

CABINET14 OCTOBER 2009ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR LOCAL RESERVE SITE RELEASES –
RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONREPORT OF THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

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

RECENT REFERENCES:

CAB1363 – Assessment of the Need for Local (Housing) Reserve Site Releases
2007 (Cabinet 13 December 2006).

CAB1435 - Local (Housing) Reserve Site Releases 2007 – Results of Consultation
(Cabinet 28 March 2007)

CAB1790 - Draft Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Releases (Cabinet
4 February 2009)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Policy H.2 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review allocates 4 'Local Reserve Sites' which are to be released only if monitoring indicates that they will be needed to meet the Structure Plan's housing requirement for the District. The Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document indicating that the possible need for one or more of the sites to be released is to be reviewed annually. An 'Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release' was published for consultation in January 2007, following which Cabinet resolved that it was not necessary to release any Local Reserve Sites at that stage.

No report was produced in 2008 as work was still on-going on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Following approval of a draft SHLAA an updated Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Sites was published for consultation (alongside the SHLAA) in March 2009. This report summarises and responds to the comments received on the draft Assessment and recommends a

revised document (attached at Appendix A). The Assessment has also been updated to reflect the adoption of the South East Plan, changes recommended to the SHLAA, updated information on planning permissions and completions and other changes.

The conclusion of the additional work, updating and consideration of comments is that the situation has changed significantly since the draft Assessment was published. The South East Plan has been adopted and has increased the housing requirement. It has also been necessary to adjust the timing of delivery on various sites to reflect the current economic climate, and, with the required trajectory being illustrated in five-year blocks, any delay in delivery can compel us to find alternative sites if we are to meet our delivery obligations.

The Council has also been given very clear advice by a Planning Inspector about what can and cannot be included within the 5-year land supply (see report CAB 1901), particularly the small sites allowance. If that advice is not taken into account, we risk, ultimately, the Core Strategy being found unsound, and will weaken our ability to reject unsuitable development. The resulting Assessment therefore takes account of all such advice, and offers a cautious, and, officers consider, a robust analysis. This will provide evidence for the LDF and allow the Council to withstand detailed examination through any appeals on land supply issues.

As a result, the revised Assessment indicates very clearly that there is a significant shortfall of housing land, such that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. This applies both to the PUSH and non-PUSH parts of the District. The risk assessment (Section 6) indicates that the Council faces very serious risks if it is judged to be failing to respond in a reasonable way to this situation. It is therefore recommended that, to meet the predicted shortfall, all the Local Reserve Sites will need to be released.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the revised Local Reserve Sites Assessment set out at Appendix 1 be approved and published as the Council's assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites and a statement of housing land supply, having taken account of comments received through the consultation, the results of further work on the SHLAA, and updating of land availability information.
2. That the need to release the Local Reserve Sites identified in Local Plan Policy H.2 be endorsed.
3. That the City Council works with the Government Office for the South East to develop a 'Housing Delivery Action Plan' and that Planning Development Control officers and Committee be advised of the conclusions of this work and Government advice on determining applications in the absence of an adequate 5-year supply of housing land.

CABINET14 OCTOBER 2009ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR LOCAL RESERVE SITE RELEASES – RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONDETAIL:1. Introduction

1.1. The Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 includes a policy (H.2) allocating four sites as 'Local Reserve Sites', as follows:

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------|
| • | Pitt Manor, Winchester | 200 dwellings |
| • | Worthy Road/Francis Gardens, Winchester | 80 dwellings |
| • | Little Frenchies Field, Denmead | 70 dwellings |
| • | Spring Gardens, New Alresford | 35 dwellings |

1.2. Policy H.2 makes clear that these sites are only to be released if needed to meet a potential shortfall of housing to meet the Structure Plan's housing requirement for the District. The Local Plan Review therefore requires that housing provision and land availability is monitored regularly, to assess whether one or more of the Local Reserve Sites should be released. This was to be done in conjunction with the production of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), in December of each year.

1.3. A detailed 'Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release' was undertaken in 2006 and published for consultation in 2007, in order to reach a conclusion as to whether any of the Local Reserve Sites needed to be released. The Assessment concluded, and Cabinet subsequently agreed following consultation, that no Local Reserve Sites (LRS) needed to be released at that time.

1.4. It had been intended that such assessments would be undertaken annually but no assessment was produced in 2008 because work was underway on a 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment' (SHLAA) as required by Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3). It had been intended that the results of the SHLAA would be available to produce a Local Reserve Sites assessment in 2008 but the SHLAA proved to be a more extensive exercise than expected, which was only completed in draft in late 2008.

1.5. A further requirement of PPS3 is that local authorities should be able to demonstrate an up-to-date 5-year supply of deliverable sites for housing. The production of the SHLAA enables monitoring to be undertaken to establish whether adequate housing land is available and for the purposes of ensuring that adequate provision for development is made through the Local Development Framework (LDF). Local Plan Policy H.2 only relates to the period covered by the Structure Plan and Local Plan (to March 2011), but PPS3's requirement to maintain a 5-year land supply extends the period beyond 2011. The Assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites

therefore doubles up as a statement of the 5-year land supply situation in Winchester District, in accordance with PPS3 requirements.

- 1.6. A draft Assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites was published for consultation, alongside the draft SHLAA, in March 2009. This enabled people to comment on the methodology and results of the SHLAA, which had been used in assessing the adequacy of housing land availability.
- 1.7. The South East Plan has now been approved and supersedes the County Structure Plan Review, so the housing requirement for the 2006-2026 period has become clearer and has increased (from a District-wide requirement for 486 dwellings per annum, to 612 dwellings per annum). Report CAB1901 recommends amendments to the SHLAA which mean that some sources of housing supply cannot be included in the 5-year land availability assessment. Therefore the draft LRS Assessment's conclusion that no LRSs should be released needs to be reconsidered in the light of an updated assessment of whether the City Council can maintain a 5-year supply of available land as required under Government advice (PPS3).
- 1.8. The draft Assessment of the Need to Release Local Reserve Sites published in March can be viewed on the following webpage:-
<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?id= SX9452-A7847EF2&cat=9129>

2 Consultation on the Assessment of the Need to Release Local Reserve Sites

- 2.1 A summary of responses received on the consultation is attached at Appendix 1. Some of the individuals and organisations who responded to the consultation on the need to release local reserve sites had also responded to the previous LRS consultation in 2007 and wished to reiterate their comments (supporting the conclusion that sites should not be released).
- 2.2 A number of key objections were raised to the way in which the LRS Assessment was carried out. In general it was believed that the Assessment should have been based on the South East Plan's allocation figures rather than the now superseded Structure Plan allocations. In addition there was concern that the 5-year land supply was based upon over-optimistic and unreasonable assumptions for the following reasons:-
 - The SHLAA sites do not have planning permission and are therefore not available now;
 - Sites with valid planning permissions may not be deliverable given the current economic situation and therefore this needs to be assessed;
 - The phasing of the delivery of large sites is too optimistic; sites such as Friarsgate and the Police HQ are likely to be delivered later than previously anticipated.
 - The small sites allowance should be removed as this is a form of windfall allowance which should not be included in a 5 year housing land supply.
 - The assessment should use April 2009, not April 2008, as a base date for the 5 year housing supply.

- 2.3 On the other hand, objections were raised about the release of the Francis Gardens Local Reserve Site, which it was said could cause problems with traffic and congestion in Francis Gardens and Worthy Road.
- 2.4 The LRS Assessment and the 5-year housing land supply figures need to be adjusted to take account of the changes recommended to the SHLAA and updated to reflect the situation as of an April 2009 base date. Government advice is that 5-year land availability also needs to be considered for 5 years from the end of the current year, i.e. at an April 2010 base date, requiring a slightly longer-term view to be taken. There are a number of key changes to the SHLAA which will affect the 5-year land supply:
- Removal of the small sites allowance. Although the SHLAA argued that the small site allowance was different from a windfall allowance, it is clear from the Planning Inspectorate's advisory note that a small sites allowance would be regarded as 'windfall'. In any event, Government advice is clear that, regardless of how the SHLAA deals with this, such an allowance cannot be included in an assessment of 5-year land supply. The draft LRS Assessment made a District-wide small site allowance of 150-225 dwellings (depending on the base year) which should, therefore, be removed;
 - Removal of 'broad locations' and updating of site constraints, capacity, timing, etc. The effect of removing 'broad locations' and other updating to SHLAA sites is significant. Although most 'broad locations' were not within the first 5-year period, the capacity or delivery of a lot of individual sites was challenged. Consideration of these comments has resulted in many sites having adjustments to their capacity, timing, or being removed altogether. This results in a reduction of almost 300 dwellings in the first 5 year period;
 - Updating of information on planning permissions as some SHLAA sites have now gained planning permission so will be classed as 'commitments' and removed from the SHLAA, whilst some very recent permissions may be on sites which were not in the SHLAA, increasing overall housing supply. Overall this results in a slight gain of dwellings but is largely a re-categorisation of sites and does not significantly affect the number of deliverable dwellings.
- 2.5 The recommended further work to include greenfield sites within the SHLAA will not affect the 5-year land supply because any sites would need to be allocated through the LDF and could not, therefore, yet be classed as available.
- 2.6 With regard to the other comments summarised in paragraph 2.2 above, although the sites in the SHLAA do not have planning permission, the assessment should show they are developable, available and achievable. Where this assessment shows that these sites are expected to come forward within the first 5-year period, which usually means they are already within the planning process, it is reasonable to include them in the LRS assessment.
- 2.7 The phasing of large sites has recently been reviewed. Developers/ landowners of all permitted large sites (10 or more dwellings) were contacted to provide an up-to-date phasing estimate for their projects and the phasing of large sites in the assessment has been adjusted to account for the updated information. Therefore, concerns about phasing and the economic climate have been addressed. Particular attention has

been paid to sites where it was claimed that the estimates were over-optimistic (e.g. Silver Hill and Police HQ in Winchester) and the delivery profiles have been updated accordingly. For example, no allowance has been included in the 5-year supply for dwellings resulting from the redevelopment of the Police HQ, as the County Council (on behalf of the Police Authority) has confirmed its intention to let the current planning permission (which includes a lot of flatted development) expire and to re-apply for permission when the housing market improves.

- 2.8 The data on the number of houses developed each year is collected at the end of the financial year. The data for this year (April 09 to March 2010) will not be collected until after March 2010, therefore an estimate needs to be made of 2009/10 completions to calculate the 5 year land requirement and supply from April 2010. The assessment needs to provide a supply trajectory for 5 further years and therefore will need to cover March 2010 to March 2015. It is therefore recommended that assessments are undertaken with April 2009 and April 2010 base dates, the latter running to March 2015.
- 2.9 An updated Assessment has been produced and is attached at Appendix 2. A summary of the updated housing supply situation, including a comparison with the draft Assessment, is set out below:

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
<u>2009-2014 (Draft Assessment March 09)</u>			
Commitments (large)	1429	763	2192
Commitments (small)	71	196	267
SHLAA Sites	305	526	831
Small Sites Allowance	63	162	225
Strategic Sites	-	-	-
TOTAL	1868	1647	3515
<u>2009-2014 (Updated)</u>			
Commitments (large)	940	522	1462
Commitments (small)	112	294	406
SHLAA Sites	148	277	425
Small Sites Allowance	-	-	-
Strategic Sites	-	-	-
TOTAL	1200	1093	2293
<u>2010-2015</u>			
Commitments (large)	1119	490	1609
Commitments (small)	78	226	304
SHLAA Sites	175	276	451
Small Sites Allowance	-	-	-
Strategic Sites	-	-	-
TOTAL	1372	992	2364

- 2.10 The table below compares the deliverable housing supply (above) with the 5-year requirements from the South East Plan, and includes the figures from the draft Assessment for comparison. The draft Assessment used a 5-year requirement based on the South East Plan's average annual requirement. The updated tables use a

requirement which takes account of any under or over-provision since the start date of the South East Plan (2006), which is now possible with the approval of the South East Plan and is consistent with Government advice. In order to calculate the requirement at 2010 an assumption has been made about completions in 2009/10, based on the housing supply figures in the table above.

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
<u>2009-2014 (Draft Assessment March 09)</u>			
Requirement	1685	1375	3060
Supply	1868	1647	3515
Surplus / Shortfall (-)	+183	+272	455 (5.7 yrs)
<u>2009-2014 (Updated)</u>			
Requirement	1845	1340	3185
Supply	1200	1093	2293
Surplus / Shortfall (-)	-645 (3.3 yrs)	-247 (4.1 yrs)	-892 (3.6 yrs)
<u>2010-2015</u>			
Requirement	1920	1315	3235
Supply	1372	992	2364
Surplus / Shortfall (-)	-548 (3.6 yrs)	-323 (3.8 yrs)	-871 (3.7 yrs)

- 2.11 The table above shows that there is a substantial shortfall of housing land, particularly in the PUSH area, but also in the non-PUSH parts of the District, and therefore at the whole District level too. This applies both to the current situation (2009-2014) and the projected situation in the coming 5 years (2010-2015).
- 2.12 Government advice (PPS3) for authorities in such situations is as follows: 'Where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate an up to date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example, where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the considerations in paragraph 69.' (PPS paragraph 71). Paragraph 69 of the PPS, which is referred to above, sets out factors which the planning authority should have regard to, such as achieving high quality design, a good mix of housing, sustainability, efficient use of land, and consistency with housing and wider policy objectives. Government advice does not therefore suggest that 'anything goes' if there is a shortfall of housing land, but it does expect action to be taken and the Local Plan includes Local Reserve Sites for such an eventuality.
- 2.13 In the PUSH area the land supply situation improves slightly from 2009 to 2010 as development at the West of Waterlooville MDA gathers pace, but there remains a large shortfall in both 5-year periods. Even taking a longer-term view, development at West of Waterlooville will not meet housing needs or requirements on its own and it is clear from Annex A of Appendix 2 that, by 2014 or so, very few other sites remain to be developed. Also, small site commitments and SHLAA sites in the PUSH area are typically modest in their contribution. Whilst the emerging Core Strategy proposes further land releases at West of Waterlooville (current reserve site) and North

Whiteley, these proposals are not sufficiently advanced within the planning process to be counted within the 5-year periods currently being examined. If and when planning permission is granted, or the Core Strategy sufficiently advanced, these could be counted and would cumulatively start to achieve an adequate level of supply, but this is unlikely to be for several years.

- 2.14 Accordingly, for the PUSH part of the District there is a substantial current shortfall which is only likely to be resolved when major new allocations can be taken into account. In the mean time, the only Local Reserve Site in this part of the District (Little Frenchie's Field) needs to be released to help maintain supply. Although this will not meet the immediate shortfall, this action in conjunction with on-going work to progress the Core Strategy allocations would show that the Council is starting to address the situation.
- 2.15 It could also be argued that it is realistic for housing delivery to build up more gradually to meet the increased targets for the PUSH part of the District during the early years of the Core Strategy period, provided it is clear that it is planned to resolve any initial shortfall in subsequent years. In addition to the release of the Local Reserve Site, a positive and proactive approach should be taken to help bring forward other housing developments which are in accordance with current planning policy, including the 'strategic reserve' site element of West of Waterlooville (1000 dwellings) and to promote affordable housing opportunities. Account should be taken of the advice in PPS3, quoted above, when dealing with planning applications in the PUSH area, due to the shortfall in supply.
- 2.16 For the non-PUSH part of the District the situation will deteriorate over time due to the lack of sites remaining to be developed after 2014 or so. Clearly the SHLAA does not identify sufficient housing opportunities within current policies to maintain an adequate supply to meet the South East Plan targets, and new allocations will be needed to achieve this. The Core Strategy Preferred Option proposes the allocation of Barton Farm (2000 dwellings), which could start to produce housing by 2013/14. However, given the early stage of the Core Strategy process and the current lack of planning permission, no allowance can yet be made for Barton Farm or other potential future allocations.
- 2.17 Therefore, in order to meet the anticipated shortfall in the 5-year land supply, it is recommended that Local Reserve Sites need to be released. The Local Plan allocates 3 Local Reserve Sites in the non-PUSH area: Pitt Manor, Winchester; Francis Gardens, Winchester; and Spring Gardens, Alresford. The Implementation of Local Reserve Sites SPD indicates that the first consideration in deciding which site(s) should be chosen is the site's size in relation to the expected shortfall. Other factors to be taken into account (in priority order) are the lead time, projected completions, sustainability and affordable housing provision.
- 2.18 Appendix 2 assesses the status of the 3 sites and notes that the shortfall in the non-PUSH part of the District amounts to 247 dwellings at April 2009, rising to 323 by 2010. As the total estimated capacity of the 3 Local Reserve Sites in the non-PUSH area amounts to 315 dwellings (325 if the capacity of Francis Gardens is taken from the recent planning application), and taking account of the lead in time needed to

deliver any completions, it is clear that all 3 sites need to be released to meet the expected shortfall.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 Given the recommended changes to the SHLAA and the LRS assessment, it is not possible to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, either within the PUSH part of the District or the non-PUSH area. The scale of the shortfall and the likely future supply situation suggests that all of the Local Reserve Sites need to be released.
- 3.2 In addition, new sites will need to be brought forward through the LDF process to maintain an on-going supply of land to meet the South East Plan's requirements. Accordingly, the Council should continue to progress work on the LDF and to work with the prospective developers of the strategic allocations identified in the Core Strategy.
- 3.3 As a result of concerns about housing delivery, the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) has asked the City Council to produce a joint 'Housing Delivery Action Plan'. Such an action plan would be particularly concerned with progressing the Core Strategy so that the strategic allocations contained within it can be delivered. It is recommended that the Council cooperates with GOSE in producing an action plan and securing help to implement it.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 None directly.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 6.1 This report and the Assessment appended identify that a shortfall of housing land is expected and recommends releasing Local Reserve Sites to address this. This is a course of action which is consistent with Government advice and the Development Plan. Therefore the risk of planning applications or successful appeals on other sites currently outside planning policy are low, especially in the non-PUSH area where release of the Local Reserve Sites can meet the expected shortfall, as are the risks of the Council having costs awarded against it.
- 6.2 On the other hand, failure to identify an adequate 5-year land supply and to put in place measures to address the situation could put the Council at a substantial risk of speculative planning applications and appeals on any sites (not just limited to the Local Reserve Sites). Having recognised the likely shortfall of housing land, the Council would be at a high risk of losing these appeals and, if it had not taken reasonable action to address the situation, may be found to have acted unreasonably and be liable for awards of costs against it. The scale of any costs would depend on the format of the appeal and the 'unnecessary' costs that the appellant was adjudged to have incurred. Given the nature of such appeals and the detailed work an appellant would need to do on land availability, such costs could be very considerable.
- 6.3 Accordingly, the recommended release of the Local Reserve Sites is considered to subject the Council to a relatively low risk of appeals and costs awards, but rejection of

this recommendation and failure to set out how land availability will be improved runs a high risk of losing planning appeals, possibly with costs being awarded. This would have consequent implications for the Council's resources (financial and staff time), reputation, and ability to influence future planning decisions.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Statistics relating to housing provision, held in the Strategic Planning Division.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Summary of Comments on draft Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release (March 2009)

Appendix 2: Recommended revised 'Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release'

**Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release
Analysis of Comments on 2009 Consultation Document**

Name	Topic	Comment
Beatrice Adams	Francis Gardens site	Remains opposed to building on the farmland adjacent to Francis Gardens
Sylvia Nye	Francis Gardens site	Remains opposed to building on the farmland adjacent to Francis Gardens
Anthony Granger	Francis Gardens site	Remains opposed to building on the farmland adjacent to Francis Gardens. Also oppose an entrance into Francis Gardens where the road is unsuitable for a lot of traffic. There are other brownfield sites available.
Mr & Mrs H.T.Roles	Francis Gardens site	Are opposed to building on the farmland adjacent to Francis Gardens. The development would cause problems with traffic congestion in Francis Gardens and Worthy Road. There are no shops in the nearby area.
Miss M Tombs	Francis Gardens site	Remains opposed to building on the farmland adjacent to Francis Gardens. The site is agricultural and not parkland (stated by Redrow).
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Little Frenchies Field	The SE Plan should be used as the basis for calculating the five year requirement to 2013, rather than the Structure Plan. This has been considered at appeal (see submission).
Redrow Homes	Francis Gardens.	<p>The 5 year supply relies upon optimistic and unreasonable assumptions and does not reflect current market conditions. Their assessment of supply demonstrates a minimum of 325 dwelling shortfall to 2013 based on the following reasoning. The LPAs best case scenario shortfall is 103 dwellings in PUSH and 699 in non-PUSH.</p> <p><u>Large sites commitments:</u> delivery of West of Waterlooville needs to be monitored. Should not include Friarsgate (269 dwells) and Police HQ (50 dwells) as they are not deliverable under PPS §54 or DCLG SHLAA Guidance.</p> <p><u>Small Sites commitments:</u> do not believe that all dwellings are deliverable. The LPA has not sought to robustly review the anticipated delivery rate within the current economic climate..</p> <p><u>SHLAA sites:</u> These sites do not have planning permission and are therefore not available now. A number of SHLAA sites have constraints which have not been taken into account and which could affect delivery including current market conditions (see submission, includes problems of delivery from sites where owners have not responded) which reduces the number of dwellings deliverable within the first 5 years from 314 to 134 (PUSH) and from 618 to 346 (non-PUSH).</p> <p><u>Small Sites Allowance:</u> under PPS3 §59 Windfall allowance should not be included in the first 10 years.</p> <p>Given the above points, the LPA should favourably consider the release of the reserve site at Little Frenchies Field and Francis Gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites are deliverable by 2011/12; • the suitability has been assessed through the Local Plan Inquiry; • it is subject to a current planning application; • it is within a sustainable location <p>Given the criteria laid out in policy H2 of the WDLPR (2006), Little Frenchies Field and Francis</p>

Gardens should be released now.

Mrs Payne	Pitt Manor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should be using the higher South East Plan Secretary of State (SoS) proposed changes, rather than the EIP recommendation figure (as supported by recent appeal decisions) which would be in line with the Core Strategy Preferred Options document. • An April 2009 base date for the 5 year housing supply should be used. • The assessment relies on the draft SHLAA in which the delivery of sites is questionable and therefore throws this assessment into doubt. • There is no foundation for §6.2 which states that the Local reserve Sites were specifically to deliver Structure Plan Requirements and therefore new policies will be required to meet the SE Plan requirements as these sites have already been through the development plan process and are part of the Districts housing land supply (see appeal). • Only when the WDLPR is superseded by the Core Strategy will Policy H.2 be superseded also. • The phasing of large sites in Annex A is too optimistic (such as at West of Waterlooville) and there are existing issues to be resolved on the Police Headquarters and the Friarsgate Bus Station. • This Local Reserve site in a sustainable location and is available to deliver 200 units and 1 Ha park and ride facility and can be delivered in the short term by 2011 • These arguments justify the release of the Pitt Manor reserve site.
Trustees of the Titchborne Estate	Spring Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft SHLAA is not in accordance with CLG Guidance. • There is likely to be a shortfall in housing supply for the next 5 year period. • The reserve site at Spring Gardens, New Alresford should be released. • The Council should be using the higher South East Plan Secretary of State (SoS) proposed changes, rather than the EIP recommendation figures. • The SHLAA does not follow the CLG guidance and grossly overestimates the potential delivery of housing (see SHLAA report for more details). There should also not be a small sites allowance in the first 10 years. • Following updates required on the SHLAA, there will be a deficit in the 5-year housing land supply.
Alresford Society	Spring Gardens	The designation of Spring Gardens as a 'Reserve Site' should be reviewed as it restricts this small site as an exception site.
Felicity Hindson County Councillor	Spring Gardens	Spring Gardens is listed as being in New Alresford, but is in the parish of Titchborne.
J Hayter	General	<p>Para 3.6 - This ignores the "deliverability" requirements 5ii) that are defined in 5iii) in the referenced document, on of which is that the site must be available <u>now</u> as defined in paragraph 6. It has not been demonstrated that all of the 1763 SHLAA sites (all of >5 dwellings) meet the requirements of guidance.</p> <p>Para 4.7 Small Sites - Para 8 of the guidance document does not normally permit these to be counted. It has not been demonstrated that any of the 375 small sites meet the requirements of guidance. This does not demonstrate the required 5-year supply.</p>

Respondents:

Beatrice Adams
Abbots Barton
21 Francis Gardens
Winchester
SO23 7HD

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

Anthony Granger
25 Francis Gardens
Abbots Barton
Winchester
SO23 7HD

Mr J Hayter
Gilberts Knapp
Beeches Hill
Bishops Waltham

Felicity Hindson
County Councillor
Meon Valley Division
Bramcote House
Exton
Southampton
SO32 3NU

Sylvia Nye
19, Francis Gardens
Abbots Barton
Winchester
SO23 7HD

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

Mr & Mrs H.T. Roles
15 Francis Gardens
Abbots Barton
Winchester
SO23 7HD

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
c/o Woolbond Planning
Jeremy Woolf
The Mitfords
Basingstoke Road
Three Mile Cross
Reading
RG7 1A

Miss M Tombs
24 Francis Gardens
Winchester
SO23 7HD

Trustees of the Titchborne Estate
c/o Dreweatt Neate
Kevin Ayrton
16-18 Market Place
Newbury
Berkshire
RG14 5AZ

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Assessment of the Need for Local Reserve Site Release & Land Availability Assessment

October 2009

1 Background

- 1.1 The Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 includes a policy (H.2) allocating four sites as 'Local Reserve Sites', as follows:
- Pitt Manor, Winchester - 200 dwellings
 - Worthy Road/Francis Gardens, Winchester - 80 dwellings
 - Little Frenchies Field, Denmead - 70 dwellings
 - Spring Gardens, New Alresford - 35 dwellings
- 1.2 These sites are only to be released if monitoring indicates that the Hampshire County Structure Plan's 'baseline' housing requirement for the District is unlikely to be met within the Local Plan period. The Local Plan Review therefore requires that housing provision and land availability is monitored regularly, to assess whether one or more of the Local Reserve Sites should be released. This is to be done in conjunction with the production of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), in December of each year.
- 1.3 An assessment of the need for the release of Local Reserve Sites was first produced in January 2007. It had been intended that such assessments would be undertaken annually but no assessment was produced in 2008. This was because work was underway on a 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment' (SHLAA) as required by Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3). A further assessment was published for consultation in March 2009 and this document is the approved assessment for 2009.
- 1.4 A further requirement of PPS3 is that local authorities should be able to demonstrate an up-to-date 5-year supply of deliverable sites for housing. The production of the SHLAA enables monitoring to be undertaken to establish whether adequate housing land is available and for the purposes of ensuring that adequate provision for development is made through the Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.5 Although Local Plan Policy H.2 only relates to the period covered by the Structure Plan and Local Plan (to March 2011), PPS3's requirement to maintain a 5-year land supply effectively extends the requirement to monitor housing provision and maintain an adequate supply indefinitely.

Also, the Structure Plan has now been superseded by the South East Plan, which was adopted in May 2009 and provides regional planning guidance to 2026. PPS3 and subsequent advice also establishes requirements for assessing whether sites are 'deliverable'. This assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites is therefore also intended as a statement of the 5-year land supply situation in Winchester District, in accordance with PPS3 requirements.

- 1.6 The draft Assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites was published for consultation alongside the draft SHLAA to enable people to comment on the methodology and results of the SHLAA, which have been used in assessing the adequacy of housing land availability. Further work is being undertaken to finalise the SHLAA. This Assessment will inform the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (to be published December 2009), which will include a 'trajectory' of future development rates and a commentary on the 5-year land supply situation.
- 1.7 The methodology for assessing land availability which is used in this Assessment draws on published Government advice on the matter, the main sources being:
- 'Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing' (Department of Communities and Local Government 2006);
 - 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance' (Department of Communities and Local Government 2007);
 - 'Demonstrating a 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites' (advice produced by the Department of Communities and Local Government for the Planning Inspectorate 2007);
 - 'Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Framework Core Output Indicators – Update 2/2008' (Department of Communities and Local Government);
 - Examining DPDs: Learning from Experience (Planning Inspectorate 2009).

All these documents can be viewed on the Communities and Local Government web site (www.communities.gov.uk) or the Planning Inspectorate's web site (www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk).

2 Process and Consultation

- 2.1 The process for assessing the need for the release of Local Reserve Sites (LRSs) is set out in the 'Implementation of Local (Housing) Reserve Sites Policy', adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in July 2006. The procedure envisages the publication of an Assessment in December, alongside the AMR, followed by public consultation. Representations on the Assessment would then be considered by the

Council, before reaching a decision on whether to release any of the Local Reserve Sites in early spring.

- 2.2 More recent requirements, as set out in PPS3 and other Government advice, must also be taken into account. The programme for producing this Assessment, and for consulting on it, was later than envisaged by the Local Reserve Sites SPD due to the need to complete work on the SHLAA.
- 2.3 This Assessment was therefore published for consultation in March 2009 with written comments invited within a 6-week period and there was also a consultation on the draft SHLAA over the same period. Representations were received from 12 individuals and organisations, some of which referred to the SHLAA, which received a greater number of comments. The comments were analysed and reported to the Council's Cabinet in October 2009, when this revised Assessment was approved.

3 Policy Requirements for Housing Provision

- 3.1 The draft Assessment referred to the Hampshire County Structure Plan which was still part of the statutory Development Plan at the time. The South East Plan has now replaced the Structure Plan (as of May 2009) and includes higher housing requirements for Winchester District than those in the Structure Plan. It also specifies separate requirements for the part of the District in the 'PUSH' (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire) area and the non-PUSH part of the District. The South East Plan's housing requirements apply from 2006-2026.
- 3.2 There have been significant fluctuations in housing provision over the Structure Plan period, as illustrated by the trajectory in the AMR 2008. Housing completions declined rapidly from a peak of 850 in 1997/98 to a low of 241 in 2000/01. They since recovered every year until 2004/05, when they peaked at 694, and then dropped back to about 500 a year from 2005 to 2008. However, with the economic recession taking hold in late 2008 completions in 2008/09 dropped to 359 dwellings.
- 3.3 Prospects for the housing market appear to be improving after a period of house prices nationally falling. The current shortage of mortgage availability is stifling the housing market, despite a continuing need for housing. However, the local housing market is traditionally stronger and the Central Hampshire and New Forest Housing Market Monitoring Report 2008 (DTZ, December 2008) shows that in almost all parts of Winchester District house prices continued to rise in the period August 2007-August 2008. Nevertheless, the volume of housing transactions has fallen by half in Central Hampshire as a whole (about a third in Winchester District).

DTZ considers that the national economy will show negative growth during 2009, with perhaps marginal positive growth in 2010.

- 3.4 Several economic forecasters are expecting the recession to be less deep and prolonged than originally feared, with economic growth returning to positive figures during 2010. House prices are also expected to start to rise in late 2010/early 2011, although there are signs that this may already be happening in some areas.
- 3.5 It is clear that house building rates have dropped locally in 2008/09 and these are expected to stay at a similar level in 2009/10. However, major development at West of Waterlooville is now underway, with the developer reporting strong buyer interest. Whilst there is uncertainty about future prospects, what is certain is that the Government has recently approved the housing requirements contained in the South East Plan, so land availability must be judged against the approved targets. The predicted 'bounce-back' of the housing market, especially in the South East, would be within the 5-year period under consideration so it remains important to maintain an adequate land supply.
- 3.6 Government advice in 'Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Framework Core Output Indicators – Update 2/2008' was that assessment of housing land availability should be forward looking, not just be based at a previous base date. Therefore the situation at a base date of April 2010 is considered, as well as at a base date of April 2009. With the approval of the South East Plan it is necessary to establish the housing requirement and supply for each sub-area of the District (PUSH and non-PUSH), as the requirements for different parts of the District are not interchangeable. The South East Plan's total requirement for the District is 12,240 over the 20-year plan period, equating to 6,740 for the PUSH part of the District and 5,500 for the non-PUSH area.
- 3.7 Although the South East Plan's requirement equates to 612 dwellings per annum (337 for the PUSH area, 275 for non-PUSH), account needs to be taken of any under- or over-provision since the Plan's start date of April 2006. Completions since April 2006 are as follows:

Sub-Area/Year	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Cumulative
PUSH	142	222	108	472
Non-PUSH	354	340	251	945
District	496	562	359	1417

- 3.8 In order to calculate the housing requirement from April 2010 it is necessary to estimate completions in 2009/10. The following estimates

are based on the expected development rates of identified large sites (see Annex A) and one-fifth of the estimated 5-year completions on small site commitments and SHLAA sites (Tables 2 and 3 below). In the PUSH area completions in 2009/10 are estimated to total 118 dwellings and in the non-PUSH area 246 dwellings.

3.9 The level of provision so far in the PUSH part of the District (472 dwellings 2006-2009 with an estimated 118 in 2009/10) has been well below the annualised requirement for 3 years (1,011 dwellings), whereas in the non-PUSH part of the District it is somewhat higher (945 dwellings 2006-2009 with an estimates 246 in 2009/10) than the annualised requirement for 3 years (825 dwellings). This has a knock-on effect for the remaining housing requirement, which will be higher than the South East Plan's annualised requirement in the PUSH area and lower in the non-PUSH area:

- **PUSH residual requirement at April 2009:-** $6,740 - 472 = 6,268$ (369 dwellings per annum over remaining 17 years of SE Plan). 5-year requirement = $369 \times 5 = 1845$
- **Non PUSH residual requirement at April 2009:-** $5,500 - 945 = 4,555$ (268 dwellings per annum over remaining 17 years of SE Plan). 5-year requirement = $268 \times 5 = 1340$
- **PUSH residual requirement at April 2010:-** $6,740 - 590 = 6,150$ (384 dwellings per annum over remaining 16 years of SE Plan). 5-year requirement = $384 \times 5 = 1920$
- **Non PUSH residual requirement at April 2010:-** $5,500 - 1291 = 4,209$ (263 dwellings per annum over remaining 16 years of SE Plan). 5-year requirement = $263 \times 5 = 1315$

3.10 The sections below consider the prospects for achieving the required level of provision and whether, at the respective base dates, it appears that any action is needed to maintain an adequate land supply, including whether the Local Reserve Sites need to be drawn upon.

4 Housing Supply

4.1 The draft Assessment of the need to release Local Reserve Sites identified and assessed several key sources of housing land supply. Some comments on the draft Assessment questioned certain sources and these have been taken into account in updating the contributions of the sources, which are considered below.

Commitments and Planning Permissions

4.2 These are sites which, at April 2009, have planning permission or are allocated in a statutory development plan. They have, therefore, been

through the planning process and have a strong certainty of being developed. Large sites (10 or more dwellings) are individually assessed by Hampshire County Council on an annual basis (see Annex A).

- 4.3 In addition, the Council had contacted the owners/developers of every undeveloped site with planning permission in late 2007, to double check that there remained development interest and to clarify expected implementation dates. The results informed the draft Assessment and the exercise was repeated for all the large sites (in Annex A) during Summer 2009. The responses are reflected in the profiles in Annex A, to ensure that these are as accurate as possible and take account of known progress, constraints, developers' plans and discussions with the local planning authority. The estimated supply from sites which are committed/permitted is as follows:

Table 1: Large Sites (10 or more dwellings)

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014	940	522	1462
2010-2015	1119	490	1609

Table 2: Small Sites (less than 10 dwellings)

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014	112	294	406
2010-2015	78	226	304

- 4.4 The information from the survey of small sites applicants in 2007, along with work on the take-up of small site permissions undertaken for the Local Plan Review, lead to a non-implementation discount of 3% being applied to small sites with planning permission by the draft Assessment. This discount was not specifically questioned during the consultation and has therefore been applied to the updated small sites commitment figures in Table 2 above. For large sites, any delay in implementation is already taken into account in the profile for each site so there is no need for a non-implementation discount.

Sites Identified in the SHLAA

- 4.5 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was published for consultation alongside the draft Assessment in March 2009. As the SHLAA identifies specific sites with development potential the Council can be certain that there is no double-counting with sites which already have planning permission (dealt with above).

- 4.6 The SHLAA only assesses sites capable of accommodating 5 or more dwellings. This is because of the size of the District, the potential number of sites involved and the difficulty in estimating capacity and development timing for a large number of small sites. The SHLAA maps each site which it estimates will contribute to dwelling supply in each of its three 5-year time periods.
- 4.7 The periods being assessed (2009-2014 and 2010-2015) do not match the time periods in the draft SHLAA. Therefore, the revised SHLAA uses revised 5-year time periods of 2009-2014, 2014-2019, and 2019-2024. For the 2010-2015 period 4/5ths of the first SHLAA period are used and added to 1/5th of the second SHLAA period, giving the following results.

Table 3: SHLAA Sites (5 or more dwellings)

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014	148	277	425
2010-2015	175	276	451

Small Sites Allowance

- 4.8 As the SHLAA only considers sites capable of accommodating 5 or more dwellings, it was thought appropriate for the draft Assessment to allow for the contribution of smaller sites. These have traditionally formed a significant and consistent component of land supply and were expected to continue to do so. However, this was an area of substantial criticism, given Government advice that ‘windfall’ sites should not be taken into account in the first 10 year period (PPS3, paragraph 59). Although the draft Assessment argued that these were not windfall sites, it has become clear from Planning Inspectorate advice that they would be viewed in this light. It is, therefore, now clear that no small site allowance should be included and this is reflected in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Small Sites Allowance (less than 5 dwellings)

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014	0	0	0
2010-2015	0	0	0

Strategic Allocations

- 4.9 In order to meet the housing requirements of the South East Plan it will be necessary to make substantial new greenfield housing releases. The West of Waterlooville Major Development Area is already planned and part of the ‘baseline’ contribution of 2,000 dwellings is included within the large site commitments (Table 1 above). The Local Development

Framework (LDF) Core Strategy will establish the development strategy for the District and proposes a number of 'strategic allocations' for housing in accordance with this strategy: at Winchester, Whiteley and West of Waterlooville. Along with the 'baseline' provision at West of Waterlooville these amount to 8000 dwellings.

- 4.10 Development of the West of Waterlooville MDA is now underway and it is anticipated that the other strategic allocations may start to deliver housing from 2013/14 onwards. Although this is within the 5-year periods being examined, no allowance is made for these other strategic sites as the Core Strategy has not progressed sufficiently for them to be considered 'deliverable' within the terms of Government guidance. In particular, further work is required on the detail of the strategic allocations, including viability and deliverability, and they have yet to be independently examined and then adopted.

Table 5: Total 5-Year Land Supply

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
<u>2009-2014</u>			
Commitments (large)	940	522	1462
Commitments (small)	112	294	406
SHLAA Sites	148	277	425
Small Sites Allowance	-	-	-
Strategic Sites	-	-	-
TOTAL	1200	1093	2293
<u>2010-2015</u>			
Commitments (large)	1119	490	1609
Commitments (small)	78	226	304
SHLAA Sites	175	276	451
Small Sites Allowance	-	-	-
Strategic Sites	-	-	-
TOTAL	1372	992	2364

5 Risk Assessment

- 5.1 The methodologies used to determine the housing requirement and supply reflect Government advice. This emphasises the deliverability of sites and the Council has sought to ensure that only deliverable sites are included. The draft Assessment was published for consultation, along with the draft SHLAA, enabling a wide input to the documents. The comments received have been taken into account and have resulted in significant changes to both documents.

- 5.2 All of the sites now included in the Assessment are specific identifiable sites which either have planning permission, are allocated in an adopted development plan, or have been identified and tested through the SHLAA process. Given the emphasis on deliverability, it is not necessary to include any additional discounting to allow for uncertainty (small site commitments have already been discounted). While such an assessment cannot be a precise science, if anything it errs on the side of caution. For example, no allowance is made for new strategic allocations which have yet to progress through the planning process, even though these may contribute housing during the 5-year period, or for windfall sites which are likely to continue to emerge.
- 5.3 The likely deliverability of all the large sites (Annex A) has been reassessed taking account of information provided by landowners/developers, who were re-consulted in Summer 2009. The main source of uncertainty relates to the current economic climate, which remains uncertain, although account has been taken of economic forecasts. Despite the uncertainty, there remains considerable need/demand for housing with many forecasters expecting house prices to rise again by late 2010/early 2011. Also, Winchester has one of the strongest housing markets in Hampshire and housing transactions have not been affected as badly as in other areas. It is also a wealthy area where some people are less reliant on mortgages. The District is, therefore, likely to suffer less than other parts of Hampshire or the country.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 Comparison of the 5-year requirements with the available supply produces the following results:

Table 6: Land Requirements and Supply

Period:	PUSH	Non-PUSH	District
2009-2014			
Requirement	1845	1340	3185
Supply	1200	1093	2293
Surplus (years supply)	-645 (3.3yrs)	-247 (4.1yrs)	-892 (3.6yrs)
2010-2015			
Requirement	1920	1315	3235
Supply	1372	992	2364
Surplus (years supply)	-548 (3.6yrs)	-323 (3.8yrs)	-871 (3.7yrs)

- 2.1 The table above shows that there is a substantial shortfall of housing land, particularly in the PUSH area, but also in the non-PUSH parts of the District, and therefore at the whole District level too. This applies both to

the current situation (2009-2014) and the projected situation in the coming 5 years (2010-2015).

2.2 Government advice (PPS3) for authorities in such situations is as follows:

'Where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate an up to date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example, where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the considerations in paragraph 69.' (PPS paragraph 71).

Paragraph 69 of the PPS, which is referred to above, sets out factors which the planning authority should have regard to, such as achieving high quality design, a good mix of housing, sustainability, efficient use of land, and consistency with housing and wider policy objectives.

- 2.3 In the PUSH area the land supply situation improves slightly from 2009 to 2010 as development at the West of Waterlooville MDA gathers pace, but there remains a large shortfall in both 5-year periods. Even taking a longer-term view, development at West of Waterlooville will not meet housing needs or requirements on its own and it is clear from Annex A that, by 2014 or so, very few other sites remain to be developed. Also, small site commitments and SHLAA sites in the PUSH area are typically modest in their contribution.
- 2.4 Whilst the emerging Core Strategy proposes further land releases at West of Waterlooville (current reserve site) and North Whiteley, these proposals are not sufficiently advanced within the planning process to be counted within the 5-year periods currently being examined. If and when planning permission is granted, or the Core Strategy sufficiently advanced, these could be counted and would cumulatively start to achieve an adequate level of supply, but this is unlikely to be for several years.
- 2.5 Accordingly, for the PUSH part of the District there is a substantial current shortfall which is only likely to be resolved when major new allocations can be taken into account. In the mean time, the only Local Reserve Site in this part of the District (Little Frenchies Field) needs to be released to help maintain supply. Although this will not meet the immediate shortfall, this action in conjunction with on-going work to progress the Core Strategy allocations starts to address the situation.
- 2.6 Account needs to be taken of the increase in housing targets for the PUSH area, much of which will need to be delivered through new greenfield allocations. It is therefore inevitable that housing delivery will build up

- more gradually to meet the increased targets for the PUSH part of the District during the early years of the Core Strategy period, with any initial shortfall being resolved in subsequent years. In addition to the release of the Local Reserve Site, a positive and proactive approach will be taken to help bring forward other housing developments which are in accordance with current planning policy, including the 'strategic reserve' site element of West of Waterlooville (1000 dwellings) and to promote affordable housing opportunities. When dealing with planning applications in the PUSH area, account will be taken of the advice in PPS3 quoted above, due to the shortfall in supply.
- 2.7 For the non-PUSH part of the District the situation will deteriorate over time due to the lack of sites remaining to be developed after 2014 or so. The SHLAA does not identify sufficient housing opportunities within current policies to maintain an adequate supply to meet the South East Plan targets, and new allocations will be needed to achieve this. The Core Strategy Preferred Option proposes the allocation of Barton Farm (2000 dwellings), which could start to produce housing as early as 2013/14. However, given the early stage of the Core Strategy process and the current lack of planning permission, no allowance can yet be made for Barton Farm or other potential future allocations.
- 2.8 Therefore, in order to meet the anticipated shortfall in the 5-year land supply, it is recommended that Local Reserve Sites need to be released. The Local Plan allocates 3 Local Reserve Sites in the non-PUSH area: Pitt Manor, Winchester; Francis Gardens, Winchester; and Spring Gardens, Alresford. The Implementation of Local Reserve Sites SPD indicates that the first consideration in deciding which site(s) should be chosen is the site's size in relation to the expected shortfall. Other factors to be taken into account (in priority order) are the lead time, projected completions, sustainability and affordable housing provision.
- 2.9 The table below summarises these considerations for the 3 non-PUSH sites:

Site	Local Plan Dwellings Estimate	Lead Time	Annual Completions	Sustainability	Affordable Housing
Pitt Manor, Winchester	200	Scoping opinion provided and public exhibition underway. No planning application yet. Possible approval in	70 approx. Completion within 3 years of start: 2011-2014	High – on edge of Winchester	35% required, 40% would be sought due to location in Winchester

		2010/11, start in 2011/12			
Francis Gardens, Winchester	80	Planning appeal pending (90 dwellings), approval possible within 6 months, start in 2010/11	50 approx. Completion within 2 years of start: 2010-2012	High – on edge of Winchester	35% required, 40% included in appeal proposal
Spring Gardens, Alresford	35	Expressed support for site release but no pre-application discussions or planning application. Approval possible in 2010/11, start in 2011/12	35 approx. Completion within 1 year of start: 2011	Good – on edge of Alresford	35% required

2.10 The expected shortfall of supply amounts to approximately 247 dwellings for the 2009-2014 period, rising to 323 for 2010-2015, although as the Implementation of Local Reserve Sites SPD notes, this is not a precise science. The initial level of shortfall is above the total Local Reserve Site capacity of 315 dwellings (325 if the capacity of Francis Gardens is taken from the recent planning application), indicating that all 3 sites will be needed to address the situation in 2010.

2.11 As the total estimated capacity of the 3 Local Reserve Sites amounts to 315 dwellings, and taking account of the lead in time needed to deliver any completions, it is clear that all 3 sites need to be released to meet the expected shortfall.

Annex A

Large sites estimated supply: PUSH

ADDRESS	STATUS	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2009/2015
ABBEY MILL STATION ROAD BISHOPS WALTHAM SOUTHAMPTON	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	12	0	12
WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE LONDON ROAD WATERLOOVILLE	NOT STARTED	39	95	135	220	240	200	929
WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE NEWLANDS LANE WATERLOOVILLE	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOUCHWOOD CHURCH ROAD SHEDFIELD SOUTHAMPTON	NOT STARTED	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
BUENA VISTA HAMBLEDON ROAD DENMEAD	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	10	5	0	0	0	0	15
AUDRUICQ WINCHESTER ROAD BISHOPS WALTHAM	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	4	0	0	0	0	0	4

SKIPPERS WINCHESTER ROAD BISHOPS WALTHAM	NOT STARTED	0	14	0	0	0	0	14
70 VERNHAM DENE WINCHESTER ROAD COLDEN COMMON WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
ST AUBYNs, FAIRLAWN AND CHERRY BULL LANE WALTHAM CHASE WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
WHITELEY FARM WHITELEY FAREHAM	1000 DWELLINGS BUILT/OCCUPIED, REST NOT STARTED	0	0	25	25	0	0	50
AREA 2 LADY BETTYS DRIVE WHITELEY FAREHAM	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	45	45	90
KNOWLE VILLAGE MAYLES LANE KNOWLE FAREHAM	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	0	37	0	0	0	0	37
Total Supply		66	162	170	245	297	245	1185

Large sites estimated supply: Non-PUSH

ADDRESS	STATUS	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2009/2015
PENINSULA BARRACKS WINCHESTER	135 BUILT/OCCUPIED, 2 NOT STARTED	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
47 WEST STREET ALRESFORD	11 DWELLINGS COMPLETED REST UNDER CONSTRUCTION	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
AREA BETWEEN BROADWAY & FRIARSGATE WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	100	100	200
BARTON FARM SITE WINCHESTER CITY (NORTH) ANDOVER ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT AVAILABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTHDOWN SCHOOL SHEPHERDS LANE COMPTON WINCHESTER	DELETED 2009 TOTAL 13 COMPLETED 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOWNSEND NORTHEND LANE DROXFORD	NOT STARTED	0	-1	10	0	0	0	9
LAND AT MOORSIDE ROAD WINNALL WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

55 CHILBOLTON AVENUE WINCHESTER	DELETED 2009 TOTAL 13 COMPLETED 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19-20A JEWRY STREET WINCHESTER	DELETED 2009 TOTAL 10 COMPLETED 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ROYAL OBSERVER CORPS ABBOTTS ROAD WINCHESTER	DELETED 2009 TOTAL 14 COMPLETED 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
FREEMANS YARD SCHOOL LANE CHERITON ALRESFORD	NOT STARTED	0	12	12	0	0	0	24
LAND OFF HOOKPIT FARM LANE KINGS WORTHY	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WINCHESTER TYRE AND EXHAUST 23 CITY ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
POLICE HEADQUARTERS ROMSEY ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

16A CITY ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
LAND SURROUNDING SHEILDAIG, HILL CREST & HEATHF WARNFORD ROAD CORHAMPTON SOUTHAMPTON	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
122-128 LOVEDON LANE KINGS WORTHY WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	7	9	0	0	0	16
CRANWORTH HOUSE PARKERSELL CRANWORTH ROAD WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
4-7 MORNINGTON DRIVE WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
10A STONEY LANE WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	-1	10	0	0	0	0	9
38-40 CHILBOLTON AVENUE WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
DOWNLANDS ESTATE DOWNLANDS WAY SOUTH WONSTON WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	17	18	0	0	0	35

61 GREENACRES SPECIAL SCHOOL ANDOVER ROAD WINCHESTER	DELETED 2009 TOTAL 19 COMPLETED 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WINTON SCHOOL WINTON CLOSE WINCHESTER	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	25	32	0	0	0	0	57
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY LIBRARY 81 NORTH WALLS WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	13	0	0	0	0	13
ORCHARD HOUSE SARUM ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
LAND AT REAR OF 22-32 BRILL CLOSE GRANGE ROAD ALRESFORD	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	13	8	0	0	0	0	21
HIGHCROFT ROMSEY ROAD WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	6	41	41	0	0	0	88
LAND AT DODDS LANE SWANMORE SOUTHAMPTON	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
CLEYLANDS AND GAMBUS CHURCHILL CLOSE KINGS WORTHY WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	-4	12	0	0	0	8
MILESDOWN NORTHBROOK AVENUE WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	0	0	0	10	13	0	23

LAND BETWEEN, ROZELLE CLOSE & LARCH COTTAGE MAIN ROAD LITTLETON WINCHESTER	NOT STARTED	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Total Supply		132	135	130	12	113	100	622