

Strategic Policy H3: Spatial Housing Distribution

Overview of Comments:

Support - 15

Neither support or object - 14

Object - 34

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

Comments in support of H3 - spatial housing distribution		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKA6-1 Durley Parish Council	Support the allocated sites and policies to support parish-led development so that villages are able to keep their character. Durley is a rural village and is unable to support additional housing.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N874-2 Kings Worthy Parish Council	Broadly support the draft local plan 2039 and the method of distributing future housing within the Winchester City Council area, particularly using brownfield sites first.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N8EM-9	Support the inclusion of Denmead as a Larger Rural Settlement. Given the settlement hierarchy evidence and scores the distribution of housing to the Larger Rural Settlements is relatively small. Denmead can accommodate a larger amount of growth and has significantly less dwellings allocated than Wickham which is directly comparable.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Comments on the settlement hierarchy and number of dwellings allocated to specific settlements are addressed below. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZF-Q	Agree that Denmead should be designated a Larger Rural Settlement and is capable of accommodating new	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change

	homes to meet the needs of the local community and the wider South Hampshire area.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZJ-U	Support the breakdown of 4,250 dwellings in the market towns / rural area and 1,410 in the Policy H3 settlements, including Kings Worthy. Agree there is space for 250 new dwellings in King Worthy which seems to include site KW04 and is supported.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N81K-K	Support the settlement hierarchy in Policy H3 which locates housing close to essential services, facilities and infrastructure, helping to achieve a sustainable pattern of development. But there should be a higher housing figure overall, allocated to the District's defined settlements, with provision for Denmead increased proportionately. Growth should be prioritised to areas with public transport and local facilities which are free of environmental designations. Promote a site at Denmead would form a logical extension and make a notable contribution to future housing needs close to PFSH neighbours.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Comments on the settlement hierarchy and number of dwellings allocated to specific settlements are addressed below. The updated Denmead Neighbourhood Plan will identify and allocate any sites needed to meet the housing target. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N8XU-4	Support the three spatial areas for housing development identified (Policy H1) and the settlement hierarchy outlined under Policy H3.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N8BS-C	Any unmet needs from neighbouring authorities should be directed towards the most sustainable Market Towns. Only 100 are directed towards Kings Worthy which represents a marginal increase in households of 5.5%. There is scope for much more growth within the Market Towns. Do not disagree with spatial distribution but caution against over reliance on PDL sites within Winchester Town, which need to be deliverable and of realistic	Comments noted, but representations regarding unmet needs from neighbouring authorities and the use of previously developed land are addressed in relation to representations on Policy H1. Comments on the settlement hierarchy and number of dwellings allocated to specific settlements are addressed below. Recommended response: No change

	capacities. Additional allocations within Market Towns will also deliver affordable housing, unlike most PDL sites.	
--	---	--

Comments which neither support nor object to H3 - spatial housing distribution		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N871-Y BHLF-KSAR-N87Q-Y BHLF-KSAR-N87B-G (3 comments)	<p>No objection to the distribution of development across the spatial areas and it is agreed that a hierarchy is useful in directing development to the most sustainable locations. The Settlement Hierarchy Review is a useful exercise, but the hierarchy should reflect the character and nature of the settlement.</p> <p>Denmead / Wickham / Bishops Waltham provide a range of facilities and services and their designation as Larger Rural Settlements is supported. The villages have the capacity to accommodate additional development in a sustainable location which will help enhance the vitality of the existing community.</p> <p>The plan's allocation of a new site for Wickham is actually in Knowle, a lower order settlement separated from Wickham by a settlement gap. No new development is proposed in Wickham which is inconsistent with the approach set out for the Larger Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Representations on the settlement hierarchy and number of dwellings allocated to specific settlements are addressed below. Comments on site allocations are dealt with in relation to the relevant site allocation policy.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8R2-U Hursley Parish Council	Developers argue that there will be significant pressure from PfSH to take a large allocation from the south of Hampshire. The local plan does not clarify this issue and the door for future overdevelopment in Winchester is left	Comments noted, but representations regarding unmet needs from neighbouring authorities and the Duty to Cooperate are

	<p>open. It would be prudent to wait and see what pressure is exerted by PfSH rather than speculate at this stage.</p> <p>The plan does not give enough information on the issues so residents are asked to approve a plan without a clear explanation of the uncertainties and risks of unnecessary development allocations.</p>	<p>addressed in relation to representations on Policy H1.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8T1-V	<p>It is not clear whether the figures stated in Policy H3 are targets, minimums or indicative for the purposes of decision-taking and monitoring. The NPPF requires the Local Plan to set housing requirements for designated neighbourhood areas: there are four designated neighbourhood areas in the District and no housing requirement has been established for any.</p> <p>Policy H3 should make it clearer which parts of the District fall within the Partnership for South Hampshire and housing proposed for each spatial area within PUSH should play a greater role in meeting unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.</p>	<p>Policies H1 and H2 refer to a total housing requirement of 'about 15,620 dwellings' and the figures in policy H3 are targets for the various spatial areas or settlements.</p> <p>It is not correct to suggest that there are no targets for the 4 neighbourhood plan areas within the District. One (Twyford) is in the South Downs and has a housing target set in the existing South Downs Local Plan. The 3 remaining neighbourhood plan areas within the rest of the District all have a housing target set in the draft Plan, at policies NA3 (New Alresford), D1 (Denmead) and HU1 (Hursley), albeit that Hursley has a zero neighbourhood plan housing requirement.</p> <p>The issue of addressing the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities is addressed in responding to comments on policy H1.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N868-5	<p>Support the aims of Policy H3, which correctly identifies Bishops Waltham as a Tier 1 settlement, but not enough</p>	<p>Comments noted. Representations</p>

	development is being proposed around Bishop's Waltham.	on the settlement hierarchy and number of dwellings allocated to specific settlements are addressed below. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZM-X	<p>No objection to the distribution of development across the spatial areas and it is agreed that a hierarchy is useful in directing development to the most sustainable locations. The Settlement Hierarchy Review is a useful exercise, but reliance on "scoring" alone can lead to a location being categorised inaccurately. The lower weighting of only 1 for a secondary school means that overall Swanmore scores lower than comparable settlements. The presence of a secondary school prevents a high number of trips being made by car which should be reflected within the weighting and overall score.</p> <p>Swanmore falls within the range for a Larger Rural Settlements whereas it is identified as an Intermediate Rural Settlement. It is equally as sustainable as Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy and Wickham which are allocated 1380 new dwellings, compared to 510 for Intermediate Rural Settlements. Swanmore should be a Larger Rural Settlement with a local plan allocation of at least 100 units.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Generally most secondary schools are accessible by bus to pupils. Clearly there is still a significant use of the private car – but on balance this was considered less critical than the presence of a primary school.</p> <p>However, the scoring of Swanmore has been reviewed in relation to other points raised in representations. The resulting revisions raise the scoring for Swanmore slightly, putting it into the Larger Rural Settlements group. The 2022 Settlement Hierarchy Review has been updated and the change reflected in the Local Plan's evidence base going forward.</p> <p>With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations. Recommended response: Amend Policy H3 to move Swanmore from the 'Intermediate Rural Settlements' category to the 'Larger Rural Settlements' category.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86X-5	Support the proposed spatial distribution of housing across the district and welcome the proposed allocation	Comments noted. The support is welcomed. The housing provision for each

	<p>at Otterbourne, which reflects its sustainability and the lack of development in the adopted Local Plan. For clarity it might be prudent for Policy H3 to indicate the settlement housing provision.</p>	<p>settlement is made up of several elements, not just the target for new site allocations. This is explained in the more comprehensive Development Allocations chapters for each spatial area and settlement. Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8RG-G</p>	<p>South Wonston scores 2 points for superfast broadband which is not available throughout the village, and for employment opportunities when most villagers work outside South Wonston. There is no doctor's surgery or health facility in South Wonston. This points system affects the possibility of development and it is vital that it is corrected</p> <p>South Wonston and Otterbourne are the only 'smaller intermediate' rural settlements to be given a housing allocation. Swanmore and Waltham Chase are not taking more housing because of developments that have been completed, but South Wonston should be treated the same due to Worthy Down. Wickham are allowed to take into account developments at Knowle, in the same parish. South Wonston is in an area of the highest levels of emission per capita so is not a sustainable location for development. It is surrounded by grade 3 agricultural farmland.</p>	<p>Comments noted. For the purposes of this study, the definition for 'Superfast Broadband' is 30Mbps (Megabytes per second) download speed or above. This was calculated from 5 different (where possible) postcodes within the settlements, spread equally around the centre and most Northern, Southern, East and Western points to ensure that the majority of the settlement had access to over 30Mbps download speed. There may be locations in any settlement that have slower speeds but the overall scoring is correct.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy methodology reflects that there is at least 1 employer in the settlement.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review reflects that there is not a GP surgery in South Wonston. It is noted that the IIA refers to a healthcare facility and this will be corrected as the plan progresses.</p>

		<p>Generally, the housing target is for new site allocations and, in any event, Worthy Down is outside and separate from South Wonston so would not contribute towards its housing target.</p> <p>Comments on site allocations are dealt with in relation to the relevant site allocation policy.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N867-4	<p>Policy H3 identifies Sutton Scotney as an 'Intermediate Rural Settlement' which represents a suitable location for some new housing. However, the Plan states that it is not possible to identify a new allocation at Sutton Scotney until foul drainage issues are resolved. Planning authorities should consider if infrastructure constraints can be overcome as an integral part of plan-making. There is a current capacity issue, but promote a site for 50-60 units which has no adverse effect on waste water and reduces the risk of surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Sutton Scotney is already included as an 'Intermediate Rural Settlement' in policy H3 and no change is needed in that respect.</p> <p>With regard to the scale of housing and potential site allocations within each settlement, these have been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations. The situation regarding foul drainage issues has been reviewed and proposed site allocations are considered in the relevant settlement section.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKZS-Q	<p>A number of sites within Curdridge have been positively assessed within the SHELAA, are free from statutory designations or constraints and should be considered for inclusion for residential development if needed. The plan relies on a number of previously allocated sites and the</p>	<p>Comments noted. All sites within the SHELAA have been assessed as potentially available, suitable and deliverable, but this does not mean that they should all be allocated for development in the new Local Plan. The</p>

	<p>number of new allocations is relatively small. Site promoted at Curdridge.</p>	<p>Plan sets out a spatial development strategy and to applies this when selecting sites for allocation. Curdridge is not a settlement that features highly in the settlement hierarchy so it does not have a housing target or site allocations. Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8B3-C</p>	<p>Support the aims of Policy H3, but Botley was not assessed in the Settlement Hierarchy Report November 2022. Fairthorne Manor is located close to Botley, with good walking and cycling opportunities. The importance of Botley and its influence on Fairthorne Manor needs to be considered and at present the evidence base is unsound.</p>	<p>Botley does not fall within the Winchester Local Plan area. Nonetheless, a significant amount of land east of Botley (in Curdridge Parish) has been promoted for development and it is considered it would be appropriate to include an assessment of Botley in the evidence base going forward. An initial assessment of the facilities available indicates that it is likely have a scoring comparable to a Market Town or Larger Rural Settlement.</p> <p>However, the Eastleigh Local Plan (2022) already allocates several sites around Botley, especially to the north (375 dwellings) and permission has been granted for over 100 dwellings within Winchester District, to the east of Botley, in conjunction with the development of Botley Bypass. Therefore, the level of housing provision already made at Botley is considerably higher than the Winchester Local Plan target for the Market Towns. Accordingly, there is no need to increase</p>

		<p>the housing allocations within Winchester District in the Botley area.</p> <p>In any event, Fairthorne Manor is separate from the Botley built-up area, but comments on omission sites are dealt with elsewhere. Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N87T-2	<p>The Local Plan policies provide for infilling in some settlements but excludes infilling in Settlement Gaps. This is counter intuitive because sites in gaps tend to be in sustainable locations adjoining settlement boundaries. Policy H3 effectively rules out any further infilling.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The purpose of settlement gaps is to prevent built development in areas that are vulnerable to the coalescence of settlements. Gaps are defined outside of built-up areas and after development requirements have been taken into account. Policy H4 deals with infilling, which is not referred to in policy H3. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKBD-G	<p>Large quantities of new housing in Winchester will have a negative impact on the environment, traffic congestion, air pollution and access to green spaces, destroying the character of the city.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, but the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly. Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8RU-X	<p>To promote sustainability and carbon neutrality, brownfield or under-utilised land and buildings should be used as a priority over greenfield. Opportunities for brownfield development exist in MTRAs which should be carefully explored.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan's strategy gives priority to brownfield allocations in all parts of the District, although the most substantial opportunities are in Winchester itself. The scale of the housing requirement means there is also a need for greenfield allocations. Recommended response: No change</p>

ANON-KSAR-N8Q5-W	Object to ancient woodland areas being included in sites allocated for development, including sites adjacent to ancient woodland where buffer zones are inadequate. Recognise the pressure to identify sites for housing and employment uses, which make it important that protection for ancient woodland and trees is upheld.	Comments noted. Where important natural features, including ancient woodland, are included within or adjoining site allocations these include requirements for it to be protected. Recommended response: No change
------------------	---	--

Comments which object to H3 - spatial housing distribution		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-N889-8 ANON-KSAR-N8S5-Y (2 comments)	Concerned that the Bushfield Camp development may result in subsequent development around Oliver's Battery. Object to development on South Winchester Golf Course, Texas Drive or the space between Hursley and Oliver's Battery (Royal Down). If Bushfield Camp is to be developed, it will important to protect the character and setting of Oliver's Battery from adjacent development.	Comments noted. The Bushfield Camp site allocation is carried forward from the existing Local Plan and applies to a defined area of land. There is no reason why this allocation should increase pressure on land around Oliver's Battery. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N81S-U (2 comments)	The distribution is weighted with the majority of new development in urban areas, with just 4,250 (27%) in the Market Towns and Rural Area, which comprises 12 settlements. This will concentrate services in the urban areas to the detriment of settlements across the rest of the District and the quality of life of those living there. This pattern is unsustainable as it will lead to people travelling to the larger urban areas. There should be a more even distribution across the three main areas including a greater number of sites within the MTRA.	Comments noted. Winchester Town and the South Hampshire Urban Areas are highly sustainable locations for development and the Local Plan's housing provisions reflect this. They are also influenced by the scale of existing completions and commitments. Nevertheless, a substantial level of development is allocated to the Market Towns and Rural Area.

	<p>Waltham Chase is one of the more sustainable settlements with a range of services and facilities. Object to the categorisation of Waltham Chase as an 'intermediate settlement' when WCC previously asked Shedfield Parish Council to accommodate 90-100 dwellings. The downgrading of Waltham Chase in the settlement hierarchy is not due to the sustainability credentials of the settlement. The Settlement Hierarchy Review should be updated to better reflect the level of services and facilities and Waltham Chase should be re-categorised as a 'larger rural settlement'.</p> <p>Promote land at Forest Farm, Waltham Chase (SH09) / South of Lower Chase Road (SH11) which scores equivalent to, or higher than, Morgan's Yard which has been rolled forward as an allocation. There is no overriding reason why SH09 / SH11 cannot be allocated to provide housing on a site which has no significant constraints and should be allocated for 100-140 / about 90 dwellings, with Policy H3 amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy scoring for Waltham Chase has been reviewed but is considered to correctly categorise the village as an Intermediate Rural Settlement.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned. Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N8YM-W ANON-KSAR-NKAB-D (2 comments)</p>	<p>Support the distribution of housing in Policy H3 and the wider development strategy. The overarching aim of the plan should be to identify the most appropriate locations for development to meet the identified need for the plan period, including unmet need in the southern part of the district.</p> <p>A mixed approach to site allocations will be necessary to achieve sustainable development consistent with the NPPF. The housing requirement and distribution should provide flexibility, and additional strategic allocations, acknowledging linkages with neighbouring authorities in South Hampshire which are part of PfSH. This places</p>	<p>Comments noted and support welcomed. The housing requirement does not necessitate additional strategic site allocations. Recommended response: No change</p>

	additional emphasis on sites such as Rareridge Lane, Bishop's Waltham which must be retained in the plan.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8R2-U Hursley Parish Council	<p>The settlement hierarchy exercise does not accurately record what facilities and services exist and has produced some very odd outcomes. Hursley, South Wonston and Sparsholt score the same as Winchester City under the public transport criteria despite having a limited service and on daily facilities Hursley and South Wonston are only 2 points below the City of Winchester. Hursley has been upgraded to an intermediate rural settlement, implying that Hursley is considered a sustainable settlement on the same scale as the much larger Otterbourne.</p> <p>Hursley parish has undertaken to produce a Neighbourhood Plan based on evidence of need, but is being expected to contribute circa 40-60 households over the planning period. This figure is an estimate and should be replaced by the figure determined by our own Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>Many rural villages such as Hursley face allocations of homes which will rely on the private car for most journeys, which will not contribute to the aim of net zero by 2030.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The information used to derive the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and corrected, as necessary. However, this has not affected the position of Hursley or the other settlements mentioned within the hierarchy. Inevitably some settlements may score the same as larger settlements for specific facilities but this does not invalidate the assessment, as it is not based on settlement size.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local plans to set housing targets for neighbourhood plans. The Local Plan's housing targets are for settlements rather than parishes, but the Plan includes no requirement to allocate additional sites in Hursley, as the City Council had already communicated a zero target, based on the existing Local Plan.</p> <p>While the Plan indicates that it would otherwise set a target of 50-60 dwellings, it does not do this for the reasons above. It is left to the emerging neighbourhood plan to identify any site allocations that it concludes are appropriate to meet the needs of the village.</p>

		Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5 Littleton and Harestock Parish Council	<p>The Plan gives the impression that all of the Sir John Moore Barracks site is previously developed land which is not the case. The area north of Winchester is proposed to accommodate approximately 3,000 new homes at King's Barton and Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB), which is 20% of the total Local Plan requirement.</p> <p>Concerned at the environmental impact of the scale of development proposed and that the in-combination effects have not been fully assessed. The impact of SJMB should be assessed in the context of the wider area including King's Barton.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The NPPF definition of previously developed land includes the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). The priority is to develop brownfield land but there may be currently undeveloped areas which are suitable for development.</p> <p>Winchester is the most sustainable location for development in the District and the area to the north of the town has the best current opportunities for the required level of development. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) assesses the cumulative impact of development and the Regulation 19 Local Plan will be accompanied by a Strategic Transport Assessment that will consider cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK5N-D	Support the proposal that Denmead should have a new housing allocation, but object to the low number of 100 new dwellings. Denmead is one of four Larger Rural Settlements, but the rationale for the distribution of dwellings among these settlements is not clear. Denmead scores well in the settlement hierarchy, has a large population and the 21 sites within or adjacent to	Comments noted. With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations. Denmead is updating its Neighbourhood Plan and any site

	<p>Denmead's settlement boundary could contribute 1,864 dwellings.</p> <p>The existence of an approval at Ravenswood, Knowle for 200 dwellings is the reason for Wickham's higher housing allocation figure, but Denmead's new allocation is only half of Wickham's when it has a much larger population and greater dwelling capacity. Denmead's new housing allocation should be at least 200 dwellings. There is also the option to reduce the number of new dwellings in Colden Common and Kings Worthy to enable Denmead's housing allocation to be increased as neither of these settlements match Denmead's facilities score, population or dwelling capacity.</p>	<p>allocations needed will be made through that process.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKJV-A	<p>Acknowledge that Winchester is the highest tier in the settlement hierarchy, with the South Hampshire Urban Areas continuing to provide growth, but there needs to be a balance between these areas and elsewhere in the district. Given the constraints on Winchester and the SHUA there is an opportunity for additional growth in sustainable settlements such as Wickham. A mixed approach to site allocations is necessary and consistent with the NPPF, which identifies the need to increase the number of medium sized sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N856-2	<p>Object to Wickham being included in larger rural settlements together with much larger settlements such as Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy, and being allocated more new housing than larger market towns (Bishops Waltham, New Alresford).</p>	<p>Comments noted. Overall Wickham is considered to be correctly categorised as a Larger Rural Settlement. The draft Plan envisages more housing development will take place at the larger market towns of New Alresford and Bishop's Waltham. The scale of housing</p>

	<p>Wickham & Knowle will have 400 new houses already allocated and 6000 new homes approx 2 miles away at Welborne, with the associated major pressure on roads and services. This development needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>The Plan says the council has worked positively with neighbouring local planning authorities and this will be set out in Statement of Common Ground but when will this Statement of Common Ground be available?</p>	<p>allocated to each category and settlement has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Statements of Common Ground are being produced so as to be available when the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan is published.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKUC-2	<p>A greater apportionment of housing to the Market Towns and Rural Area is justified, to contribute to sustainable patterns of development. This includes additional housing in Wickham, which is the fifth most sustainable settlement within the Plan area. The proposed 'new' allocation at Wickham already benefits from planning permission and is located at Knowle. Knowle and Wickham are different settlements and Knowle falls within the 'Smaller Rural Settlements' category.</p> <p>The spatial strategy does not distribute growth by Parish yet, in the case of Wickham, the Plan appears to adopt the Parish boundary without any reasonable justification. This simply reflects the preferences of the Parish Council but the site performs poorly compared to alternatives.</p> <p>Our land interest is excluded from shortlist of sites as WCC appear to have excluded any site that does not directly adjoin the existing settlement boundary. Land South of Titchfield Lane adjoins the built form of the settlement and the exclusion of site WI19 from the shortlist is arbitrary,</p>	<p>Comments noted. Winchester Town and the South Hampshire Urban Areas are highly sustainable locations for development and the Local Plan's housing provisions reflect this. They are also influenced by the scale of existing completions and commitments. Nevertheless, a substantial level of development is allocated to the Market Towns and Rural Area.</p> <p>The scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p>

	particularly as it performs well compared to those alternatives shortlisted.	Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NKJC-Q	<p>The settlements listed under the ‘South Hampshire Urban Areas’ should be expanded to all those within the PfSH boundary. The contribution such settlements make to meeting unmet needs in the PfSH sub-area is a strategic cross boundary policy matter that the PfSH authorities have signed up to co-operate on. The contribution from settlements like Wickham need to be reassessed in this context, having additional regard to the fact this settlement abuts the SDNP, where there are likely to be substantial additional unmet needs.</p> <p>Wickham should make an additional contribution over and above existing allocations, including reassessing options abutting the urban edge, such as Wickham Golf Club. There is potential to release part of the course for a modest level of growth, retaining of part of the course and the driving range and clubhouse in situ.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The ‘South Hampshire Urban Areas’ is a spatial area defined by the Local Plan which is not intended to correspond with the area covered by PfSH.</p> <p>Overall Wickham is considered to be correctly categorised as a Larger Rural Settlement. The scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement has been reviewed to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific ‘omission’ sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N859-5	<p>Object to Colden Common being given a target for housing numbers, particularly in light of the recent government announcement to drop housebuilding targets. The target for Colden Common should be removed and transferred to locations with better infrastructure and less dependency on car transport. Growth in Colden Common is not sustainable due to the lack of facilities, infrastructure and transport links.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There remains a substantial housing requirement (see responses to comments on policy H1) and the Local Plan must define a development strategy and settlement hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy Review 2022 concluded that Colden Common is a relatively sustainable location which should receive an appropriate housing target.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>

BHLF-KSAR-N8ZX-9	<p>The Plan proposes a further 90-100 homes in Colden Common which would require building on Countryside surrounding the village and has no support from residents. The sites put forward by the Parish Council are a last resort, should Winchester City Council not heed the major issues and concerns raised. These include the impact of development on carbon footprint and the environment, flooding, pollution, Colden Common Village Design Statement, traffic, services and amenities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There remains a substantial housing requirement (see responses to comments on policy H1) and the Local Plan must define a development strategy and Colden Common is a relatively sustainable location that should receive an appropriate housing target. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) concludes that this is possible without significant adverse effects. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK2A-W	<p>No objection to the distribution of development across different spatial areas and a hierarchy is useful in directing development to the most sustainable locations. The Settlement Hierarchy Review is useful but do not agree with the conclusions in relation to Swanmore.</p> <p>Swanmore provides a wide range of facilities and services, so its relegation to an Intermediate Rural Settlement is not supported. It has a Post Office and a convenience store, which the review does not award points for, and could receive another point for the daily bus service. Only 1 point is awarded for having a secondary school. Swanmore is as sustainable as Colden Common and Denmead, so should be in the Larger Rural Settlement category and receive a 90-100 house allocation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is accepted that Swanmore has a post office service, this will be now reflected in the Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper. A change to score is needed, to add 1 point.</p> <p>Swanmore already has a score of 2 for a daily convenience store. The bus service is considered insufficient justification for an additional point to be awarded.</p> <p>Generally most secondary schools are accessible by bus to pupils. Clearly there is still a significant use of the private car – but on balance this was considered less critical than the presence of a primary school.</p>

		<p>The scoring for Swanmore is therefore raised slightly, putting it into the Larger Rural Settlements group. The 2022 Settlement Hierarchy Review has been updated by the Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper and this change is therefore reflected in the Local Plan's evidence base going forward.</p> <p>With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this will be reviewed in due course to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy H3 to move Swanmore from the 'Intermediate Rural Settlements' category to the 'Larger Rural Settlements' category.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8RD-D	<p>Policy H3 is contrary to the Council's evidence and local data. The Settlement Hierarchy Review ranks and classifies settlements in the District, based on the availability and accessibility of a broad range of facilities, a settlement's economic role and the environmental constraints to development. Despite Swanmore being classified as an Intermediate Rural Settlement within Policy H3, the detailed scoring demonstrates it should be classified as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'. Swanmore's facilities score only 1 less point than three other villages within the 'Larger Rural Settlement' category.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is accepted that the scoring for Swanmore should be raised slightly (see above), putting it into the Larger Rural Settlements group. The 2022 Settlement Hierarchy Review has been updated by the Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper and this change is therefore reflected in the Local Plan's evidence base going forward.</p>

	<p>In light of the sustainability of Swanmore and its correct position in the settlement hierarchy, the level of development proposed is insufficient. If growth is effectively prevented by the Local Plan this would have an adverse impact on existing facilities in the village which may become unsustainable and unviable. Swanmore demonstrates the characteristics of the other Larger Rural Settlements and should be expected to provide for 85-200 dwellings, in accordance with Paragraph 9.26 of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The settlement boundary should be extended to incorporate land to the north of Lower Chase Road, which is considered to be a part of the built-up area of the village. There are no sites within the settlement boundary of Swanmore which would support the delivery of windfall development as currently envisaged. There are opportunities to accommodate a some of the anticipated sub-regional unmet need at Swanmore, which is within the part of the District that falls within PfSH.</p>	<p>With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this will be reviewed in due course to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy H3 to move Swanmore from the 'Intermediate Rural Settlements' category to the 'Larger Rural Settlements' category.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKZU-S	<p>The assumption of 450 additional homes in Market Towns and Rural Areas does not represent positive planning and further allocations should be considered within this area to provide continued vibrancy and vitality of rural communities.</p> <p>Shedfield Parish is identified as suitable for 50-60 dwellings and should deliver its 'fair share' of housing. Shedfield Parish Council has provided evidence with regard to alternative sites that would be suitable for housing. Site SH26 would deliver low-density self-custom build housing,</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy H3 proposes 4,250 dwellings in the Market Towns and Rural Area, of which 785 are new allocations. Many others are allocations remaining to be completed from the existing Local Plan. The figure of 450 new allocations is not, therefore, recognised as the level of additional housing proposed.</p>

	<p>including affordable custom build. There is an unmet housing need for this tenure that should be planned for.</p>	<p>The information used to derive the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and corrected, as necessary. However, this has not affected the position of Shirrell Heath (where site SH26 is located) within the hierarchy. The figure of 50-60 dwellings relates to the settlement of Waltham Chase, not to Shirrell Heath, which has no specific housing target.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8Z4-5</p>	<p>The overall approach to the location of housing is largely focussed on the approach of the existing local plan, with an element of other options, notably a focus on Winchester and other larger settlements and one or more new strategic allocations. Policy H3 includes Shedfield within the 'Remaining Rural Area', the lowest tier of the settlement hierarchy which has a housing provision of 950 dwellings between 2019 and 2039 (500 of which are in the SDNP).</p> <p>The provision of additional housing allocations in the remaining rural area, particularly in settlements without a settlement boundary would help to deliver additional homes in accordance with Government aspirations. This could include the land at the corner of Sandy Lane and Botley Road site given that this is deliverable and developable within SHELAA assessments.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional housing generally, or additional site allocations in the rural area (see responses to comments on policy H1).</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>

ANON-KSAR-NKKF-U	<p>Otterbourne is identified as an intermediate settlement in the 2022 Settlement Hierarchy with a moderate level of services and facilities. Otterbourne offers everyday facilities, and good public transport links, is close to other settlements and accessible to a significant number of amenities and services within walking/cycling distance. This is commensurate with a much larger settlement and Otterbourne should be considered with other nearby settlements as a suitable location for proportionate levels of growth.</p> <p>The growth apportioned to Otterbourne is minor in scale with only one allocation on a site that is questionable in terms of its ability to deliver 55 units. The area could accommodate a greater contribution and land off Cranbourne Drive is largely unconstrained, physically and visually contained and can deliver 55 to 70 homes alongside benefits to the local community. It should be considered a more suitable option for growth.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The information used to derive the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and corrected, as necessary. However, this has not affected the position of Otterbourne within the hierarchy. With regard to the scale of housing allocated to each category and settlement, this will be reviewed in due course to take account of the overall housing requirement, existing commitments and potential site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N83Q-U	<p>The division into three spatial areas is accepted but the overall level of housing proposed is insufficient in meeting housing needs. The way in which the spatial strategy has translated into housing allocations in Policy H3, specifically in the market towns and rural areas is questionable.</p> <p>Otterbourne is designated as an Intermediate Rural Settlement but this broad approach treats each settlement in isolation with no consideration of facilities in neighbouring settlements within reasonable walking or cycling distance. The only daily facilities/services which are not contained in Otterbourne are within the directly adjacent settlements, meaning that all daily facilities/services are</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional housing (see responses to comments on policy H1).</p> <p>The hierarchy focuses upon the services within each settlement, as that is more easily quantifiable in a way which can be summarised and inform the emerging development strategy. The methodology for the settlement hierarchy is set out in the background paper, and the relative merits and</p>

	<p>within walking or cycling distance. Otterbourne's score should be corrected and its categorisation in the hierarchy changed to a Larger Rural Settlement.</p> <p>The Plan should recognise the greater sustainable merits of Otterbourne and further development should be allocated (land at Kiln Lane promoted). Otterbourne is also ideally located to contribute to meeting the unmet housing needs of the PfSH area.</p>	<p>limitations are discussed in that paper. Overall, it is considered that the methodology is appropriate in considering the relative sustainability of a settlement.</p> <p>The comments regarding the proximity of other facilities (at Otterbourne Hill and Shawford) are noted. The assessment of Otterbourne in the 2022 study identify it as being in the lower end of the range of intermediate rural settlements, and on balance the presence of additional services 800m and 3km away is not sufficient justification to conclude the outcome is incorrect.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the proximity of individual facilities is assessed in the sustainability appraisal of each site promoted for development in the Integrated Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKME-V	<p>There is a need for increased provision within the district which should be directed to the South Hampshire area in particular. At North Whiteley substantial investment is being made in the delivery of new homes, green spaces and physical and community infrastructure. This can be</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional site allocations in South Hampshire (see responses to comments on policy H1). North Whiteley is the largest strategic</p>

	<p>continued through allocating site CU32 as an enlargement to North Whiteley. Land west of Fairthorne Grange Farm and at Brindle Farm (CU32) has a capacity of c.356 homes and is well placed to meet increased housing provision in South Hampshire. Policy H3 should be amended to include the site as an additional allocation adjoining North Whiteley.</p>	<p>allocation in the Local Plan (3,500 dwellings) and this development is expected to continue for much of the Local Plan period. It provides the necessary infrastructure to serve the development planned and there is no need to expand North Whiteley further in the way suggested. To do so would extend development into a rural area where it would be poorly related to the facilities and services being provided at North Whiteley.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N863-Z</p>	<p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review (Nov 2022) fails to recognise a number of services within Curdridge, including daily needs retail, bus service and children's play area. Correcting this would increase the sustainability score for Curdridge, which should have a settlement boundary and be looked at as an option for accommodating growth.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The conclusions reached by the Settlement Hierarchy Review have been revisited following comments about how it deals with Curdridge and Botley. As a result, it is necessary to be clearer about which facilities relate more to Curdridge and which to Botley.</p> <p>The railway line is a sensible dividing point, with facilities to the west (Botley Station, petrol station, convenience store, industrial estate) relating more to Botley. This is emphasised by the recent consent for housing development</p>

		<p>between the built-up area of Botley and Bottings Industrial Estate, which will bring these areas into the built-up part of Botley.</p> <p>Therefore, the presence of a shop at the petrol station does not affect the assessment for Curdridge and the removal of Botley Station would reduce Curdridge's score by 2 points. The most recent timetable for the 28 Botley – Fareham bus (April 2023) states it runs only a few buses a day and not at weekends. The settlement already receives scoring for an infrequent bus service which is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The Reading Room play area is included in the Council Open Space assessment, so this should be recognised – adding 2 points. There is no county council library at Curdridge and no post office.</p> <p>Overall these amendments would not change the scoring of Curdridge. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKTJ-8	Policy H3 cannot be considered 'justified', nor consistent in the assessment of development opportunities and site selection. Littleton is the closest village to Winchester, less than 600m at its closest point, and benefits from local centres of Weeke and Harestock within 2km. Despite this proximity the Village is categorised as one of the least	Comments noted. The hierarchy focuses upon the services within each settlement, as that is more easily quantifiable in a way which can be summarised and inform the emerging development strategy.

	<p>sustainable.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates Sir John Moore Barracks, located within Littleton and Harestock, to serve the housing requirement of Winchester City, which is rightly categorised as the most sustainable settlement within the District. Other brownfield sites within the village, such as Littleton Nursery, should also part of the 'brownfield first' strategy. Both sites lie within Littleton, are equidistant from services and facilities within Winchester, and are brownfield. It cannot be the case that one supports the delivery of housing in Winchester City and the other is in an unsustainable rural village.</p> <p>The categorisation of Littleton within the Settlement Hierarchy is misplaced and cannot be justified.</p>	<p>Sir John Moore Barracks is a major site which is being released from military use. It is important for the Local Plan to consider the future use of the site for this reason, not simply because it is brownfield site. It is logical that it should be treated as an extension of Winchester as it adjoins the Winchester built-up area, unlike Littleton Nursery.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N81U-W	<p>The distribution is weighted with the majority of new development in urban areas, with just 4,250 (27%) in the Market Towns and Rural Area, which comprises 12 settlements. This will concentrate services in the urban areas to the detriment of settlements across the rest of the District and the quality of life of those living there. This pattern is unsustainable as it will lead to people travelling to the larger urban areas. There should be a more even distribution across the three main areas including a greater number of sites within the MTRA.</p> <p>There are a number of sites, including KW05 – Land at Springvale Road, Kings Worthy; SWA10 – Land at Field Farm, Swanmore; and CC07 – Tanglewood Equestrian Centre, Colden Common which have scored equivalent to or higher than the sites allocated in the plan. Accordingly,</p>	<p>Winchester Town and the South Hampshire Urban Areas are highly sustainable locations for development and the Local Plan's housing provisions reflect this. They are also influenced by the scale of existing completions and commitments. Nevertheless, a substantial level of development is allocated to the Market Towns and Rural Area.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlements concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>

	there is no overriding reason why these sites cannot be allocated to accommodate the additional development likely to be needed and also to address the imbalanced distribution across the District.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZD-N	The Plan's strategy for relies heavily on existing allocations and previously developed sites and fails to adequately apportion growth to the 'Market Towns and Rural Area'. The Plan must improve the volume and diversity of housing supply through the allocation of additional sites within the Market Towns and Rural Area. This will help reinforce the vitality of existing infrastructure and amenities, and urban growth at Winchester or the South Hampshire Area cannot address issues of rural housing affordability or prevent 'rural stagnation'.	Comments noted. It is not accepted that the Plan relies excessively on existing allocations or previously developed sites, or that there is a need for additional site allocations in the Market Towns and Rural Area (see responses to comments on policy H1). Substantial development has taken place and continues to be planned in the MTRA area and there is no evidence of 'rural stagnation'. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NK79-T	There is double counting for the Southern part of the district. Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Wickham, Otterbourne, Waltham Chase are in PfSH area so the actual contribution is much more than the 5,700 listed in H3. This should be clarified as it is very misleading.	Comments noted. The figure of 5,700 dwellings relates to the South Hampshire Urban Areas, which consists primarily of West of Waterlooville and Whiteley. This is a separate spatial area from the Market Towns and Rural Area, which has provision for 4,250 dwellings in the Regulation 18 Local Plan and contains the settlements listed by the respondent. There is no double counting and the Plan's spatial strategy is set out in policy SP2. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-N85G-K	The basis for the distribution between the three components of the District is unclear. South Hampshire has been the main focus for growth yet the numbers in the rural	Comments noted. The draft Local Plan's housing provision in the South Hampshire Urban Areas was higher than

	<p>settlements and the City far exceed South Hampshire. Consideration must be given to the impact of traffic from new housing along the B3335 and B2177 corridors passing through the historic core of Twyford.</p> <p>There is inadequate provision made for mitigating the harm caused by new development and works to mitigate this should be a prior requirement of development, including the application of CIL. This should be tied to upgrading cycling facilities.</p>	<p>in the MTRA or Winchester Town areas, although the scale of new allocations were smaller. This is because the SHUA area contains two strategic allocations which are still being developed and where there is limited scope for expansion.</p> <p>Where site allocations are made they include requirements for infrastructure provision or improvement, including transport, where necessary and justified.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8M8-V	<p>The spatial strategy is unsound when the wider Vision and Objectives of the Plan are considered against the policies proposed. The Plan should increase the overall level of housing growth, with a greater proportion of at Winchester Town. Increasing growth assigned to Winchester Town would be a proactive response to addressing unmet housing needs from the PfSH area and to facilitate reductions in commuting flows into the main urban area.</p> <p>Maintaining the existing spatial distribution of employment across the district would mean that Winchester Town would generate 5,150 additional jobs within the plan period, which would require around 6,000 new homes to be planned for at Winchester Town to maintain the status quo. Over 7,000 new homes would be needed to reduce commuting flows by 10% and a higher increase could achieve a more pronounced reversal. The strategy does not include a specific uplift to address the affordability challenges at</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional housing provision generally, or site allocations in the Winchester Town spatial area (see responses to comments on policy H1).</p> <p>While Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly. The housing requirement does not necessitate additional strategic site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>

	<p>Winchester, and the Council should consider this as part of a positive response to structural challenges that exist within the housing market.</p> <p>A positive decision to allocate further MDA scale development at Winchester (land to the north of Wellhouse Lane promoted) would increase the potential for 40% affordable housing to be delivered.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8QS-U	<p>The spatial strategy is essential to mitigating carbon from transport sources, but the Plan does not follow from the evidence base. Far from concentrating development allocations at Winchester, the most sustainable settlement in the District, the plan does almost the opposite. This arises from the strategy being, largely, to extend the plan period by 8 years and “roll forward” allocations of the previous plan. The spatial approach fundamentally conflicts with the evidence base, including the Transport Assessment Stage 1 report; draft Hampshire Local Transport Plan 4; Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) and the Settlement Hierarchy Review.</p> <p>Of the four spatial options, option 1 was demonstrably the most sustainable. The draft Plan conflicts with the draft LTP4 vision whose outcomes cannot be delivered where the spatial distribution compounds existing car dependency, and the Transport Assessment Stage 1. Focusing development in Winchester Town would perform most favourably in terms of reducing carbon emissions and air pollution and has increased potential to create or consolidate 15 minute neighbourhoods. The Transport Assessment Stage 1 identifies that Winchester Town</p>	<p>Comments noted. While Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly.</p> <p>It is agreed that approach 1 is the most sustainable of the 4 options consulted on at the Strategic Issues and Priorities stage. The Local Plan is based on this approach, with modifications to improve its sustainability, reflect site availability and suitability, and take account of the comments made.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>

	provides the highest levels of service and supporting infrastructure for public transport, walking and cycling.	
ANON-KSAR-N81F-E	<p>Support growth in and around Winchester Town, the overarching aim should be to identify the most appropriate locations for sustainable development to meet the identified development need. A mixed approach to site allocations is necessary, consistent with the NPPF which identifies the need to increase the number of medium sized sites coming forward, whilst also advocating the benefits of strategic scale developments.</p> <p>In light of the unmet housing needs in PfSH, the minimum housing requirement and distribution for Winchester District needs to be updated and should provide flexibility, and additional strategic allocations, acknowledging established linkages with neighbouring authorities. Sites such as land at Salters Lane should be acknowledged within the draft plan as an allocation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional housing provision generally, or site allocations in the Winchester Town spatial area (see responses to comments on policy H1).</p> <p>While Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly. The housing requirement does not necessitate additional strategic site allocations.</p> <p>Comments on specific 'omission' sites are addressed in relation to the settlement concerned.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N85J-P	The existing data demonstrates that Winchester Town is the only location within the District that enables truly sustainable travel patterns to become established and has the greatest affordable housing need. Development at Winchester Town is the most appropriate way to respond to the climate emergency and affordable housing need and it is appropriate to allocate a greater percentage of all new development in and around Winchester city.	<p>Comments noted. While Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK21-D	In part this policy replicates the provisions of Policy SP2. Object to the distribution which should have a greater focus on Winchester Town. The 5,670 dwellings should be	Comments noted. Policy H3 expands on, and adds detail to, the spatial strategy set out in policy SP2.

	<p>expressed as a minimum and the required site allocations need to be increased to reflect our objections to H1.</p>	<p>While Winchester is the most sustainable location for new development in the District, the Local Plan recognises that there are significant constraints and sets an appropriate housing target accordingly. Recommended response: No change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N8Q1-S</p>	<p>The current distribution and allocation of housing growth is unjustified as it does not allow a variety of land to come forward where it is needed. The southern parts of the district are set to deliver at least 7,823 homes (50% of overall housing) despite representing c.30% of the district's population and c.19% of its area. 38% is planned in Winchester (including Kings Worthy) with a further 3% in the South Downs National Park. This leaves only modest growth in the northern areas of the district outside of Winchester and the national park.</p> <p>1,859 homes previously attributed to South Hampshire's unmet need in the 2021 PfSH Statement of Common Ground are now being offset against needs outside the PfSH area, demonstrating that the Council believes there is market fluidity between the PfSH part of the district and the centre and north. It follows that development in the centre and north could equally help needs arising in the PfSH area.</p> <p>A sizeable portion of development within the PfSH area of Winchester district will need to be allocated to unmet needs rather than Winchester's. Additional development is needed here to meet the PfSHs most recent assessment of its</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not accepted that there is a need for additional housing provision generally, or to meet the unmet needs of neighbouring PfSH authorities (see responses to comments on policy H1).</p> <p>The Plan sets out an appropriate distribution of development, based on the results of the Integrated Impact Assessment, evidence base and public consultation on the Strategic Issues and Priorities (SIP) document. The SIP consultation included the option of a new settlement or strategic allocation and this resulted in the clear rejection of this option.</p> <p>Micheldever Station is in a relatively remote part of the District which is least well-placed to serve any significant needs in a sustainable way. Adequate provision is made to contribute towards the unmet needs of PfSH authorities and</p>

	<p>unmet need (20,000 homes). Additional homes are needed elsewhere in the district to meet Winchester's local housing need and achieve a balanced pattern of growth. For example, the Council could allocate Micheldever Station in to meet its own needs, freeing up sites in the south to be allocated to PfSH's unmet needs. The Council has not actively explored this option or shown that it is not a sustainable way of meeting housing needs.</p>	<p>there is no need to free up sites in the south of the District to achieve this. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8G3-H	<p>There is an over-reliance on large strategic housing allocations which are prone to infrastructure and cash-flow delays. More smaller sites should be encouraged to sustain local communities rather than major strategic sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This issue is dealt with in the section responding to comments on policy H1. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8WJ-R	<p>In view of the government's altered stance towards enforcing housing allocations and the fact that Denmead has met its housing commitment if the number of windfall sites are taken into consideration, the requirement for 100 further houses in Denmead is unwarranted and in contravention to a number of the policies in this document.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The issue of the Government's advice on meeting housing requirements is dealt with in the section responding to comments on policy H1. The housing requirement for specific settlements is for new site allocations, over and above existing completions, commitments and windfall. Such a requirement is justified given the level of additional development needed and to ensure a consistent approach reflecting the Plan's spatial strategy. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S	<p>What does Remaining in Rural Area mean? No definition or indication as to site locations which is unhelpful to residents worried about over development.</p>	<p>The reference to the 'remaining rural area' in policy H3 refers to the parts of the Market Towns and Rural Area outside the settlements listed. Paragraph 9.26 of the Plan explains that planning policies allow for modest development within defined settlements,</p>

		<p>which is reflected in the windfall allowance for this area, and provision made through the South Downs National Park Local Plan. There is no intention to allocate additional sites in this area, as confirmed by the zero entry under the 'New Allocations Proposed' column in policy H3.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
--	--	---

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	<p>No recommendations are included in relation Policy H3. The level of housing provision for the District is set out to have regard for the Government's Standard Method calculation and it is therefore not considered appropriate to include recommendations in relation to this policy area.</p> <p>The spatial strategy for the District is implemented through the allocation of sites included in the plan. The appraisal of site options has informed the selection of sites for allocation. Furthermore, throughout the IIA, recommendations are included relating to the topic based policies against which proposals for the development of allocated sites will be decided upon.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
Comments from HRA	None.	N/A

Strategic Policy H3: Spatial Housing Distribution

Amendments to policy

In order to achieve the housing proposed for each spatial area (Policy H1) housing development will be permitted to achieve the following distribution (2019-2039 **2020-2040**):

Spatial Area	Settlement / Area	Housing Provision	New Allocations Proposed
Winchester Town		5,640	1,410
	Winchester	5,670	1,460
South Hampshire Urban Areas		5,650 5,700	500 440
	Newlands (West of Waterlooville), including Newlands		
	Whiteley		
	Botley		
Market Towns and Rural Area		3,825 4,250	965 785
	Market Towns	1,375 1,380	200
	Bishop's Waltham		
	New Alresford		
	Larger Rural Settlements	1,570 1,410	610 490
	Colden Common		
	Denmead		
	Kings Worthy		
	Swanmore		
	Wickham		
	Intermediate Rural Settlements	360 510	155 95

	Hursley		
	Otterbourne		
	South Wonston		
	Sutton Scotney		
	Swanmore		
	Waltham Chase		
	Remaining Rural Area	520 950 (500* in SDNP area, 450** in remaining area)	0
Winchester District		15, 115 15,620	2,875 2,685

* Agreed with SDNP Authority

** ~~Based on completions, commitments and windfall - no expectation of additional housing to be identified.~~