

Local Plan Launch Summary

Winchester District Local Plan 2039

2018



Winchester
City Council

Local plan launch summary of key comments received

All responses can be viewed in full at https://winchester.citizenspace.com/policy-and-planning/winchester-lp-launch/consultation/published_select_respondent

Question 1

Currently we have a development strategy that sets out planning policy requirements for three spatial areas within the district :- Winchester Town, South Hampshire Urban Areas and Market Towns and Rural Areas. This has allowed us to develop focussed policies including proposed levels of growth in these areas to reflect local circumstances and opportunities.

Have the three spatial areas proved useful and are they still relevant – should they be retained?

Response to Question 1:

Yes	64.38%
No	9.59%
Not answered	26.03%

Summary of Comments:-

- It is important to reflect and distinguish between the inherently different requirements and characters of the areas.
- Rural Areas should allow for incremental growth not just house building to include - a mix of housing for entry level sites of exception, smaller units for the elderly, self build and market value homes, but also commercial development .
- needs to be a connectivity to larger towns and cities
- Growth should be focussed in sustainable locations and the settlement hierarchy reviewed
- There is not the need for half the houses that are being pressed for by the government. Very few of them are affordable and thus serve no purpose other than to make builders and landowners rich
- Too much infill
- The three categories have proved more useful to developers than to residents - The Local Plan for Market Towns and Rural Areas was designed to determine housing needs and site allocations up to 2031. In fact, the target of 250 homes for Shedfield Civil Parish will be exceeded by at least 25% as early as 2021.
- Plan processes & policies focus on forecasted future needs but largely ignore backlog; - Create sustainable mini local plan for all settlements, near surroundings and their satellites as a hub to deliver zero carbon footprint and

all of the housing backlog & growth by 2036. Plans should define a central zone where aim is meet needs particularly for older age groups, this could include transport hub, shops, pubs, churches & other places to meet, surgery & close care at home.

- Small sites should be identified for self build
- The distinct nature of the three spatial areas within the District necessitate policy that reflects the characteristics, challenges and opportunities of each area. Distinguishing between the three areas in this way is particularly useful as a tool in directing the majority of growth to the most sustainable locations in the District (e.g. Winchester City) and to protect against inappropriate development in rural areas. Whilst not explicitly stated in the revised NPPF, this type of spatial strategy supports a number of wider sustainable development objectives of the framework, including: delivering development in well-connected locations with services and facilities, making effective use of land, improving accessibility, ensuring business viability, coordinating infrastructure provision and promoting vibrant communities.
- there is a risk of 'pigeonholing' when defining high level spatial areas where broad generalisations are made. There will always be exceptions to any rule and planning polices need to be flexible enough to reflect that
- promotion of 71 hectares of land at South Winchester Golf Club for a residential-led development (circa 1,300 dwellings), where it has links with existing residential developments to the north and north-west (Oliver's Battery and Stanmore respectively), developments which form part of the built up extent of 'Winchester Town'. This relationship, together with the strong accessibility credentials with existing public transport provision providing direct links to the town centre and train station, make the site a logical and sustainable location for future housing growth
- MTRA3 parishes settlements without boundary's – this policy stops local people from staying in the area, locals can't afford the inflated house prices and are not allowed to develop for themselves
- Some settlement-specific analysis is required to achieve this is a 'settlement master plan' approach to set a constraints and opportunities based and longer term growth strategy for each settlement, as the about 250 isn't flexible enough.
- Promotion of 11 hectares of land (about 200 dwellings) at Wickham Park Golf Cub - The Site is not subject to any significant constraints and lies outside of the South Downs National Park. The Site is positioned well in relation to local amenities, Wickham local centre and bus stops, with regular services between Wickham, Winchester and Fareham.
- the Local Plan should continue to reflect the inter-relationships with adjacent neighbouring authorities and plan appropriately around these with greater emphasis of growth at Market Towns and Rural Areas

- Miller and Bloor consider the discussion as to the spatial development strategy to be employed in the new Local Plan to be premature there is a need to have an understanding of development needs and land availability
- Taylor Wimpey supports the Council in the production of a new Local Plan – the distribution of development should seek to achieve sustainable development and broadly should direct development to those locations which offer a range of services and facilities as well as ensuring settlements can remain sustainable and support community needs – promote land at Swanmore Road for 225 dwellings, and Springvale Road for 300 dwellings
- New settlements, small/medium allocations and urban extensions should all be considered based on the evidence, not a pre agreed spatial strategy that undermines national policy.
- Promote land at Dodds Lane for development
- should be a bespoke approach for rural areas, recognising the specific needs of rural communities
- The spatial strategy is still relevant, particularly the role of Winchester Town - it is important that sufficient homes are allocated to the Winchester Town spatial area to support its status and importance within the District
- Whilst it is possible that the council may well conclude that it remains appropriate to continue with the spatial areas identified in the adopted local plans, it is premature to conclude that this is the case, as the council has the opportunity to depart from it
- The NPPG emphasises the need for plan makers to be proactive in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, as well as broad locations for development. NPPF paragraph 20 requires Local Plans to identify an appropriate and sustainable strategy for the pattern and scale of development, including housing. National planning policy also stipulates that new development should be distributed to reduce travel and encourage more sustainable modes of travel.
- Development is currently directed to a small number of very broad locations. This strategy increases pressure for new development in those areas in terms of constraints, opportunities and infrastructure, and creates an over-reliance on a small number of large sites, usually on green field sites. This strategy is inconsistent with the NPPF requirement for at least 10% of the housing requirement to be on sites no larger than 1ha.
- Whilst the NPPF has amended the definition of affordable housing to include starter homes and discounted market housing, the overall strategy should be reviewed to encourage the delivery of new homes to meet an up to date local housing need
- Welbeck Strategic Land supports the current spatial strategy and its retention focusing new development in accordance with the current spatial strategy, would be more likely to ensure the most efficient use of land and local service

provision, by locating new housing where it will be close to essential services, facilities and infrastructure – promote land in Denmead for development

- The Local Plan Review should support a framework to allow for additional growth within the District's Towns and Villages, - promoting land at New Alresford and Littleton
- It is important that the Local Plan Development Management policies are consistent with the approach taken in National Planning Policy for such city centre locations.
- The current city boundaries need to be revisited as they do not reflect the current built up area or adequately respond to possible growth; need a vision for Winchester, plus detailed design guidance
- The NPPF places a renewed emphasis on the importance of supporting and enhancing the vitality of rural communities, and states that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive
- The delivery of new homes by local plans will be assessed by the Housing Delivery Test and so the expected rates of build-out should be realistic given the lead-in times for large scale sites. Large sites make up a significant proportion of the housing supply in both Winchester district itself and the PUSH area. In order to ensure the delivery of new allocations within the proposed plan period, alongside the continued build-out of committed urban extensions, it is likely to be necessary to refocus the strategy towards directing growth to support town and village centres on relatively modest sized sites.
- Support existing development strategy and agree that the focus for development should be around Winchester City, close to existing services and facilities and existing public transport routes
- it is important that the spatial strategy is developed in response to identified housing needs with a distribution that is consistent with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.
- Focus on redevelopment and re-use of brownfield sites
- Amend settlement boundaries to include all allocated sites
- Publication of statements of common ground to ensure transparency
- Spatial areas has been helpful in guiding development across the District, but needs to be recognition that there is overlap between these; need also to take into account the review of LEPs and their relationship with the spatial areas.
- Identify a fourth spatial area – South Downs National Park – to ensure the SDNP context is reflected in the local plan and its unmet needs are addressed where there is capacity in Winchester District
- Approach should be informed by the Local Nature Partnership's Ecological Network Mapping, to ensure development is located in least damaging and most sustainable locations.

Question 2

Should the amount of new development required (to be determined) be distributed in a similar way to that in the adopted local plans, with Winchester Town being a focus for development given its level of services and facilities; development within the South Hampshire Urban Area to serve both ours and wider housing needs in accordance with the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire Strategy; and with settlements in the Market Towns and Rural area having levels of development proportionate to their size and function?

Do you agree with this approach?

Response to Question 2:

Yes	49.32%
No	26.03%
Not answered	24.66%

Summary of Comments:

- Review needs to include Denmead Neighbourhood Plan area
- Local infrastructure has been ignored
- Need to build cheaper housing
- Smaller rural communities have been excluded – development boundaries must be extended to allow for a mix of housing as current options are only infill or exception sites
- Must retain character of settlements and not overload them
- Market towns are at capacity
- Need to keep MTRA settlements thriving so allow more development where it can be accommodated
- Do not overlook cycling infrastructure
- Rural communities need expansion – be pragmatic about sites outside settlement boundaries
- Winchester Town should no longer be the focus for development – it is being destroyed it may be that certain areas are reaching their development capacity and alternatives need to be explored
- Distribution of development should be proportionate to size and function everywhere
- Must ensure all local people have a say
- Existing density and character should be taken into account when deciding if development is appropriate
- The amount of building would suggest a new town would facilities and infrastructure would be better to fulfil the need for housing
- MTRA has taken too big a share of the development since 2011

- Winchester Town should remain the focus of development as it is the most sustainable location due to its size and services – consider a sustainable urban extension or a new settlement in close proximity
- Approach is too prescriptive – need flexibility as to where development can go
- Must establish the appropriate level of need for the District
- MTRA settlements need development to survive
- MTRA2 settlements should have elevated status
- Areas around market towns could be considered as one housing area, to allow for linkages to reflect the application of 'local' criteria with exception housing
- MTRA development needs to be proportionate and in keeping without compromising character and future sustainability
- Winchester Town is full up – a county wide strategy is needed with a green belt around the City
- Greater emphasis should be given to accommodating growth with MTRA with lower levels of growth to MTRA3 settlements. Several smaller opportunities at a range of sustainable locations is a more nimble way of sustaining housing supply.
- Should not carry forward the existing approach, need to test against updated evidence and identify the most appropriate locations for sustainable development; need to adopt a mixed approach to provide flexibility to changing circumstances.
- Each locality should take their fair proportion of housing requirements; create settlement boundaries for all settlements
- Need to reflect NPPF requirements for 10% of housing on small sites of less than 1 ha
- Current approach is too rigid and needs to be more flexible
- Winchester and South Hampshire Urban Area should be the focus for development – any development in rural areas should be proportionate to size and function
- Changes to the NPPF allow the Council to consider changing the distribution strategy
- Existing strategy is too limited – should allow new housing adjoining existing settlements, there are opportunities to make more efficient use of the countryside in sustainable locations.
- Need protection of settlement boundaries – consider a green belt around Winchester. Explore local green space designations to provide protection to boundaries
- South Hampshire Urban Area should accommodate the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities
- Standard methodology numbers are minimums, need to identify actual housing needs
- New local plan should accommodate sufficient flexibility to allow settlements to evolve

- Consider delivering more housing to support economic growth aspirations and the delivery of additional affordable housing

Question 3

The Government now requires local plans to be updated every 5 years, we are suggesting the local plan period is rolled forward by 5 years to run from 2016 – 2036 – what this means is that we will need to find land for new development to cover the period from the end of the existing plan period (2031) to the end of the new plan period (2036). The plan period will include planning permissions granted and houses completed from 1 April 2016 onwards.

Do you agree with rolling forward the local plan by 5 years?

Response to Question 3:

Yes	58.22%
No	17.81%
Not answered	23.97%

Summary of Comments:

- Not sensible to have all the development happen at the start of the plan period, needs to be a way of releasing land for development on a rolling programme – releasing land early devalues local democracy and puts pressure on local services
- Rolling over 5 years is sensible
- Plan needs to identify development sites as early as possible and meet NPPF housing delivery tests annually
- Plan should reflect actual timeline so period 2020 – 2040 would be more appropriate
- Need to update demographic data used aswell
- Need for continuous review seems to be driven by fixation on housing numbers rather than the need for proper planning
- Numbers built since 2011 must be counted
- Rolling forward simply increases the total numbers of homes to be built
- Housing needs to be addressed by small and medium sized sites as well as large strategic allocations
- A full local plan review is required inline with national planning policy
- A solution may be to allocate reserve sites to which countryside policies apply until they are needed
- Need to take a longer term strategic view – beyond 2036 to better accommodate a rolling 5 year update process

- Need to retain plan period as 2031 – should not be able to shift goalposts continuously
- Base date should be 2018 to correspond to when preparation started, with end date 2038
- A rolling 5 year local plan will allow for any shortfall in housing need/delivery to be addressed and new land identified if required
- Rolling forward runs a risk of continued stalling of strategic sites resulting in targets not being met
- By the time the plan is adopted it will only have a life of about 10 years, plans are meant to be visionary and have a 15 year horizon
- Reassess 5 year supply and update annually
- Need to plan positively on both brownfield and greenfield sites with a focus on existing settlements of all sizes
- NPPF requires plan to have 15 year period from adoption so any review needs to be rapid to ensure that there is 15 years post adoption
- Rolling forward the local plan is not a sound strategy – this will not boost the supply of housing and is not consistent with NPPF
- Review should examine whether the strategy and evidence base are still the most appropriate. The review should therefore not focus solely on extending the plan period but to consider all material changes
- LPP2 inspector advised a full review is required with adoption during 2021, if this is delayed then the local plan period must be rolled forward
- Review must properly examine the evidence
- If the housing figure increases then additional development land will be required throughout the plan period not just at the end
- Need a spatial plan for each settlement
- New local plan should not be applied retrospectively
- This is too far ahead and just not give the planning process time to adjust to changing circumstances
- Need to set strategic policies for a longer period to 2014, which will allow for any slippage to the timetable and provide certainty about the development strategy
- The Council's ambitions for economic growth could result in a higher need for housing that calculated using the standard methodology
- The council will need to plan to accommodate for a portion of the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities and the National Park

Question 4

Larger more complex development proposals can take longer to achieve, should the local plan therefore allocate 'strategic' sites (if necessary) even if they may not be fully developed by 2036?

Response to Question 4:

Yes	56.16%
No	17.81%
Not answered	26.03%

Summary of Comments:

- Larger sites bring the potential to improve services and amenities, but ensuring the necessary infrastructure is in place before the development commences is unsustainable
- Definition of 'strategic' needs to be amended in the smaller settlements to reflect the scale and context
- Must ensure health needs are considered as part of the process
- Should also plan to ensure biodiversity and nature conservation interests are protected
- Need to be forward thinking and identify sites ahead of requirement
- Larger sites can be suitable in the right context
- Strategy needs to be robust enough to demonstrate how development will be accommodated in the future if needed to proper planning can take place for infrastructure etc
- The allocation of strategic sites is necessary to provide the District with a clear long-term strategy for bringing land forward for development – this approach is supported by the revised NPPF. Large sites allow for master planning and have the benefit of providing new services and infrastructure so avoid overburdening existing services
- Need balance between different sizes and spatial distribution
- Need mix of sites to deliver over the plan period, smaller sites have shorter lead in times
- Large scale housing in sustainable locations can and should play a role in meeting housing needs, critical issue is viability which is now a requirement during the plan making process
- Explore full potential of MTRA2 settlements first before considering strategic sites
- Larger sites deliver infrastructure as well as housing but are not likely to be fully developed in the plan period

- Need to take a longer term view
- Should not allocate larger sites if will not deliver in plan period - have a robust number of smaller sites to come forward more quickly without the complications of larger sites etc
- Must stop garden grabbing
- Should focus on delivery of strategic sites already allocated rather than identifying new allocations. Need to identify a range of sites at sustainable rural settlements as this is a nimbler way to ensure housing supply is maintained
- Support inclusion of strategic scale housing, adopting a mixed approach will provide flexibility to changing circumstances
- The allocation of some strategic sites can help to deliver sustainable communities and housing over the longer term
- Over reliance on large sites 500+units should be avoided as these can negatively impact on the level of supply
- Should have mix with smaller allocations of 50 -150
- Need a formal framework to guide decisions as to where development should be allocated as none has been in place since 2011
- Development should be guided to the edge of existing settlements
- Strategic sites should be allocated if they are available and appropriate
- NPPF (para 72) highlights the role of larger scale development
- NPPF requires LPAs to allocate 10% of housing on small sites
- Urban regeneration is the key to success
- Taking a long strategic view will protect the area towards the end of the plan period
- Identify potential reserve sites
- Sites should not be allocated unless there is a realistic prospect of them being delivered
- Need to achieve higher densities; facilitate land assembly

Question 5

Revised Government Guidance suggests that Local Authorities can have a strategic level plan setting out the development strategy for the District and large scale development allocations, followed by details in a local or neighbourhood plan. This would require the preparation of a number of separate documents, along the lines of Local Plan Parts 1 and 2.

Should we follow this approach or aim for a single Plan?

Response to Question 5:

Yes	37.67%
No	23.26%
Not answered	39.04%

Summary of Comments:

- Overall strategic plan is sensible
- Splitting the planning allows for a more granular approach
- Every parish or ward should have the opportunity to prepare their own local plan
- More detailed local plans would allow for focussed updating under a strategic level plan
- Single plan is preferred
- Need local plans for neighbourhoods
- Single plan is too cumbersome
- Need consistency across the District with a single plan
- Single plan is preferred given the length of time for preparation
- Plans need to be more sympathetic to an area rather than broach brush
- Depends on scale of development
- All policies must be in the same place
- A strategic level plan could progress to adoption more rapidly than progressing a combined local plan
- Retain separate site allocations plan
- unsure of wider implications given the need to review local plans every 5 years – may be appropriate to ensure that there is a District wide strategy in place first followed by detailed implementation policies
- have a single local plan with large allocations 150+ units and smaller allocations through neighbourhood plans
- single local plan is simpler and clearer
- need a number of separate documents

- two plans are too complicated
- allocation of housing targets followed by identification of sites is more manageable in terms of community engagement
- need place based plans
- need to incorporate CWR SPD policies to ensure that these have the force of a local plan policy

Question 6

Cross border strategic matters need close working with not only neighbouring local authorities but also the key infrastructure providers. Government Guidance sets out the strategic priorities (National Planning Policy Framework 2012, paragraph 156) but are there any cross border issues that you consider particularly important, or which are not mentioned in the NPPF, that will need to be reflected in the local plan?

Response to Question 6:

Summary of Comments:

- Eastleigh and Fareham have strategic sites adjacent to the District
- Relationship with South Downs National Park – review border with SDNP
- Need better integration with SDNP where parishes/villages are split across both
- Concern there is a trend for permitting large development on borders
- This covers :- highways; health; education; road network; public transport; biodiversity/nature conservation; water and sewerage; wildlife corridors; drainage; flooding; emergency services
- concern about large scale development impacts on rural areas in Winchester district
- Fixation with housing numbers denies the relationship between those who live in the houses, where they work, shop etc – need to look wider than the local level.
- Needs to be more transparency on how councils are working together – how are housing targets shared
- Several environmental/landscape issues are cross border this needs a strategic overview – setting of Winchester now includes South Downs and should be revisited to prelude to any further growth of the city
- Housing need for WCC should provide flexibility to establish linkages with neighbouring authorities
- Commercial developments
- Request that the local plan has a bespoke policy recognising the interaction with SDNP, with reference to views looking out from and into the Park. Development outside of a protected landscape can harm its special qualities – cross boundary issues with SDNP – cover conserving and enhancing the natural beauty and cultural heritage; biodiversity; delivery of new homes

including provision for gypsies and travellers; sustainable tourism; safeguarding multi-user routes between SDNP and Winchester District.

- Must development Winchester and SDNP plans in tandem – Winchester has capacity to meet SDNPs unmet housing needs compared to other neighbouring authorities
- PUSH is an important cross broader issue – the strategic needs of PUSH should be met in full and Winchester should aim to deliver as much as possible

Question 7

The Council has a new Council Strategy which sets out 4 outcomes to be achieved across the District:

*Winchester District will be a premier business location;
Delivering quality housing options;
Improve the health and happiness of our community and
Improving the quality of the District's environment*

the local plan will reflect the land use requirements of these, are there any other broad matters that the local plan should also refer to?

Response to Question 7:

Yes	48.63%
No	19.18%
Not answered	32.19%

Summary of Comments:

- Not just about quality of housing need a lot more homes
- Need to cover care and welfare of young people
- Improving infrastructure and services
- Design quality
- Improve biodiversity, wildlife, nature conservation and public open space
- Need for key worker housing
- Green infrastructure
- Sustainable transport
- More attention to self builders
- Protect rural nature of the countryside around villages and protect green spaces between communities
- Population and housing density and available services
- What's the land use consequences of a premier business location?
- What is the relationship between the local plan and the Council strategy – these should not be separate documents
- Sport and recreation provision

- Housing affordability is a key issue - need a step change in housing delivery
- Build local houses for local people
- Introduce a south Hampshire green belt
- Need growth in employment opportunities
- Landscape character and natural capital
- Maintain the character and community cohesion of rural communities
- Implications of an ageing population
- Consider level of retail rents if there is a desire to be a premier business location
- Parking/park and ride and public transport all need addressing
- Health infrastructure is necessary to meet the needs of patients
- Climate change – both mitigation and adaptation need to be specifically referred to
- Winchester should be a major commercial centre and the local plan provides an opportunity to create a leading commercial centre to accommodate a wide range of businesses – there is not enough office space; local businesses feel the council does not reflect their needs; commercial developers feel unwelcome; not enough development of offices for start – ups and small businesses; Winchester is a weak economy dominated by the public sector, its heritage attracts short term visitors these do not provide a strong base on which to build a dynamic economy
- Resolve affordable housing issue – need whole plan affordable housing target with a flexible approach to delivery and a wide range of types
- Retain commercial development on edge of the city
- need a pro-business strategy and leadership to realise aim of being a premier business location
- Winchester is identified as a gateway to SDNP in SDNP local plan – need to ensure tourism benefits the city and links beyond
- Need to differentiate between premier business location and vibrant town centres
- Add heritage related businesses to the list
- Have regard to the PUSH area
- Business is too broad an expression need to clarify and define

Question 8

Local Plan Part 2 includes over 30 development management policies, are there any topics/issues not covered that it would be beneficial to have planning policy guidance on, or any matters that are covered which you consider unnecessary?

Response to Question 8:

Summary of comments :

- Include policy on space standards
- Rail infrastructure
- Consider local distinctiveness and character
- Reuse of existing buildings
- Annex buildings for the elderly/housing for the elderly
- Local policies at ward level
- Rewilding the District – great crested newts licensing
- Equestrians – particularly transport and travel plans
- More details on industrial developments
- Self build
- None of the DM policies support the objectives of enhancing wildlife and biodiversity
- Limiting extensions to small houses only applies to rural area but principle applies also to urban areas
- Need to cover sport and recreation
- Traffic management – transport and parking – sustainable transport
- Focus on economic activity
- Provision for environmental improvements
- Recycling facilities
- Walking, cycling routes
- Stronger focus on landscape – mature trees – public realm
- Health provision – medical facilities
- Affordable housing
- Borders of SDNP – include reference to the ‘landscape scale approach for the Winchester Urban Fringe’ currently being prepared
- Green belt
- Brownfield site policy
- Nitrogen neutral developments
- Strategic gaps
- Air pollution
- Preserving communities
- Urban regeneration
- Contemporary play strategy/policies are required
- Good design

- Airspace
- Local green space
- Climate change should feature more strongly
- Food retail/betting shops – hot food takeaways – healthy high street guidance
- Health and wellbeing
- Dementia friendly communities
- Lifetime homes – flexible and affordable accommodation
- Open space needs to reflect perceived quality/safety; physical activity opportunities; social cohesion
- Parking – cars, cycle etc
- Review of settlement boundaries – have policy to allow for flexible application

Question 9

Do you have any other comments on the development management policies?

Response to Question 9:

Summary of comments:

- Build cheaper houses
- Must keep new housing in Winchester to a minimum
- Low level housing for older people
- Market towns need transport and parking strategies; transport policy
- Infrastructure
- Management of land within development
- Electric charging points on streets
- Self build
- Simpler use of CIL
- Have lost detail on our landscape character and heritage
- Economic development
- Avoid using terms acceptable/unacceptable in policies
- Policies are too generic
- Inclusion of nationally described space standards needs to be justified and evidence based
- Need to strengthen policies on local centres; open space strategy; landscape policy
- Need to amend the settlement boundary around Winchester as it is too restrictive and does not allow for sustainable growth
- Incorporate SPDs into the local plan to give them more weight
- Trees and tree planting and the natural environment
- Airspace
- Local green space
- Energy and sustainability requirements

Question 10

Government guidance requires local plan policies to be viable taking into account evidence of infrastructure and all other policy requirements (affordable housing provision, open space and green infrastructure, access requirements etc) What in your experience are the main challenges for developers in delivering these or for communities in achieving them?

Response to Question 10:

Summary of comments;

- Restrictions on land available for development
- Developers want to maximise profits so do not wish to provide low cost housing
- Need infrastructure to ensure places are created not just housing
- Developers are allowed to use viability as a tool to amend plans
- Current policies do not allow for progress in meeting housing needs due to local opposition
- Too much is paid for the land so the project becomes unviable
- Small builders will be more committed
- Need to manage expectations of profit and cost plans appropriately to cover all requirements of infrastructure, design etc
- Need joined up approach to infrastructure provision
- Need settlement master plans to balance rates of delivery and infrastructure requirements
- Need to fully understand infrastructure requirements and costs etc
- Lack of transparency with regard to viability
- Need to optimise densities on sites
- Ensure that CIL rates and/or S106 are proportionate
- CIL is main constraint
- Must also deliver net gain in biodiversity and enhance ecological networks

Question 11

Do you have any other comments on the scope and content of the proposed local plan?

Response to Question 11:

Summary of comments:

- Development boundaries need to expand in all communities
- Health needs must be taken into consideration
- Relationship of WCC and SDNP and their strategic outcomes is fundamental to the balance of the District
- Local plan needs to refer to all non-motorised forms of transport

- Southern water requests policies on new utility infrastructure; prevention of development that leads to an unacceptable deterioration in water quality; phasing of development where existing capacity is insufficient to meet the increased demand; encourage water efficiency in all developments
- Should not ignore existing ribbons of development – these should not be placed in the countryside they form part of the settlement
- Allow village ‘infill’ for small builders
- Botley bypass offers opportunity for new development to address a number of longstanding issues – affordable housing; parking at the station; elderly accommodation etc
- Request Curbridge and Curdrige should continue to be included under rural villages policy
- Update biodiversity action plan
- Housing strategy is short sighted
- Travel infrastructure – rapid transport solution
- Thames Water – detailed comments in relation to water supply and sewerage/waste water treatment infrastructure
- Historic England - detailed comments in relation to the historic environment
- National Custom and Self Build Association – local plan needs to reflect government advice in relation to self build – with a target included and policy promoting self build opportunities
- Focus on re-use of brownfield sites
- Need to accommodate needs for travelling showpeople and allocate more sites
- Highways England – would be concerned if there is a material increase in traffic on strategic road network without consideration of mitigation measures
- Environment Agency – comments refer to improving and protecting water quality; mitigating and adapting effects of climate change; achieving biodiversity net gain; improving and protecting groundwater- suggest preparing an Environmental Infrastructure Plan
- Consider new development sites around Winchester including for park and ride; and future of River Park Leisure Centre site – need a city wide urban design framework