is a lot of financial value in the existing properties.</li> <li>• The assessment has not been done in an open and transparent manner.</li> <li>• Multiple ownership and covenants are constraints on acquiring the land and should have been excluded from the survey.</li> <li>• The site is the town's natural barrier, recognized in the New Alresford Design Statement.</li> <li>• Oppose any development on this site which is out of character.</li> <li>• NATC identified a small field adjacent to watercress beds as potential for development and did not propose building on all the garden space of each of the properties in this site.</li> <li>• This area is important in offering a range of housing in Alresford.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to flood zones and may therefore need further investigation into effects of climate change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Alresford Town Council</li> <li>• Alresford Society</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2123</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the inclusion of this site as long as the refurbished barn remains in tact as part of any development.</li> <li>• Alresford Society do not know whether the site is available, and would be yet another piecemeal development for which there is no overall design.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winchester Cathedral</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2134</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The easternmost parcel (land adjoining 1, The Close) is omitted from the more detailed plan.</li> <li>• The adopted Close Plan (see submission for detail) proposes 22 dwellings; the SHLAA only proposes 15. The comments on reducing the density due to the character of the site is concerning, given the consultation of the Plan with the Council. The density reduction should be omitted from the SHLAA.</li> <li>• The Cathedral hopes to start development prior to 2011 and therefore the</li> </ul>

estimated development timescale should be amended to 2006-2011.

- The draft SHLAA indicates that the whole site lies within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. These constraints should be reviewed as the Close Plan identifies only Parcel G as being close to the floodplain.
- Suitability: Access could be a potential issue; the current access to the Inner Close via the Priory Gate would probably not be acceptable for the level of development proposed. No.9 The Close is leased to a tenant to carry out administration duties therefore policy SF7 applies, although as significant refurbishment is required this could make conversion to residential acceptable. The workshop may also be subject to policy E2. A 30dph density would suggest that up to 14 dwellings would be acceptable.
- Achievability: The lease terms of the tenant would need to be taken into consideration for the timing along side costs of providing access and high quality design to fit in with the sensitive surroundings.
- Site capacity – reduce from 15 to 14

- Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
- Environment Agency

Site:2146

- The site has no planning application (only scoping opinion) and scale and existing uses mean that it's not currently available and may not be achievable by 2013.

- Drs. R. and M-L Millard, Hambledon
- Professor D.E. and Mrs B.G. Johnson, Hambledon
- Dr Richard.G. Hull, Hambledon
- Mr & Mrs Meeson Hambledon
- Environment Agency

Site:2235

- Development of the site could exacerbate existing traffic flow and parking problems in East Street. Any access would have restricted visibility which is unlikely to meet Highways Agency standards.
- Part of the site is liable to flood under the EA's flood maps – alternative sites should be sought under PPS 25
- Development will alter the character of the village and the area which is linear; and would conflict with the Conservation Area designation.
- Recent development (infilling development or the New Inn site ) has put pressure on the existing infrastructure (work is needed on electricity and water system; sewerage system is strained during times of flood).
- Any development would affect the neighbouring property through noise, light, loss of vegetation. The existing tree cover makes an important contribution to the Conservation Area and should be protected.

- There may be boundary issues, ownership or legal problems that need to be resolved – the map in the draft document does not cover the footprint of the house that would need to be demolished.
- Any development would have a severe and unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenity of Cartref.
- The Agency would ask for adequate buffer strips on either side of the river which could reduce housing capacity. Developers may also need to look at the feasibility of de-culverting sections of main river.
- The site has limited depth to groundwater and is likely to have hydraulic continuity with nearby watercourses.
- Land Drainage consent will need to be sought from the Agency for works or structure in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the bank of a designated 'main river'.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site: 2280</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability: An additional 11 units would be out of context with the surrounding character and density and could have an adverse impact on amenity to neighbouring sites and cause congestion problems. There are a number of mature trees on site which may also restrict development. Access is currently shared with Kingsgate House, or alternatively could be achieved off Whiteshute Lane.</li> <li>• Availability: developer interest is unknown and therefore the site is not readily available.</li> <li>• Achievability: There is no developer interest and the timescale is therefore not achievable. In addition the existing high land values may make affect viability.</li> <li>• Site capacity –reduce from 11 to 0</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savills</li> <li>• Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	<p>Site:2281</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downlands Way, S. Wonston</li> <li>• This site already has planning permission and has therefore been double counted.</li> <li>• It is confusing why the estimated capacity has been set at 32 when planning permission has been given for 35.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without contacting the landowner it is difficult to confirm that the site can be commenced in the next 18 months.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 2282	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitability: An application for 11 dwellings was refused in 2007 and the appeal upheld as the proposed scale of the development was out of character with the surrounding area (AONB). 10 units could still be considered out of character and the density should be lowered to 20dph (7 units). In the Local Plan Inquiry Inspectors report (2005) it was acknowledged that the site could possibly be reconsidered when the northern boundary hedge matured; especially if other urban capacity sites in Droxford did not come forward or to provide for affordable housing needs for Droxford. The large number of mature trees on site, including the TPOs could restrict development on the site.</li> <li>Availability: New application for 10 units submitted in April 09.</li> <li>Achievability: If lower density scheme is proposed and accepted, the proposed timescale of 2006-2011 may be possible. It is unlikely that 10 units is acceptable given the constraints.</li> <li>Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 7</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> <li>Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd</li> </ul>	Site:2282	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitability: An application for 11 units on site was refused as the proposed scale was out of character with the surrounding area (AONB); the appeal was upheld. The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry recognised that as the northern boundary hedge matures, the site could possibly be reconsidered for allocation especially if other urban capacity sites in Droxford did not come forward, or to provide for the affordable housing needs of Droxford. The number of mature trees on site (including TPOs) could restrict development.</li> <li>Achievability: Given the constraints and past reasons for refusal, it is unlikely that 10 units will be acceptable and the density should subsequently be reduced to 20dph (7 units).</li> <li>Site capacity – reduce from 10 to 7</li> <li>Appeal on application for 11 units dismissed on 16/01/07</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments</li> </ul>	Site: 1826, 1827, 1829	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitability: Hospitals are a community facility and Policy SF.7 is relevant. The amount of development should respect the conservation area setting (and listed building for site 1827 and 1829) which would reduce the developable area. On Site 1827 and 1829, capacity should be reduced to allow for a mixed use</li> </ul>

scheme as proposed on behalf of the Hospital Trust. Site 1829 may be constrained by the narrow, one-way access from Burma Road.

- Achievability: The complexity of the site means that it is unlikely to be delivered before 2011 (contamination may also be an issue). 2011-2016 is a more suitable time period.
  - Site 1826 capacity – reduce from 22 to 18
  - Site 1827 capacity – reduce from 21 to 16
  - Site 1829 capacity – reduce from 30 to 22
-

**Adam Welch**

Littlestowe  
Otterbourne Road  
Shawford  
Winchester  
SO21 2DG

**Alresford Society**

c/o D.W.Goodman  
Wycliffe Cottage  
Arlebury Park Barns  
Alresford  
SO24 9ES

**Apex Centre**

Colden Common  
c/o Turley Associates  
Sarah Cornwell  
Brunswick House  
8-13 Brunswick Place  
Southampton  
SO15 2AP

**P.R. Attenborough**

Itchen Mead  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Barton Willmore**

Tim Burden, Associate  
Bensheaf Farmhouse  
Bourne Close  
Calcot  
Reading  
RG31 7BW

**Bewley Homes**

c/o Charles Planning  
Associates  
1644-1645 Parkway  
Solent Business Park  
Whiteley  
PO15 7AH

**Bovis Homes and Heron  
Land Developments**

C/o Adams Hendry  
Emma Barnett  
7 St Peter Street  
Winchester  
SO23 8BW

**Carter Jonas LLP**

c/o Hallam, Amy  
Anchor House  
269 Banbury Road  
Summertown  
Oxford  
OX2 7LL

**Clayfield Park Homes**

C/o Phil Bird  
Town Planner  
8 Gunners Mews  
Bishops Waltham  
SO32 1HX

**Colden Common Old  
School Trustees**

c/o Reverend Andrew Miller  
The incumbent  
The Vicarage  
157 Main Road  
Colden Common  
SO21 1TL

**Denmead Parish Council**

Kelvin Andrews  
Deputy Clerk  
The Old School  
School Lane  
Denmead  
PO7 6LU

**Mary Dunn**

Sanditon  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Environment Agency**

Colvedene Court  
Wessex Business Park  
Colden Common  
Winchester  
SO21 1WP

**Barbara Gray**

New Alresford Town  
Council  
Arlebury Park  
The Avenue  
Alresford  
SO24 9EP

**Hampshire County  
Council**

**Estates**

Andy Trotter  
Property, Business and  
regulatory Services  
The Castle  
Winchester  
SO23 9DS



**John Hankin**

Heronbrook House  
New Farm Road  
New Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Highways Agency**

Paul Robinson  
1B Federated House  
London Road  
Dorking  
RH41SZ

**Holmes and Sons**

c/o Dreweatt-Neate  
Steven Smallman  
16-18 Market Place  
Newbury  
Berkshire  
RG14 5AZ

**Dr Richard.G. Hull**

Japonica Cottage  
East Street  
Hambledon  
PO7 4RX

**Itchen Valley Parish  
Council**

c/o John D. Harris  
Chilland Barn  
Martyr Worthy  
Winchester  
SO21 1EB

**Professor D.E. and Mrs  
B.G. Johnson**

12 East Street  
Hambledon  
PO7 4RX

**Mr R.M.Kennedy**

Carey Down  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**R.M. Lees**

Dragon House  
Hoe Road  
Bishops Waltham  
SO32 1DW

**LxB (Winchester) Limited**

C/o DetonWildeSapte LLP  
One Fleet Place  
London  
EC4M 7WS

**W.J.Mayers and M.  
Mayers**

Endelig  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Mr & Mrs Meeson**

Cartref, Hambledon  
C/o Dreweatt Neate  
16-18 Market Place  
Newbury  
Berkshire  
RG14 5AZ

**Drs. R. and M-L Millard**

Greenfields  
East Street  
Hambledon  
PO7 4RX

**Otterbourne Parish  
Council**

c/o Mrs J Ayre

**Mrs Payne**

(Pitt Manor)  
c/o Turley Associates  
Sarah Cornwell  
Brunswick House  
8-13 Brunswick Place  
Southampton  
SO15 2AP

**Redrow Homes  
(Southern) Ltd**

c/o Woolf Bond Planning  
The Mitfords  
Basingstoke Road  
Three Mile Cross  
Reading  
RG7 1AT

**G.Rees**

Braye House  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Mrs Vasanti Rogers**

Chalk Hill  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Save Barton Farm Group**

Chris Slattery  
7 Coutenay Road  
Winchester  
SO23 7ER

**Savills (L7P) Ltd**

crees@savills.com  
c/o Chris Rees

**Shedfield Parish Council**

Shedfield Parish Office  
Upper Church Road  
Shedfield  
SO32 2JB

**South Wonston Parish Council**

c/o Ann Peal  
[ann.peal@btinternet.com](mailto:ann.peal@btinternet.com)

**Smart Futures Ltd**

Charlie Hughes  
13 Southgate  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1ES

**Sport England**

Edward Lockett  
South East Office  
51a Church Street  
Caversham  
Reading  
RG4 8AX

**Swanmore Parish Council**

c/o Peter Hildrew  
[peter.hildrew@btconnect.com](mailto:peter.hildrew@btconnect.com)

**Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd**

c/o Woolf Bond Planning  
Jeremy Woolf  
The Mitfords  
Basingstoke Road  
Three Mile Cross  
Reading  
RG7 1AT

**Mrs A.J. Thornycroft**

Searles House  
New Farm Road  
Alresford  
SO24 9QH

**Trustees of the Titchborne Estate**

c/o Dreweatt Neate  
Kevin Ayrton  
16-18 Market Place  
Newbury  
Berkshire  
RG14 5AZ

**Paul Underhill**

[Psunderhill@btopenworld.com](mailto:Psunderhill@btopenworld.com)

**Upper Itchen Valley Society**

Alison Matthews  
c/o Lake House  
Avington  
Winchester  
SO21 1DE

**Winchester Cathedral**

c/o Adams Hendry  
Peter Wilson  
7 St Peter Street  
Winchester  
SO23 8BW

**Winchester College**

c/o Adams Hendry  
Peter Wilson  
7 St Peter Street  
Winchester  
SO23 8BW

**Fran Wright**

80 De Lucy Avenue  
Alresford  
SO24 9EU

**Appendix B:****Recommended response to comments on individual sites and amendments made to sites in the draft SHLAA****Table 1: The following sites were granted planning permission between March 08 and March 09 and are therefore now recorded as 'large site commitments' and should be removed from the SHLAA to prevent duplication.**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Colden Common	Vernham, 70 Main Road	482	Y	13	0	-13	1 <sup>st</sup>
Waltham Chase	St Aubyns, Fairlawn And Cherry Trees Bull Lane	495	Y	10	0	-10	1 <sup>st</sup>
Kings Worthy	Clelands And Gambut Churchill Close	483	N	15	0	-15	1 <sup>st</sup>
South Wonston	Opposite Environment Agency & Scotts Close Estate, Main Road	2281	N	32	0	-32	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Kirtling House, 52 Chilbolton Avenue	2086	N	13	13	-13	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	82&84 Old Kennels Lane	503	N	8	0	-8	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Black Bridge	320	N	5	6	-5	1 <sup>st</sup>
Denmead	Land To Rear Of 32 - 36 Mill Road	2113	Y	7	0	-7	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Silver Hill	2077	N	38	0	-38	2 <sup>nd</sup>

**Table 2: The following site is given has been given planning permission since March 09 which is also a SHLAA site**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Hambledon	Hartridges, west Street	334	N	10	28	18	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Table 3: The following sites are 'broad locations' and have therefore been removed from the SHLAA**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Bishops Waltham	Winchester Road	1695	Y	14	0	-14	1 <sup>st</sup>
Kings Worthy	3-5, 6-10 Court Road	485	N	24	0	-24	1 <sup>st</sup>
Kings Worthy	Gardens off Springvale Road	324	N	110	0	-110	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Micheldever Station	Land Between New Cottage and Dove Inn	463	N	5	0	-5	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Quarry Road	2075	N	10	0	-10	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Gardens behind Andover Road	2084	N	15	0	-15	2 <sup>nd</sup>
New Alresford	West of Farm Road	2122	N	22	0	-22	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Southdown	Gardens rear of	1992	N	31	0	-31	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Bishops Waltham	Hoe Road and Rareridge Lane	1719	Y	48	0	-48	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Wickham	Mayles Lane	1201	Y	9	0	-9	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Table 4: The following sites have been subject to appeals which have been dismissed, but there is some potential capacity within the sites.**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Droxford	Townsend, North Lane	2282	N	Retain site; appeal for 11 dismissed, but a new application has been submitted for 10 which has now gone to appeal to be heard Dec 09. Reduce capacity to 20dph.	10	7	-3	1 <sup>st</sup>
Kings Worthy	Springvale Road	329	N	Planning permission refused June 09 for 62 units, net gain would be 55	58	55	-3	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Blue Ball Hill	1913	N	Appeal dismissed in July 09 for 14, keep at 13 units.	13	13	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Romsey Road	399	N	Pre application for 9 (net gain 8)	8	8	0	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Table 5: The estimated delivery period for the following sites has been amended to reflect comments made on the draft SHLAA**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	New 5 Year period
Hambledon	Paddock House, East Street	2235	N	Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	6	6	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Kings Worthy	Kings Worthy Court	381	N	Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	13	13	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
New Alresford	Former Railway Cutting, New Farm/Bridge Rd	2006	N	Not RT2, but site is less likely to come fwd given appeal dismissed for 24 in Sept 09, Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	18	18	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
New Alresford	Titchbourne Down	1966	N	Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	14	14	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Sutton Scotney	Taylor Garage/Bus Depot	427	N	Have already accounted for employment and planning refusal not based on density; Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	54	54	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	15 Chilbolton Avenue	1801	N	Keep at estimated capacity but move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	8	8	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Winchester Club and former cattle market	2009	N	Site doesn't include WCC car park, move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	18	18	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Swanmore	New Road	1751	Y	Retain, but delay to later period, move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	14	14	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Waltham Chase	Land behind Roasehill Garage	2065	Y	Move site from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 year time period	22	22	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Colden Common	The Woodside, Main Road	2052	Y	Move site from 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> 5 year time period and try contacting owners again	7	7	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Denmead	Land behind Highclere, School Lane	475	Y	Move site from 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> 5 year time period and recheck ownership	7	7	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Swanmore	Land behind 1 & 2 Cottles	466	Y	Move site from 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> 5 year time period	7	7	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Table 6: The density of the following sites has been reduced to account for character or constraints highlighted through comments made on the draft SHLAA and the sites have been put into later periods**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Winchester	Royal Hampshire Hospital (B)	1827	N	Reduce density to 30dph and delay	21	16	-5	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Royal Hampshire Hospital (E)	1829	N	Reduce density to 30dph and delay	30	23	-7	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Beech House, Whiteshute Lane	2280	N	Reduce density to 20 dph and move to last period	11	5	-6	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Itchen Abbas	Station House, Old Station Road	488	N	Reduce density to 15dph to account for trees and character of area, delay start	10	7	-3	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Table 7: The density of the following sites has been reduced to account for character or constraints highlighted through comments made on the draft SHLAA**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Bishops Waltham	Malt Lane	1712	Y	reduce density as allocated for mix use	18	14	-4	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Corhampton	Land at Corhampton Lane	286	N	To accommodate for mixed use, the site area has been reduced from 1.08 Ha to 0.68 Ha to allow for mixed use, in addition the density has been reduced to 20dph.	31	14	-17	1 <sup>st</sup>
Sparsholt	Land at Church Farm	2062	N	Remove cottage from site area and reduce capacity	11	8	-3	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	West End Close,	569	N	Reduce the density to 30dph	10	8	-2	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Back of Stoney Lane	2081	N	Retain, but reduce site area to garage area and reduce density to 20dph	21	8	-13	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Newick	2030	N	Reduce density to 20dph and move to last period - net increase = 7	12	7	-5	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Table 8: The following sites have been removed from the SHLAA for other reasons (as stated).**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Original Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	loss/gain from draft SHLAA figures	5 Year period
Whiteley	Whiteley Village	2146	Y	Retain but reduce to 76 units in-line with planning permission under consideration	81	76	-5	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Winchester College Tennis Courts, St Cross Road	305	N	Would have to provide open space and mixed use which would leave the site under the threshold	15	0	-15	1 <sup>st</sup>
Denmead	Inghams Farm, Inghams Lane	960	Y	Remove site; there's no developer interest and the site is currently in employment use.	7	0	-7	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Sparks and Garden centre	502	N	Remove site; multiple-ownership, and removal of sites would leave them below the threshold	10	0	-10	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Stanmore Lane	385	N	Remove site. If looking at only car park area to keep the public house facility, this site falls below threshold	13	0	-13	2 <sup>nd</sup>
South Wonston	64 & 74 Downs Road	2017	N	Remove, sites unlikely to come fwd given development already to south	11	0	-11	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Table 9: No amendments are proposed for these sites following comments made through the draft consultation.**

Settlement	Address/Identifier	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	WCC response to comments	Estimated Capacity	Difference in figures	Difference in figures	5 Year period
Colden Common	Clayfield	888	Y	Retain as o/o interest	35	35	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Colden Common	Off Main Road	889	Y	Retain as o/o interest	24	24	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Denmead	Southwick Road	1783	Y	Retain, but re-consult estates on potential and time - remove if no intention	8	8	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Denmead	Bere Road	1835	Y	Retain, can overcome policy constraints	20	20	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Denmead		2054	Y	Retain	5	5	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Hambledon	Hartridges	458	N	join with 457, but keep net gain of 10	10	10	5	2 <sup>nd</sup>
New Alresford	Telephone Exchange	2123	N	Retain	7	7	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>

Swanmore	Lower Chase Road	1725	Y	Retain	8	8	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Waltham Chase	Land off Chase Grove	497	Y	Retain	17	17	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Royal Hampshire County Hospital A	1826	N	SF7 doesn't apply as accommodation for hospital	22	22	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Cheriton Road	1833	N	Retain	10	10	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Laundry Site, Hyde Abbey Road	1903	N	retain, but check status of appeal	12	12	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	The Boat House, Domum Road	1950	N	retain, but amend details	5	5	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Cromwell Road	2103	N	Have re-consulted Strategic Housing about this site, and it is still in the pipeline.	10	10	0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Winchester	Hillcote House, Airlie Lane	2104	N	Retain	17	17	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Winchester	Winchester Cathedral grounds	2134	N	Retain and put in 1st period.	15	15	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winnall Ind Estate	Off Firmstone Road	659	N	This site has been considered in the past, but discounted, but Strategic Housing are keeping this site for future consideration.	10	10	0	2 <sup>nd</sup>

**Table 10: No comments were made on the following sites**

Address/Identifier	Settlement	SHLAA ID Ref	In PUSH?	Estimated Capacity	Amended Estimated Capacity	Difference in figures	5 Year period
Sparsholt	Moor Court Lane	1791	N	5		0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Wickham	Wickham Labs	2144	Y	16		0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Colden Common	Dunhall, Main Road	1758	Y	11		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Micheldever Station	Beechwood, Andover Road	2060	N	6		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
West Meon	Meadow House	2048	N	5		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>



West Meon	Meonwara Crescent Allotments	2066	N	3		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Whiteley	Bluebell	1767	Y	68		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Whiteley	Lady Betty's Drive	1810	Y	14		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Whiteley	Lady Betty's Drive	1812	Y	88		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Austen Close	166	N	6		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Hyde Abbey Road	341	N	9		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Behind Trussell Crescent	1846	N	4		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Winchester	Fire Station	2072	N	8		0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Bishops Waltham	St Peters Terrace	852	Y	34	A pre-application enquiry has been made for 14, estimated capacity has therefore been reduced.	-22	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Denmead	Green Meadows, Green Lane	958	Y	7		0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Sparsholt	Garden of property fronting Home Lane	434	N	5		0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Whiteley	Lady Betty's Drive	1811	Y	8		0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Winchester	Edgar Road	80	N	6		0	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**Additional Sites (for over 5 dwellings) in the planning process not counted as ‘commitments’ as the sites have come forward since March 09**

**Table 12: Planning permissions since March 09**

Planning Application	Address	Description	In PUSH?	Decision Date	Net Gain
09/01024/FUL	Orchard House Sparkford Road Winchester Hampshire	Replacement of existing single storey building and erection of four storey extension; fourth floor extension to existing three storey building to provide 6 no. one bed and 2 no. two bed flats (RESUBMISSION)	N	17-Sep-09	8
09/00219/FUL	The Croft 3 Badger Farm Road Winchester Hampshire SO22 4QB	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. detached four bedroom and 3 no. two bedroom terraced dwellings with associated garaging, car parking and landscaping	N	24-Jul-09	5
09/00527/FUL	Kirtling House 52 Chilbolton Avenue Winchester Hampshire SO22 5HQ	Demolition of existing properties and erection of 10 no. two bed and 3 no. four bed dwellings with associated parking, formation of new vehicular access and stopping up of existing access	N	11-Sep-09	12
09/00529/FUL	Temberlaye Edinburgh Road Kings Worthy Hampshire SO23 7NY	Demolish 2 no. bungalows and replace with 4 no. semi-detached two bedroom dwellings and 4 no. detached three bedroom dwellings with parking, cycle sheds and associated works (Works to include Hilmarton, adjoining property). (Proposal would affect the setting of a public right of way).	N	31-Jul-09	6
09/00937/FUL	Plot 1, 122 - 128 Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy	Demolition of 3 no. dwellings 122-128 Lovedon Lane and replace with 30 no. mixed dwellings; 6 no. three bedroom, 21 no. two bedroom, 3 no. 1	N	13-08-09	14
08/02792/FUL	New Inn, West Street, Hambledon	Conversion of disused public house to 6 no. cottages	N	26-05-09	6
08/02074/FUL	Wharf Farm, Wharf Hill	Convert existing barn into 2 no one bedroom dwellings and erection of detached 2 storey building to provide 1 no 1 bedroom dwelling, 1 no 2 bedroom dwelling and 2 no 3 bedroom dwelling (RESUBMISSION)	N	18-06-09	6
09/00571/FUL	Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue	(additional 28 for phase 3) Development of 64 dwellings comprising of; 6 no. one bed flats, 27 no. two bed flats, 2 no. two bed houses, 20 no. three bed houses, 9 no. four bed	Y	18-Jun-09	28

**Table 13: Planning applications since March 09 (decision not yet made)**

Planning Application	Address	Description	In PUSH?	Decision Date	Net Gain
09/01407/FUL	37 Willis Way, Kings Worthy	Demolition of no.37 Willis Way, the garage courts to the rear of Willis Way and Meadowsweet to allow the construction of 30 no. dwellings	N	not yet given permission, but being recommended for approval 08 Oct	28

**Table 14: Planning permissions permitted subject to signing legal agreement and not recorded in other permissions**

Planning Application	Address	Description	In PUSH?	Decision Date	Net Gain
08/01344/FUL	34-36 Chilbolton Avenue	Demolition of 34 and 36 Chilbolton Avenue and erection of 11 no. dwellings; 6 no. two bedroom, 4 no. four bedroom and 1 no. five bedroom with associated parking and landscape.	N	11-Sep-08	9