



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

- Each questioner will have 2 minutes in which to ask their question (or may simply state to “refer to the order paper”). The order of the questions to be asked is as set out below and an officer will direct the questioner to the microphone when their name is called by the Mayor.
- If a questioner who has submitted a question is unable to be present, the Mayor may ask the question on their behalf, or invite another Councillor to do so, or indicate that a written reply will be given and published on the website following the meeting. or decide, in the absence of the questioner, that the question will not be dealt with.
- Please note that following the response given by the Councillor, the questioner may also ask a supplementary question which must arise directly out of the original reply.
- The **total** time allocated for questions will *normally* be limited to 20 minutes.
- Written answers will be published to questions submitted (but not supplementary questions) following the meeting and all members of the public who have asked a question will be notified accordingly.

	From:
1	Patrick Davies
2	Dave Brockless
3	Caroline Waller/James Turner
4	Phil Lee
5	Stuart Jones
6	June Perrins
7	David Baldwin
8	Wickham Parish Council
9	Jonathan Marmont
10	Lucy Hall
11	Swanmore Parish Council



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 1

From: Patrick Davies

To: Leader and Cabinet Member for Asset Management (Cllr Tod)

“How will the Council be able to resist applications for significant new housing developments on sites not allocated for development in their proposed regulation 19 document, which may soon be submitted to them by developers who will be able to point out that the Council has totally ignored the impending changes to the NPPF in its published document with its failure to reconsider the required housing numbers?”

Reply:

“Thank you for your question.

The most important thing we can do to properly control development in the Winchester District is to have an up-to-date Local Plan – and that is what we will be discussing later this evening.

We’re also moving ahead in a way that is completely in line with the Government’s new National Planning Policy Framework or NPPF.

Annex 1 of the proposed NPPF lays out crystal clear guidance in paragraph 226c and paragraph 227 how Local Planning Authorities that have submitted their Local Plan for inspection within a month of the publication of the final NPPF should proceed – and the council is following that procedure to the letter.

In that situation, the Government is clear that, in event that our plan reaches adoption with an annual housing requirement that is more than 200 dwellings lower than the relevant published Local Housing Need figure, we will be expected to commence plan-making in the new plan-making system at the earliest opportunity to address the shortfall in housing need. And that is, indeed, the plan of action we are committed to.

We are following the process required by the draft NPPF exactly and will be able to demonstrate that in the event of any planning appeal.

In addition, because the Local Plan that we will be discussing later this evening carefully identifies allocations for more than 15,000 houses, easily enough to enable development in the upcoming period of 1,099 houses per year in the Government’s draft target, we are confident that we will be able to continue to demonstrate a 5-year land supply – even with any new target - and developers will not be able to appeal on this basis either.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 2

From: Dave Brockless

To: The Cabinet Member for the Climate Emergency (Cllr Learney)

“As the Local Plan is built around the climate emergency, has the Council calculated the impact of the measures to mitigate the climate emergency on the climate? (i.e. how much change in global temperature in °C will the adoption of the Winchester local plan have); and if the above calculation has not been carried, why not; and has the Council carried out a financial impact assessment to include the impact of the measures to mitigate the climate emergency within the plan on the short and long term finances of individuals, households and local businesses and if this has been carried out please explain where this can be found and if it has not been carried out, why not?”

Reply:

“As Mr Brockless indicates the draft local plan contains significant policies that tackle the climate emergency which have both carbon and monetary impacts. For example as compared to Part L 2021 building regulations the introduction of LETI (Low Energy Transformation Initiative) standards is estimated to cut the annual carbon impact for a semi-detached house by 1,316 kg per year and energy bills by a third.

However in calculating the overall impact of a Local Plan which runs until 2040 a number of variables come into play that would make any calculations on carbon savings unreliable. Rate of buildout, carbon cost of materials, housing typology, resident take-up of sustainable travel options, rate of decarbonisation of the grid, and changes to national policy over time will all alter the impact a new local plan will have on climate change.

The Local Plan Viability Assessment carried out by an independent company has covered the costs of all the policies in the Reg 18 and Reg 19 stage. Together with the other work used by the Council to support the policies contained within the Regulation 19 Local Plan the report is available in the 2040 Local Plan evidence base on the Councils website.

On an individual household basis, as many of us in this room can testify the cost of retrofitting a home to a high energy efficiency standard is significant and retrofitting sustainable travel measures and creating usable green space both difficult and very expensive. Not only is it more cost effective to build these measures into developments from the beginning but the reduced energy costs and better living environment are achieved from day one.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 3

From: Caroline Waller/James Turner

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“We have sent a number of letters (to which we have not had a response) explaining that the assessment of the settlement of Hursley that informed the Regulation 18 draft wrongly excluded a number of facilities. We included a list of these as Appendix 1 to our letter of 14 December 2022. The facilities located in Hursley are a matter of objective fact. The information is openly discoverable and easily proven. There is nothing to be gained by the Council in relying on a flawed evidence base.

Therefore, please confirm why the evidence base relating to the assessment of Hursley has not been updated despite the fact that these errors were drawn to the Council’s attention nearly 2 years ago.

Does the Council intend to correct the errors in its evidence base in this respect?”

Reply:

“Thank you for your question.

The comments relating to the presence of facilities in Hursley have been considered as part of the responses to the draft Local Plan consultation (under reference BHLF-KSAR-N8ZS-4).

The points made have been addressed in the document “*Settlement Hierarchy – Evidence Base*” which is available on the Council’s website (at <https://www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk/have-your-say>)

Some of the points raised relate to services assessed in the 2021 version of this document but removed for the assessment in 2022. There are other considerations within the assessment from which a conclusion is made.

The remaining points have been considered and responded to, with the outcome that it is considered that the place of Hursley hierarchy should not be amended.

You are welcome to make your points to the Reg 19 proposal.

Any further comments received by WCC during the Reg 19 consultation will be sent direct for consideration by the Inspector.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 4

From: Phil Lee

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“Please explain to South Wonston Parish Council, Local Councillors and residents of South Wonston how their representations have been used to influence the draft plan when they were not responded to until 3 days after the Cabinet meeting by which time the draft plan had already been amended?”

Reply:

“Thank you for your question, Mr Lee.

Although the consultation comments and the Council officer responses have only been published recently, they have all been carefully considered over the months since the consultation at the end of 2022.

The outcome of that work has informed the version of the Plan that is before Council.

The Health provision in the village has been updated to reflect the current (2024) position.

In the case of the proposed allocation in South Wonston, a number of changes were made to the Plan, including being clearer about how any potential highways safety matters due to the nearby Alresford Drove junction will be managed, going further than the initial advice from the transport consultant’s report in the Development and Site Selection Background Paper.

Further details are set out in the document setting out officer responses to the consultation.

You are of course invited to make your submission to the published Reg 19 proposals. These submissions will be submitted direct to the inspector. You can do this online at www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk .”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 5

From: Stuart Jones

To: The Cabinet Member for the Climate Emergency (Cllr Learney)

“At the Cabinet meeting on Monday 19th August I highlighted several issues with the July Transport Assessment. These include the fact that there was no acknowledgement of the significant loss of public transport in the Southern Parishes in the last 7 years, for example 53 weekday bus departures from Bishop's Waltham in 2017 is now down to 35 and will fall further. There was no assessment of the impact of that loss. And thirdly, the Assessment is out of date and inaccurate, with a diagram that shows the X9 bus, which stopped 2 years ago.

Although Hampshire is responsible for transport, that does not absolve Winchester City Council of the responsibility to assess the transport provision appropriately to support its plan, as required by the NPPF, specifically to quote 'align growth and infrastructure'.

These issues mean that the Transport Assessment is flawed and will not stand examination. I understand your timing for the proposed plan submission but this Assessment is a risk to that submission. Please, I'd encourage you to reduce that risk. It cannot wait until the start of a future local plan.

So can I ask the Council: 'will you commit to improve the Transport Assessment, in parallel with the submission process, to assess the actual public transport required by people in the District for sustainable development, and to identify gaps that need to be addressed?’”

Reply:

“Thank you for asking the question and bringing an error in the document to our attention. This detailed point has been discussed with the transport consultants and the incorrect image showing out of date information has been removed from the version of the document that will be published in support of the Local Plan consultation.

The Transport Assessment has been prepared with the oversight of Hampshire County Council and National Highways as Highway Authorities. It assesses the transport situation, and considers what the implications are of the proposed site allocations contained in the Plan. The Council does have a responsibility to assess the transport provision appropriately in the development of the Local Plan but it cannot direct future public transport provision.

Going forward, it is considered that the document is fit for purpose but we encourage comments on its contents including any mistakes in the forthcoming consultation. As



Winchester
City Council

with all other aspects of this consultation, once we have those responses we can consider if further work is required to support the Local Plan at Examination.

Following the adoption of the Local Plan as each allocation comes forward it will need to provide its own transport assessment and demonstrate compliance with the sustainable and active travel policies within the plan which require the provision of “A genuine choice of sustainable and active transport modes of travel; prioritising walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport,” (Strategic Policy T1)

As a Council we recognize the insufficiency of public transport in the district particularly in our rural areas and will continue to use what influence and levers we do have to improve services wherever possible.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 6

From: June Perrins

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“South Wonston Parish Council once again would like to question issues with the Settlement Hierarchy.

The overall score is still uncorrected, proposing the village be downgraded from an Intermediate Rural Settlement to Smaller Rural Settlement.

The residents in South Wonston have never felt that our Settlement Hierarchy category or the Integrated Impact Assessment scores fitted the reality of South Wonston.

What is the clear reasoning behind why South Wonston cannot be downgraded from Intermediate Rural Settlement to Smaller Rural Settlement as requested bringing it down to a level that excludes the village from future development?”

Reply:

“Thank you for your question, Cllr Perrins.

It is acknowledged that the Parish Council and others in South Wonston have questioned the place of the village in the settlement hierarchy. The officer’s responses to the detailed points raised in the draft plan consultation are set out in the document *Settlement Hierarchy Evidence Base* on the Local Plan website.

Rather than repeat those debates, it is worth saying that what is important is the categorisation of settlements and whether that is considered sensible and appropriate. South Wonston is categorised as an intermediate settlement, alongside Hursley, Otterbourne, Sutton Scotney and Waltham Chase. It is not scored as highly as some, but is scored higher than others in that category.

Smaller rural settlements scoring lower, for example Curdridge, Knowle and Shedfield, tend to be missing key facilities such as schools or shops and therefore on balance it is considered the categorisation of South Wonston as an intermediate settlement is considered appropriate.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 7

From: David Baldwin

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“Why have the Council and its planning department seemingly ignored the conclusions of its own Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 paper with regard to the SW01 allocation that "The site contributes to the distinctive setting and identity of the village and is considered to be an 11, which equates to high sensitivity: protection from development is the preferred option".

Reply:

“Dear Mr Baldwin,

The site is visually sensitive and that is recognised in the initial landscape appraisal which forms part of the Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper.

That document also sets out why the site was considered the best available, with the opportunity to deliver homes with pedestrian and cycling access to the centre of the village.

The Plan policy includes specific provisions requiring any planning application to minimise wider landscape impacts, retain trees and screening where possible and provide landscape buffers (criteria ii, vi and vii).

This is considered an appropriate response to the sensitivity of the site, and it is considered that it can be delivered in an appropriate way.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 8

From: Wickham Parish Council

To: Leader and Cabinet Member for Asset Management (Cllr Tod)

“Why has the Ravenswood site at Knowle now been included in the Local Plan? The Settlement Hierarchy for Knowle highlights that the village should not have an allocation therefore should not be part of the Plan. The Settlement Hierarchy for Knowle is incorrect, there is no preschool, employment opportunities and the convenience and retail needs are not met; the facility score for Knowle Village should be rated 6 and not 14.

Any development at Knowle should be community-led, with significant community and facility benefits negotiated outside of the local plan.”

Reply:

“The Ravenswood site has progressed as a community-led proposal and once a S106 is signed planning permission will be issued and, therefore we should recognise this in the Plan. If we tried – now – to make an argument that it was not suitable for allocation in our Local Plan, after having publicly taken it so far through the planning process, we would almost certainly lose the argument at inspection – and lose it badly.

There are elements of the S106 that still need agreement before final permission is issued – but to support the community benefits that the planning application highlights, such as securing the open space of the Knowle Triangle and the water meadows, we are also confirming them through the Local Plan policies.

If the Parish Council or local residents submit any detailed comments on the presence of facilities in Knowle at the forthcoming consultation they can be considered as part of that process.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 9

From: Jonathan Marmont

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“Section 13.17 (Allocations - North Whiteley) states "It had not been possible to achieve the planned 40% affordable housing provision within the development originally permitted at Whiteley for viability reasons". Why is this the case?”

Reply:

“The level of affordable housing for North Whiteley was set when the planning application was originally agreed in late 2015.

This set the level of affordable housing at 25%, provided in the form of 525 affordable housing units on-site and an off-site contribution of £17.5 million – based on an independent assessment at the time by the District Valuation Office Agency.

The 2015 decision is binding on the council and cannot be unilaterally increased – even via the Local Plan process.

Even though the level of affordable housing at North Whiteley is far lower than we would like, the Council has sought to increase this figure via other means – most recently with the purchase of 54 new Winchester City Council houses in Cobbett Gardens.

The failure to secure adequate social housing in Whiteley is one of the main reasons that we have a new process in this local plan that guarantees a set level of affordable housing on greenfield and brownfield sites.”



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public
under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 10

From: Lucy Hall

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“Will you be ensuring the protection of our precious countryside by focusing on developing brownfield sites and utilising empty buildings?”

Reply:

“Thank you for your question.

Winchester City Council is absolutely committed to conserving as much of our countryside as possible.

We are requiring brownfield sites to be built out first. No greenfield site will be given planning approval before 2030.

But despite asking, Winchester City Council landowners and residents do not put forward enough brownfield land to satisfy our Local Plan housing number set by central Government.

I take this opportunity to ask, if residents, businesses or any landowner knows of currently unused brownfield land available for development, please let us know. We’d be delighted to have that conversation.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 28 August 2024

Questions by the Public under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

QUESTION 11

From: Swanmore Parish Council

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

“There are inconsistencies within the Regulation 19 document. At some points in the document Swanmore is referred to as an Intermediate Rural Settlement and in other places a Large Rural Settlement. Please could you confirm our current status?”

Reply:

“Following the local plan consultation in 2022 a review was undertaken of the Settlement Hierarchy and the services and facilities present in each settlement. It was brought to the Council’s attention that there were post office facilities in Swanmore, and following verification by Council officers this led to the scoring for Swanmore being changed, and the recategorisation of Swanmore as a Larger Rural Settlement.

Further detail on this is set out in the document summarising and responding to comments made on the Settlement Hierarchy, which is available on the Council’s Local Plan website¹. The revised Settlement Hierarchy document is also available on the Council’s website².

The regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan³ does treat Swanmore as a Larger Rural settlement. The Plan document has been reviewed and it is not apparent where incorrect references to Swanmore being an intermediate rural settlement remain. As such, it would be very helpful if you could advise where they are so that any inconsistencies can be clarified for the consultation.

The responses to the comments received on the settlement hierarchy were published on 16 August. We have not advised parish councils or other interested parties as and when individual documents go on the website – the intention is for all documents

¹ Available at

<https://www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk/assets/attach/385/Settlement-Hierarchy-Consultation-Responses.pdf>

² Available at

<https://www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk/LibraryAssets/attach/431/Settlement-Hierarchy-Review-August-2024.pdf>

³ Available at

https://www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk/assets/attach/390/303_local_plan_re_q19-web-1-.pdf



Winchester

City Council

to be available (and to be commented upon) following the commencement of the Local Plan consultation.

It is worth making clear that despite the recategorisation of Swanmore as a larger rural settlement, the Plan does not propose further new housing allocations due to a lack of suitable sites as set out in the Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper, which is available on the Council's Local Plan website⁴.

The Parish Council is invited to submit any comments it wishes to make on the content of the revised settlement hierarchy document or any other part of the evidence base for the Plan as part of the current Local Plan consultation. The consultation is open and closes at 23.59 on 13th October 2024. During the consultation we are also hosting 3 drop in sessions on 11th, 17th and 25th September. Details of the consultation and events are available from this link.

[Winchester District Local Plan 2020-2040: Regulation 19 Consultation - Winchester City Council - Citizen Space](#)

⁴ Available at

<https://www.localplan.winchester.gov.uk/LibraryAssets/attach/181/Development-Strategy-and-Sites-Proposed-Submission-2024-Topic-paper.pdf>