

SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North

- Support - 1
- Neither support of object - 11
- Object - 32

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 SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-N814-V	I support this Policy SW01 but I really want to support the Settlement Boundary Adjustment to the south for which there wasn't a tab to press in this consultation. I support the settlement boundary adjustment under para 14.125 for the Land off Chaucer Close. Several SHELAA submissions and representations have been made over the last 10-12 years for at least the east end (shown darker green) colouring being a natural extension into on otherwise redundant and now derelict parcel of land immediately to the west of Nos 1 and 2 Cottages. I cannot speak for the owners of the rear gardens of the dwellings to the south west but this darker green area would provide more than adequate access to serve the modest number of dwellings that could be accommodated within the land area as a part or whole of the proposed boundary adjustment	Comments noted and support welcomed. Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N8B6-F	Summary of the representation received. Additional info saved on SP. Site Location	(This representation was submitted under SW07 Swanmore, but refers to this site allocation at South Wonston, which was SW07 in the SHELAA)

	<p>2.1. The subject site is held under an option to Beechcroft Land Ltd who are actively promoting the site for residential purposes.</p> <p>POLICY SW01 – WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION PLAN NOVEMBER 2022</p> <p>ITEM 1 – SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION.</p> <p>4.1. As above we support the proposed allocation at policy SW01 of the RCP for the following reasons.</p> <p>4.2. The existing Local Plan's spatial strategy will be carried forward to an extent, but there is a requirement to evolve this to provide for future housing needs in locations which are most sustainable, and which can best meet the District's needs. Most of the development contemplated in the existing Local Plan now has planning permission. This means that there is a requirement for new sites to be allocated to meet the needs of those short, medium and long term.</p> <p>4.3. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) confirms in paragraph 11 that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan making this means that: 'all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet the development needs of their area....'</p> <p>4.4. Details relating to housing needs and provisions for the District are provided in Table H2 of the RCP. Provision is made for the development of about 15,620 dwellings over the local plan period from 2019 to 2039. In terms of distribution, it is proposed that 4,250 dwellings are to be allocated in market towns and rural areas (Strategic Policy H1).</p> <p>4.5. This strategy reflects the advice provided within the Framework where</p>	<p>Comments noted. The support for both the wider strategy of the plan and this particular allocation are welcomed.</p> <p>The availability of the site is also noted.</p> <p>The detailed representation contained an indicative scheme including possible numbers and disposition of housing. The layout and site design included a proposed location for site access from West Hill Road.</p> <p>The allocation in the Reg 18 Plan does not represent any judgement or endorsement of the developers' scheme – including the housing numbers and types.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>it is established in Paragraph 78 that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is echoed in the new PPG on rural housing. Equally, Paragraph 68 of the Framework makes clear that small and medium-sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly.</p> <p>4.6. South Wonston is identified within the RCP as an 'Intermediate Rural Settlement' and in such settlements, new sites to accommodate around 50 to 60 dwellings are to be identified. Paragraph 14.124 of the RCP confirms that there is the capacity for the development of around 70 dwellings at South Wonston.</p> <p>4.7. It is considered entirely reasonable that South Wonston is capable of accommodating up to 70 dwellings and that 40 of these dwellings are to be located on land at West Hill Road North. South Wonston has a number of facilities and services as detailed in Chapter 2 above, including leisure, retail, medical and educational facilities. Furthermore, there are good public transport links to the nearby towns of Winchester, Whitchurch and Andover, all of which provide more extensive services and facilities along with employment opportunities.</p> <p>4.8. Furthermore, it is considered that the allocation of additional housing within South Wonston will meet the needs of the Parish which have been set out in recent survey work. It has therefore been established locally that there is a community need for the provision of market and affordable housing which this scheme would provide. Thus, it is our view that the additional housing within South Wonston would realise local community aspirations.</p> <p>4.9. In relation to the allocation of the site at Land at West Hill Road North, (Policy SW01) for residential purposes, this allocation is fully supported at</p>	
--	--	--

	this location as it offers an opportunity for South Wonston to grow in a logical manner (providing a logical rounding-off of the built-up area) which is reminiscent of the existing settlement pattern of the village. In addition to this, development in this location will inherently support local services and facilities, particularly as it borders the existing built form and is in close walking distance to existing services and facilities.	
--	---	--

Comments which neither support nor object to SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N8BE-X Environment Agency Link here	<p>Based on the information currently available, the site raises some environmental concerns that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Further work will be needed to show how these issues can be satisfactorily addressed to ensure no environmental impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPZ • Principal Aquifer <p>Water Quality The protection of the groundwater will need to be considered as part of this site - specific policy.</p>	<p>Comments regarding groundwater sensitivity are noted and a criterion will be added to the policy to ensure that proposals take this into account:</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add new criteria – ‘xi Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.’ An explanation will also be added to the supporting text to explain the reason for this new criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add additional text to end of paragraph 14.131 as follows:</p>

		‘As the site is located on a principal aquifer, any proposed development will need to avoid any contamination to this aquifer.’
BHLF-KSAR-N86Z-7	<p>GP Surgeries South Wonston Sutton Scotney Gratton Surgery (Main and Branch) NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB - Primary Care Response</p> <p>The GP surgery that serves these potential sites are currently have capacity for 1,404 patients as of October 2022 in terms of estate, but the practice feel that should the sites proposed be developed, they would require further workforce. The surgery has already seen an increase of 300 in the last year, which, should it continue, will reduce the capacity shown above to zero before the Local Plan is adopted. Additionally, the PCN base some of their ARRS staff in this location, as one of the few with capacity across the locality.</p> <p>Gratton Surgery note that the national accepted average is around between 1,800 - 2,000 patients per WTE GP, and they have 2,100 patients per WTE already. They currently employ a model in the practice using Advance Nurse Practitioners to do on the day work, however more patients would require more GP time and Nurse time.</p> <p>Winchester City Council – Local Plan Policies Due to the additional healthcare activities that will derive from the Local Plan we believe that there should be references to healthcare in policy SW1 to inform potential developers of the requirement for these impacts to be mitigated.</p>	<p>Officers have held a number of meetings with the ICB to understand further this representation and others on proposed site allocations in the regulation 18 draft Local Plan. Further information has been sought from the ICB to provide more detail on the nature and scope of any deficit in GP surgery facilities and how it may be resolved. This includes confirmation of which surgeries serve proposed allocations and which may require improvement. At this point it is considered prudent for the Plan and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to note this position and set out a mechanism to deal with any necessary infrastructure requirements arising from this request. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include the most recent information received from the ICB regarding the capacity of infrastructure and identified need for any improvements.</p>

		Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)	<p>Policy SW01 Land at West Hill Road North</p> <p>This is a site close to a sharp right-hand bend with poor sightlines at the junction of Alresford Drove and Grindelwald. Alresford Drove itself is a narrow single carriageway rural road with no footway which causes problems when vehicles meet each other or equestrians and pedestrians. There are existing highway safety concerns related to vehicles speeding and the risk to pedestrians and horses.</p> <p>Any proposed allocation at this site will need to prove it can provide safe and suitable access for all users and will not worsen the highway safety issues on Alresford Road. If the site is likely to have a negative impact on highway safety it will need to provide or contribute towards a scheme to mitigate the problem.</p> <p>The existing footway provision on Grindelwald does not extend as far north as the site and as part of the proposals the County Council would expect the development proposals to provide a footway along the length of the site boundary.</p>	<p>The response from HCC suggests that it is possible to achieve satisfactory access to the site, but there needs to be careful site planning to ensure that suitable access can be provided safely. There are existing highway issues regarding the junction between Alresford Drove and West Hill Road North (Grindlewald) which will affect where and how this access is provided.</p> <p>Additional wording is therefore recommended to specifically require that the access be provided at a safe distance from the junction. Additional wording is also recommended to the text to ensure that highway safety issues and the provision of safe and suitable access are adequately addressed as part of the design process for this site.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend Policy SW01 by adding the following wording to the end of criteria iii) – ‘at a safe distance from Alresford Drove’</p>

		<p>Amend paragraph 14.129 by adding additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –</p> <p>‘As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they can provide safe and suitable access for all users and address highway safety issues on Alresford Drove.’</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N86M-T Hampshire County Council (Schools)</p>	<p>Land West Hill Road North 40 dwellings are likely to generate up to 12 additional primary age pupils and 8 secondary. The site is served by South Wonston Primary School and Henry Beaufort Secondary. It is likely that these could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.</p>	<p>The representation from the Local Education Authority (HCC) suggests that additional secondary school place provision may be required as a result of this development, but that primary is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>It is recognised that there is local concern regarding school capacity and that the situation may alter depending on the nature of other proposed allocations and the timing of their constructions, that will affect the catchment(s) of HB in particular. As no specific requirement is currently identified, it would not be appropriate to include this in the policy.</p>

		<p>This development will not be until after 2030 and neither will the large scale developments that affect Henry Beaufort (W1 and W2) so the situation should be kept under review. The city council will continue to liaise with the LEA in respect of required school places as part of continuing IDP work.</p> <p>In recognition of this uncertainty, it is considered appropriate that attention is drawn to this issue within the policy criteria and supporting text. Although only secondary is currently highlighted by HCC, it is suggested that reference is also included due to the future uncertainty.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add the following at the end of criteria xii) of Policy SW01 – including addressing any need for education provision (Primary and Secondary) to meet the needs of the development. Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 14.131 –</p> <p>The site lies within the catchment areas of South Wonston Primary and Henry Beaufort Secondary</p>
--	--	--

		School. Advice from the Local Education Authority has indicated that it is likely that the development could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	To increase traffic in this section of South Wonston needs to seriously consider the safety of the corner from West Hill Road and Alresford Drove Road and take steps to massively improve this	<p>Amendments have been made to the policy and text to address this as a result of comments from HCC, as described in the response above</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8TZ-5	<p>Paragraph 14.127 acknowledges the existence of The Drove Road as a PROW with the status of a restricted byway. This means there is a right to ride and drive a horse along this historic route but motorised vehicles are excluded.</p> <p>The policy SW01 in criterion ii. should say ‘public rights of way’ rather than ‘footpaths’ in recognition of the importance and higher status of the rights of way network that surrounds the settlement including the restricted byway along the northern boundary of the site.</p>	<p><i>ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F is identical representation.</i></p> <p>The Drove Road is a PROW. There are also a number of other active travel routes around South Wonston for a variety of different users, such as some footpaths and some cycleways etc.</p> <p>An amendment is recommended to the policy to clarify the status of Drove Road.</p> <p>HCC are also keen to improve active travel links and usage and additional</p>

		<p>wording is therefore recommended to acknowledge the role and variety of such routes in the area.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend Policy SW01 criteria ii as follows –</p> <p>‘...linkages to ‡The Drove Road PROW/existing footpaths around the site.’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 14.130 by adding additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –</p> <p>‘As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to provide active travel links across the site and links to the surrounding network of PROW and other active travel routes’.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8TH-K	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.128 Any Development “in such a way as to minimise visual intrusion into the wider landscape” • Environmental 8 and 10 “important to protect wider views to the North” “minimise light pollution and visual intrusion into the wider countryside area” <p>The proposed 40 houses is greater the 15/hectare typical of the parish. When would the type of housing and impact to the wider views be</p>	<p>The site design process would develop a layout of development that would illustrate the proposed location, type and height of housing, across the site. The design process includes careful consideration of a number of factors as set out in general design policy D1 and D4 in relation to the MTRA area. This</p>

	<p>understood and communicated, single or double storey? Can we be reassured that 3 storey town houses would not get permission?</p> <p>Light pollution is almost zero to the North; will there be an assessment for light pollution and potential loss of a beautiful night sky? Has ample consideration gone into the brown field oil site on the A272 before considering green field agricultural sites?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.129 “the junction with Drove Road has poor visibility” <p>Has, or will an assessment be carried out and communicated on the risks of a single track road and blind bend? The village is effectively a 1 mile Cul-de-Sac, any development will add risk to village road and pedestrian users and push traffic to use the Drove Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.131 Infrastructure “Do not currently have adequate mains sewage and drainage” <p>Has, or will an assessment been carried out and communicated on any detrimental effect on existing services, including clean water supply pressure and capacity required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and GP surgery. <p>Are there additional spaces being provided for what I understand to be full school and GP surgery?</p> <p>We and many of our neighbours moved to, and remain in South Wonston because it is RURAL and provides a soothing environment, a sense of wellbeing and LOW potential for development, as opposed to an URBAN</p>	<p>would include consideration of the context of the site in relation to the existing village and wider landscape.</p> <p>Appropriate lighting will be considered as part of the design process.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection DSSS (as updated 2024) explains why this site was selected and why other sites - such as the oil site referred to – were rejected.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) took account of the existing levels of facilities and services in potential development locations. The council is liaising with all infrastructure service providers in respect of required infrastructure provision. The process is further detailed in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) prepared as part of the Reg 19 Plan.</p> <p>In relation to specific issues – Highways safety – see response to HCC above. Schools capacity – see response to HCC above.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>area with a higher potential for development. I ask that if there is capacity and suitability in a more urban area or brownfield site, that this is considered.</p> <p>We must keep and treasure our agricultural open space.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The hierarchy used is wrong, employment opportunities post build are nil 2. Worthy down development is within the parish and must form part of existing development count. 3. It is stated that South Wonston has a healthcare facility, this is not true and needs to be removed from the count. 4. The local plan commits to brownfield development before greenfield ('negative impacts for loss of greenfield land'), the old oil site at Stockbridge Road is brownfield but dismissed for development, this breaks the commitment from WCC to put brownfield first. 5. Development of land outside of the settlement boundary means building into the countryside and greenfield land. 6. Assumptions have been made on services and infrastructure without consideration of detail or resolution. 7. Already high pollution levels will be increased by the development and ongoing need for the addition travel pollution for an increased urban population, a local risk to health and wellbeing. <p>I ask that these points and attached mentioned document get due consideration to reverse any decision made for additional development of greenfield sites within and attached to the parish.</p>	<p>GP capacity – see response to ICP above.</p> <p>Mains sewage, water supply, pressure and capacity – see detailed response provided under this heading below.</p> <p>Issues relating to the use of greenfield land for development, the account taken of existing nearby development, the settlement hierarchy and increases in travel and pollution are considered in detail below under the development strategy, hierarchy and transport and traffic headings.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKT4-J	<p>The proposal for housing development in South Wonston falls mostly outside the development boundary to the north of the village. No notice has been taken of the pressure on utilities, especially sewerage and water supply in this proposal. Not enough attempt has been made to find brownfield sites for small infilling, and no consideration has been given to</p>	<p>The plan prioritises brownfield development where appropriate and possible. However, the scale of required development necessitates some allocations on greenfield sites.</p>

	<p>developing to the south of the village. No notice seems to have been taken of the local expression of objections when residents were consulted by the parish council and this seems to make a mockery of the consultation process. It was not nimby-ism but real concerns for the pressure on utilities and other practical considerations.</p>	<p>The DSSS sets out details of the council's assessment process, including an analysis of the various sites promoted via the SHELAA process.</p> <p>A detailed response on utilities, including sewerage and water supply is provided below.</p> <p>Comments in relation to consideration of the views of the Parish Council are also covered below.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
--	--	---

Comments which object to SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKFA-H	<p><u>SWPC – SHELAA RESPONSE</u></p> <p><i>In addition to specific comments in relation to site allocation SW01, the SHELAA response of South Wonston Parish Council has also been re-submitted in response to the Reg 18 draft local plan. The main points this raises are summarised below.</i></p> <p>Main conclusion of the SWPC SHELAA response:</p>	<p><i>This representation was submitted under Comments on Other Topics. The main points are summarised here. The full version of South Wonston Parish Council's SHELAA Response can be seen in Appendix 3 of the</i></p>

	<p>South Wonston Parish Council ..., given the constraints and concerns that have been noted in our submission do not agree that any development take place on the nominated SHELAA sites.</p> <p>A summary of the main general concerns is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devt Strategy - The climate emergency housing needs to be in a location with better public transport/access • Allocation of Numbers is flawed – hierarchy require better justification of the allocation of the numbers as we consider the allocation system to be flawed. • Hierarchy – Methodology and scoring are flawed • Climate emergency - Due to lack of facilities eg employment and public transport, most new residents would travel by car – increase in carbon footprint and pollution • Public transport - Lack of bus means most people will travel by car • Traffic Increase -Lack of public transport and restricted road system = increase in traffic generally and at congested exit from Downs Road onto Christmas Hill. • Road access - Access to sites, but restricted road system, unmade and unsuitable roads. <p>Infrastructure - Current capacity strained re water supply/sewerage, bus service and road quality Water - Significant upgrade & investment in services required Water quality - Concern re sewage into treatment plant off Andover Rd and then into the Itchen Broadband - Inadequate Health - Current provision cannot cope. No Drs School - Current school has no available space Wildlife & habitats - Open land around the boundary is rich in wildlife. Detrimental to biodiversity. Known protected species in the vicinity.</p>	<p><i>Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 document.</i></p> <p>It is recognised that the Parish Council do not support any development at South Wonston. Some representations to SW01 consider that sufficient account has not been taken of the views of local residents and the Parish Council.</p> <p>There is a requirement to provide for additional development throughout the plan period. The amount of housing required is still set by the Standard Method and there are no special circumstances justifying a deviation from this. The Housing Topic Paper discusses this in more detail.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not possible to reject additional housing development per se. The development strategy of the plan seeks to provide for the required level of development in an appropriate manner. The strategy has been subject to a sustainability appraisal which considered it represented a sound approach.</p> <p>The particular concerns raised by the SHELAA response, and the</p>
--	---	---

		<p>representations of the Parish Council and other respondents are given detailed consideration below, listed by the specific issues raised.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	Settlement Boundary adjustment – Land at Chaucer Close	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J (South Wonston Parish Council)</p> <p>ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B</p>	<p>Before proceeding to the site allocation SW01 proposes to adjust South Wonston's settlement boundary to include Land at Chaucer Close and the adjoining back gardens of 63-69 Wrights Way. South Wonston is the only recipient of such a proposal. The pronouncement that the adjustment "is to be made" shows scant regard for the community engagement encouraged elsewhere in the plan. Consultation should have taken place before the draft was released. Access to development here can only be gained through the front curtilages of Canterbury Cottages. A previous application for the adjacent field was withdrawn. The Parish Council don't wish the settlement boundary to be adjusted just to make development acceptable in planning terms in an area classed as countryside.</p>	<p><i>The Parish Council's representation on this was submitted under Missing Policy category.</i></p> <p>The area in question comprises the land of the SHELAA site SW03. The site has therefore been subject to consideration by the Parish Council and local residents as part of the Parish's community engagement process.</p> <p>This area of land has been subject to several planning applications, and it is considered acceptable in principle from a landscape point of view. HCC as the highway authority, did not object to the planning applications in principle, subject to the applicant demonstrating that suitable access can be provided, although they would be unlikely to publicly adopt this due to the number of properties that would be using the access.</p>

		<p>Due to these constraints, this site is only likely to be able to provide a small number of dwellings, below the level which would generally be allocated within the local plan. Nevertheless, due to the need to accommodate additional housing in the local plan, the presence of a willing developer and there being no objections in principle to the development, it is considered appropriate to allow for a limited amount of development by means of a small adjustment to the settlement boundary in that location.</p> <p>Development would only be permitted if it could satisfactorily address the access, landscaping and design issues in relation to the existing surrounding properties that were identified as part of previous planning applications.</p> <p>Recommend Response: No Change</p>
	SW01 Site Allocation	
ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J South Wonston	The policy SW01 is unsupported by the Parish Council. The site is greenfield, outside the current settlement boundary, intruding into the countryside. It is classed as a sensitive landscape. There will be little benefit from forty houses to local character, biodiversity, air quality, water quality and current waste management facilities (which will	<i>See responses under specific issues as set out below.</i>

Parish Council	require extensive improvements). The site is some distance from local facilities. Winchester, the wider county and London are yet further away. The local bus service is insufficient and car use is high, even within the village. Commuting is common. North Hampshire already has poor air quality. Increased traffic from the development won't help reduce carbon emissions. More journeys on foot, cycle or by car will add to problems already experienced at the junction with West Hill Rd North and Alresford Drove (a notorious bottleneck, frequently used) and will create a hot spot at the new access. The site has already been rejected for affordable housing for Highways, policy and separation issues. Would a much larger development be any more acceptable in planning terms?	
ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J South Wonston Parish Council & others as listed.	<p>ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J, ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4, ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q, ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H, ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3, ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H, ANON-KSAR-NKTZ-R, ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K, ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7, ANON-KSAR-NKRG-3, ANON-KSAR-NK7X-S, ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E, ANON-KSAR-NKRU-H, ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A, ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3, ANON-KSAR-NK6Q-H, ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y, ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5, ANON-KSAR-NKFW-7, ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F, ANON-KSAR-NKR3-F, ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T, ANON-KSAR-N8YS-3, ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7, ANON-KSAR-N8YA-H, ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B, ANON-KSAR-N8GV-M, ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N, ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J, ANON-KSAR-N83N-R, ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X, BHLF-KSAR-N8RS-V, ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3</p> <p><i>The majority of representations from the Parish Council and other respondents have raised similar issues. It is therefore considered appropriate to consider these under a series of main headings.</i></p> <p><i>Following consideration of the main issues raised, the individual representations submitted are also provided below by respondent for completeness.</i></p>	
	<p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be focussed more on the larger settlements, that have a greater capacity and range of facilities. • Development should be focussed on brownfield sites. • It is not compatible with Winchester's concerns regarding the climate emergency as will result in additional vehicle trips and increase in pollution. 	The development strategy was informed by a number of factors including the settlement hierarchy, the quantity of development required and the need to achieve a suitable balance of development throughout the plan area.

		<p>The strategy for the distribution of development broadly follows the approach in the existing plan, with Winchester being the focus for development along with the other larger settlements of the district. It was also considered appropriate to have some degree of disbursement of development in proportion to the locations of settlements and their relative levels of sustainability.</p> <p>South Wonston is classified as an intermediate settlement, where a modest amount of development could theoretically occur.</p> <p>The distribution of development is set out in Policy H3 of the plan. The Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper (DSSS) 2024 provides further detail on the approach taken.</p> <p>The plan focusses on appropriately located brownfield development where possible. However, the scale of development means that some greenfield sites will need to be allocated. It is recognised that there are likely to be fewer opportunities for brownfield development within the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>smaller settlements, where more modest allocations are proposed.</p> <p>The development strategy was subject to the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), which included a sustainability appraisal and considered that the proposed strategy would be an appropriate approach. The Reg 19 Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Assessment which considers the volume and patterns of traffic generation and proposes mitigation where necessary.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change</p>
	<p><u>Quantity of development and calculation of apportionment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Wonston should not have the amount of housing allocated, taking regard of the size of the village in comparison to other settlements. • Why have other settlements in the intermediate category not been allocated housing? • Why can't South Wonston take account of the development at Worthy Down, which is just outside the village and uses its facilities? This approach has not been taken at Ravenswood. 	<p>The DSSS 2024 summarises how the relative distribution of housing was reconsidered, following representations on the Settlement Hierarchy Review 2022 and the Reg 18 Draft Local Plan strategy. This confirms that the position of South Wonston within the intermediate category is still considered correct and therefore an appropriate location for a modest amount of development.</p> <p>The settlements in the intermediate category were all assessed as potential locations for new development.</p>

		<p>Following suitable evaluation, development is not being proposed within all of these settlements due to a number of factors, such as local constraints and availability of suitable sites. The DSSS sets out this process and reasoning in more detail.</p> <p>The local plan's approach takes account of recent developments only where they occur within or adjoining particular settlements as a general principle. The approach to development in the southern parish area has been revised following the Reg 18 consultation, as explained in the 2024 DSSS.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	<p><u>Hierarchy is flawed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hierarchy does not take account of the relative sustainability of the settlement and the range of facilities and services within it • The scoring of facilities and services on which the hierarchy is based is flawed. • There are no health facilities within South Wonston. • The bus service is inadequate and over-represented in the scoring. • Employment in South Wonston is very limited. • There is not high quality broadband. 	<p>It is recognised that South Wonston does not contain the range of facilities and services of higher order settlements, towns and cities. However, as explained above and within the strategy of the plan, it is considered reasonable to consider a modest amount of development in the village and that this is also appropriate in terms of the overall sustainability of the district.</p>

		<p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review has been updated in response to comments received and make necessary corrections. The status of the bus service provision in the area has been re-evaluated. The methodology reflects that there is at least 1 employer in the settlement. A detailed explanation of the scoring in relation to broadband provision is also provided.</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>The resulting altered scores for facilities and services does not change the category of South Wonston, which remains as an intermediate rural settlement in the 2024 Settlement Hierarchy, with a moderate level of services and facilities and a location where a modest amount of development could be considered. It is therefore considered that the site allocation SW01 is still appropriate.</p> <p>The revised scoring for facilities and services and the resulting settlement</p>
--	--	---

		<p>hierarchy is described in more detail in the Settlement Hierarchy Paper 2024.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	<p><u>Transport and traffic concerns</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The high car ownership and poor bus service means that there will be an increase in traffic as a result of proposed development • The local roads are inadequate to cope with the increase in traffic, with many being constrained, un-made or unadopted • Additional traffic is likely to exit onto Christmas Hill, adding to existing congestion in this location. 	<p>The plan recognises that the smaller settlements and more rural areas of the district have higher car dependency. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) considered the levels of car usage and public transport provision as part of its evaluation of sites.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Local Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Assessment that considers cumulative impacts and proposes mitigation where necessary. None have been identified in this locality.</p> <p>The council has liaised with HCC Transportation in respect of the prospective SHELAA sites. They did not identify any concerns regarding the quantity of development being proposed in South Wonston. They identified constraints in relation to some of the sites, due to the suitability of their access but considered that SW01 could be developed subject to certain criteria,</p>

		<p>as set out in their representation and WCC proposed response above.</p> <p>HCC is seeking appropriate improvements in the area as part of its Local Transport Plan Part 4. HCC is undertaking a district-wide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which will consider the potential for improved walking and cycling links.</p> <p>To support active travel opportunities in the area, Policy SW01 requires proposals to provide pedestrian and cycle links through and around the site and linking to existing routes into the village centre.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	<p><u>Infrastructure and Utilities Capacity - General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing infrastructure is not adequate and will not cope with additional development. Health - Current provision cannot cope. No Drs in South Wonston. School - School has no available space Bus service inadequate Water supply and sewage capacity concerns Water quality concerns regarding treatment and discharge 	<p>The council is liaising with all infrastructure service providers in respect of required infrastructure provision. The process is further detailed in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) prepared as part of the Reg 19 Plan.</p> <p>WCC is continuing to liaise with local health providers in respect of facilities</p>

		<p>in the area as outlined in response to representations by the ICB provided above.</p> <p>The Local Education Authority (HCC) was consulted as part of the development of the local plan and specifically regarding the proposed allocations. They did not identify any issues in relation to the required capacity of the primary school. A detailed analysis of their comments is provided above and amendments have been recommended to the policy and text to address any potential future issues, having regard to planned developments and local concerns. WCC is continuing to work with HCC regarding future education requirements as part of the IDP work.</p> <p>Public transport provision is outside the control of WCC. It is recognised that the use of private car is higher in rural areas and the policy requires improvements in active travel links to encourage use of other modes of travel and support existing bus services. HCC is seeking appropriate improvements in the area as part of its Local Transport Plan Part 4.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>There are recognised concerns regarding water and sewage provision in the area. A detailed response is provided on these issues below.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	<p><u>Water Supply, Quality and Sewage issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply and sewage system already an issue locally. Significant upgrading and investment in services is required <p>Some respondents have also expressed concerns that necessary improvement packages will not be available in a timely manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality - Concern re sewage into treatment plant off Andover Rd and then into the Itchen 	<p>The council is liaising with Southern Water the service provider in respect of known issues in relation to water supply and sewage connection and disposal in the area. Improvements are planned in the vicinity as discussed in IDP at Appendix 1 which contains a letter from Southern Water dated 18th July 2024, outlining actions in relation to this. A new pipeline is to be constructed from Sutton Scotney, through South Wonston into Harestock, Waste Water Treatment Works to address sewerage capacity issues in the local area. This work has been delayed due to adverse weather conditions, but Southern Water state that this should be completed in advance of the planned development of this site, post 2030.</p> <p>Improvements are also planned as detailed in this letter, to drainage infrastructure along with upgrades to water treatment works which should improve both sewage capacity and the</p>

		<p>treatment of water to address concerns regarding potential pollution of the Itchen.</p> <p>Although the local plan cannot redress existing issues of water supply and disposal in the area, it is hoped that the planned upgrades will address these. The letter from Southern Water also sets out the processes for arranging access to their network from existing properties under a number of situations.</p> <p>In respect of the development being proposed for SW01 therefore, improvements should be in place prior to the commencement of development. Nevertheless, the policy requires developers to liaise with the service provider and provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity for supply and drainage, and/or make arrangements for appropriate water drainage and disposal as appropriate, to allow for flexibility as to how this is achieved.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
--	--	---

	<p><u>Landscape and wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site allocation is in a sensitive landscape location that should be protected from development • There are concerns regarding wildlife and protected species in the area 	<p>The site does not have any particular landscape designation that would require protection. However much of the open areas to the north of South Wonston, have been identified as being sensitive in terms of the potential to affect wider views - including the land of this, and other SHELAA sites being promoted. In view of the need to accommodate new development, this site was considered the most suitable option in the area when all factors were taken into consideration. The site selection process is set out in the DSSS 2024, which summarises the criteria used to assess this and the alternative sites around South Wonston and explains why this site was selected.</p> <p>Criteria ii) of the policy requires an overall site plan that minimises wider landscape impacts and vi) requires the retention of existing vegetation around the site boundary where possible, together with additional planting to increase screening. Criteria vii) requires landscape buffers to protect the wider views to the north.</p> <p>The site is improved pasture land, it does not have any ecological</p>
--	---	---

		<p>designation and is not identified as priority habitat.</p> <p>Ecological assessments will be carried out as part of the design process for the development of the site, which will identify key species, including any with particular protection. Evaluation and protection of existing trees and hedgerows provides habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>National and local policy requires development proposals to deliver net gains in biodiversity.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
	Representations as submitted...	
ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4	<p>This should be abandoned.</p> <p>South Wonston does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this size. The school and GP surgery (in Sutton Scotney) are at capacity. There is poor public transport in the area and so a development this size would result in more use of private cars, which counters Winchester city council's climate change policies. This is a Greenfield site and should not be developed. It will ruin the important and beautiful views of the countryside.</p> <p>The roads cannot handle further traffic. Alresford drove is already a dangerous junction. More car movements would escalate existing problems at this junction.</p> <p>Michael Gove housing minister recently stated that the government</p>	

	<p>"need to make sure that we have local communities consenting to development". South Wonston does not consent to this development, or any other large development in our village. At the very least I was glad to see that the polo field is not being built on, as that would have been significantly worse than the site you have chosen. But the chosen site is still very inappropriate.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q	<p>Climate Emergency → Winchester City Council has declared a Climate Emergency and are committed to reducing the carbon footprint of the District. Any development in South Wonston will therefore be in complete contravention of this policy. Winchester City Council is committed to becoming a carbon neutral local authority by 2024 and is aiming for the wider district to be carbon neutral by 2030.</p> <p>South Wonston and Sutton Scotney are already highlighted that they have the highest carbon footprint in the District. The high levels of pollution, as a result of the amount of traffic traversing in and out of the village, is of immediate concern to residents and has a serious impact on the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new development of additional housing in South Wonston would contravene Winchester city Council's climate change reduction strategies. <p>- South Wonston has a single small often poorly stocked, privately owned shop, with no public car parking, whose viability is in doubt.</p> <p>The Primary school is full - unless extension and place availability is increased (Following the 60 additional houses at Worthy Down, local children are already displaced to other schools. This should not score as there is no facility for further housing families.</p> <p>Access to Employment Opportunity - 2 points</p>	

	<p>There are no employment opportunities for local people other than minimum employees as bar work at local club (maximum 8 people), and the store mentioned above is run by the 2 owners</p> <p>WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL OPEN SPACE ASSESSMENT 2022 page 4 review and main findings South Wonston has a deficit of accessible open space for it's current population -6.04ha which is the fifth worse out of the 15 identified. SW01 represents 40 new dwellings, which would make this far worse.</p> <p>South Wonston is affected by the concerns regarding water quality as our sewage system runs to the Water Treatment plant off the Andover Road and then into the Itchen. Any such pollution is likely to be a critical factor in considering the merits of the village as a location for more development.</p> <p>Transport. As noted above the public transport system that the village has is not effective both in frequency and cost (£6.50 return to Winchester). This will mean that the majority of the new houses will be using personal transport thus increasing the density of cars entering and leaving via downs road and Alresford drove. This could also create more issues in the area of the school on Downs Road. There is no provision in the Winchester mobility plans to assist or increase the access to public transport or to cap costs so that the alternative is a viable alternative.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J South Wonston Parish Council		

<p>ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J South Wonston Parish Council</p>	<p>Before proceeding to the site allocation SW01 proposes to adjust South Wonston's settlement boundary to include Land at Chaucer Close and the adjoining back gardens of 63-69 Wrights Way. South Wonston is the only recipient of such a proposal. The pronouncement that the adjustment "is to be made" shows scant regard for the community engagement encouraged elsewhere in the plan. Consultation should have taken place before the draft was released. Access to development here can only be gained through the front curtilages of Canterbury Cottages. A previous application for the adjacent field was withdrawn. The Parish Council don't wish the settlement boundary to be adjusted just to make development acceptable in planning terms in an area classed as countryside.</p>	<p>Copied from 'Missing Policy' document (Was submitted as part of the above representation)</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are South Wonston and Otterbourne the only 'smaller intermediate' rural settlements to be given a housing allocation? Eg why does Hurley have no allocation - it has many more facilities and services than South Wonston? 2. Swanmore and Waltham Chase are not taking more housing because of developments that has been completed. South Wonston should be treated the same. Worthy Down, in the parish of South Wonston, has been greatly extended over recent years and this is no different and has a similar impact on the village. I note that Wickham are allowed to take into account developments at Knowle, in the same parish. How is this different? This is not consistent. 3. In the proposal to extend the village boundary there is an error in the scoring for a health centre. There is no doctor's surgery or health care facility in South Wonston. 4. South Wonston has been identified as being in an area of the highest levels of emission per capita from commuting. This shows that it is not a 	

	<p>sustainable location for further development. Local transport is poor, so the vast majority of residents drive to work. We are in a climate crisis and the Local plan states its aim is to reduce carbon emissions. Further development goes completely contrary to this.</p> <p>5. South Wonston is surrounded by grade 3 agricultural farmland. There will be a significant negative impact for loss of greenfield land, the higher value agricultural soils and mineral resources. Present policy is that brownfield sites should be developed.</p> <p>6.South Wonston is close to Groundwater source protection zones (SPZ) Further development is not desirable.</p> <p>7. The integrated impact assessment has been updated so that the score for impact on biodiversity is not negligible (0) but minor negative. How can development on a greenfield site be allocated if it will be harmful to biodiversity and the landscape.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3	<p>SW01 (previously SW07) is not suitable for the proposed 40 extra houses.</p> <p>It is a green field site. Brown field sites are supposed to be developed first.</p> <p>It is outside the village boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity would be threatened, a declared aim of the WCC. Red kites, buzzards and kestrels are regularly seen over the site. -The Parish Council has declared its opposition to the development, and they should be listened to. -Assessment of the sustainability of such a development has been based on false criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is NO health facility in the village. The surgery is in Sutton Scotney, so car journeys needed to get there. 2.Superfast broadband is not widely available. 	

	<p>3. There is no potential employment.</p> <p>4. Public transport is very poor.</p> <p>5. There is no mains drainage in this part of South Wonston</p> <p>6. The Integrated Impact Assessment has been corrected to show that this site has negative landscape and biodiversity impact. Why is it still being allocated?</p> <p>7. The primary school in South Wonston is already full. Where will the children of 40 households go?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is all the new housing in Worthy Down not included? They are a part of the Parish and use the school and shop. At Wickham, they can count the houses being built at Knowle which is in the parish but not directly connected to Wickham. Lack of consistency. - A community like Hursley has not been allocated new housing, yet they have better shops, pubs, employment, transport. Therefore, more sustainable than South Wonston. - Access to this site is potentially very dangerous. West Hill Road North is very narrow at this point, with a dangerous 90 degree blind bend on the corner of West Hill Road North and Alresford Drove. There is no room for a pavement on either side of the road, visibility splays would necessitate the removal of mature hedgerows. Cyclists, walkers and horse-riders would be at even greater risk than they are now. The walk to nearby bridleways is very popular. A development here would mitigate against such use. THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE and should lead to a decision against development. - The WCC's declared Climate Emergency aims to reduce carbon emissions and discourage the use of the car. 40 houses would inevitably mean 80 more cars. Every household in South Wonston has at least 2 cars and carbon emission are already high. So the laudable environmental aims of the WCC would be negated. - South Wonston has been reported as being deficient in open space, yet 40 houses are proposed on a green field site outside the village boundary. 	
--	---	--

	<p>There are so many inaccuracies in this document, on which the allocation has been based. It should be re-assessed and it would be clear that this site is unsustainable for development.</p>	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H</p>	<p>This is a follow up response because I didn't know where to put my concerns about the Settlement Hierarchy. Having emailed planning I was told I could add this in.</p> <p>I object to the score allocated to South Wonston in The Settlement Hierarchy and to the housing allocation given to South Wonston in the draft local plan. I believe that environmental issues have been ignored and that there are inaccuracy about the amenities in the village.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>1. A score of 2 has been given for super fast broadband. This is not the case throughout the village. Many people still don't have access to it across the village. In our particular case, to the east of the village, our broadband is still carried above ground. It is frequently severely affected by bad weather.</p> <p>2. It was also given a score of 2 for employment opportunities. This is just not realistic. Almost all of the villagers work outside South Wonston, most commuting to Winchester, Southampton and Basingstoke and some to London. The majority of households run two cars and, with the inadequate bus service, have little choice but to use them. South Wonston has been identified as an area with the highest emissions per capita from commuting.</p> <p>I will add below here my previous comments in case there is a problem matching my identity to previous response. (I put I'd with my name on front page.</p> <p>The Draft Local plan published 2nd November 2022</p>	

	<p>1. Why have South Wonston and Otterbourne been the only 'smaller intermediate' rural settlements to be given a housing allocation? Eg why does Hurley have no allocation - it has many more facilities and services than South Wonston?</p> <p>2. Swanmore and Waltham Chase are not taking more housing because of developments that has been completed. South Wonston should be treated the same. Worthy Down, in the parish of South Wonston, has been greatly extended over recent years and this is no different and has a similar impact on the village. I note that Wickham are allowed to take into account developments at Knowle, in the same parish. How is this different? This is not consistent.</p> <p>3. In the proposal to extend the village boundary there is an error in the scoring for a health centre. There is no doctor's surgery or health care facility in South Wonston.</p> <p>4. South Wonston has been identified as being in an area of the highest levels of emission per capita from commuting. This shows that it is not a sustainable location for further development. Local transport is poor so the vast majority of residents drive to work.</p> <p>5. South Wonston is surrounded by grade 3 agricultural farmland. There will be a significant negative impact for loss of greenfield land, the higher value agricultural soils and mineral resources. Present policy is that brownfield sites should be developed.</p> <p>6. South Wonston is close to Groundwater source protection zones (SPZ) Further development is not desirable.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKTZ-R	<p>1/ This involves breaking the village boundary. Looking at the rest of the areas plans I believe this is the only location this been permitted. Why? Increased traffic alone will be an issue (on an already dangerous road)</p>	

	<p>to the Alresford Drove. Adding 50 to 100 cars to a road that can't be widened is a recipe for trouble.</p> <p>2/ The fields highlighted for potential development are home to several species of birds including the Redwing which is classified in the UK as Amber under the Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the Red List for Birds (2021). Protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981.</p> <p>I believe other residents have recorded and documented the hedgerows as habitats of bats, again a protected species.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K	<p>There should be no further allocated land for development outside the boundary of the village. This allocated land is on a green field site, which is against the general intention of the local plan to prioritise brownfield sites for development.</p> <p>The statement in the policy regarding improving the infrastructure should be much more strongly worded if there is to be any more development in South Wonston and there should be investment in this.</p> <p>The village has poor public transport links, with, on average of one bus an hour during the day and no buses in the evening or on a Sunday. This means reliance on cars. A development of 40 properties most likely will mean a further 40-80 cars driving into and out of the village. West Hill Road North is already a busy road at rush hour, as is Downs Road. These are residential roads but are treated as through routes and there is often speeding.</p> <p>Currently the village has poor water supply with often very low pressure. No obvious consideration has been made in respect of this and the impact of 40 more houses.</p> <p>Lastly, South Wonston may not be a conservation area nor does it have any historic buildings, but what it does have is the broad expanse of</p>	

	<p>arable countryside both north and south. This is a principal characteristic of the village and allowing development on a green field site outside the boundary of the village threatens this unique feature and so should not be permitted.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7	<p>1. This site is not suitable for the proposed number of houses.</p> <p>1. 1 The need for an additional 40 houses in South Wonston has not been demonstrated in the plan.</p> <p>1.2. No consideration has been made for effect upon the existing roads leading both in and out of South Wonston. Based on your own figures this will result on 60 additional vehicles and their associated daily movements in and out. West Hill rd., North is already very busy (I am not aware of any traffic study for this road to have been carried out for this plan) and is particularly unsuited to handle this additional traffic. Neither West Hill rd., North nor Downs Road are suitable for the quantity of material and construction vehicles that would be required for such a large development.</p> <p>1.3. Disruption to the occupants of existing properties will be enormous. The existing water supply and sewage facility are far from adequate and you cannot simply plug in 40 additional houses. Major re-working of system will have to be undertaken with long term effects on existing residents.</p> <p>2. This site should be protected.</p> <p>2.1 The plan has not demonstrated any suitable reason for the development of this green field site. It is situated outside the village boundary in open countryside and this proposal is in direct contradiction to the stated aims of the plan.</p>	

	<p>2.2 Development Strategy and Site selection, Appendix 3 - Initial Technical Appraisal November 2022, Page 178 states that the land adjacent to West Hill Rd., North should be protected.</p> <p>(please note that the above paper refers to SW07 while the local plan refers to SW01. However, according to the published maps these cover the same piece of land adjacent to West Hill Rd North)</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKRG-3	<p>1 - This site is the only one that breaks an existing settlement boundary. Without Community support this is unacceptable.</p> <p>2 - The site has totally inadequate access.</p> <p>a - Very close to a blind three way junction that is the easterly access to South Wonston. It is experiencing year on year increasing volumes of traffic and the total inadequacy of the junction on Westhill Road North with Alresford Drove is dangerous to vehicle passengers, pedestrians and horse riders.</p> <p>b - This site would also significantly increase the traffic on Alresford Drove, which at its westerly end is a single track country lane with 4 adjacent dwellings. Alresford Drove is weight restricted, but this is routinely ignored by large vehicles and would be a major issue for the construction traffic.</p> <p>3 - South Wonston is poorly served by public transport and this development will only increase the number of vehicles on the local roads. Even if in the future these are EVs, it does not fit well with the 15 minute neighbourhood or the desire for active travel. Other than by private car South Wonston (and Worthy Down) is not well connected to Winchester, this has to be rectified before further development of South Wonston can be contemplated. The proposed Northern Park and Ride needs to take into account the transport needs of South Wonston and Worthy Down.</p> <p>4 - The Government is about to change the rules on mandatory housebuilding targets, via amendments to the levelling up and</p>	

	regeneration bill. WCC needs to take note and amend its plans accordingly, including removing SWO1 for its list of development sites.	
ANON-KSAR-NK7X-S	The traffic in the village and in particular in the area suggested for development is already difficult for a rural location. High numbers of delivery vehicles, and the volume of cars per household has increased traffic through the village enormously. In addition the infrastructure to support a large development is a concern. Drainage has already been an issue in the last 2 years with sewage leaks causing health concerns. This was never an issue until recent developments.	
ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E	There is definitely a question of access to this site based on a single narrow road, lack of pavement and the addition of 80+ cars due to lack of public transport. The other village infrastructure would need a substantial upgrade as well including the primary school. There is a need to check on local wildlife given the bats, slow worms, kites and other animals that live in that area. Finally, light pollution and bridleways are other considerations of construction here; I think that South Wonston is a village with no economic, logistic, environmental or social benefits to be gained from additional housing with no commensurate and substantial uplift in local facilities. Time and energy might be better spent focusing on better candidates for homebuilding where new facilities can be put in, such as the John Moore Barracks.	
ANON-KSAR-NKRU-H	Development allocation is totally unsuitable for the site. Much comment is made within the consultation plan that priority is given to choosing brownfield sites. This site is clearly a greenfield site on an isolated edge of the village; it will join the main road in/out of the village on a blind bend which already causes problems with the existing traffic. The plan also makes much of having a greener community and access to public transport to reduce the regular use of private transport. The village has a very poor bus service which means that a car is essential. Adding housing to the village goes against many of the aims in the plan.	

ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A	<p>This site is being proposed with a lack of certainty that it can be developed. The Local Plan skips key areas that are crucial to the sites delivery. Sewerage provision is left to the developer to resolve. This can only be achieved by either a package plant or a pumped system. It is unlikely that the Environment Agency will approve a package plant. The pumped solution if accepted by the sewerage undertaker will be required to pump 511,000,000 litres of waste water for the life time of the development. This will destroy any chance of this site becoming net carbon zero. The local plan needs to be clear how it will achieve net zero.</p> <p>The plan suggests a children's play area on the site. Did the planners not visit the excellent play area run by our parish council just a 5 minute walk away?</p> <p>Construction traffic will have to travel past an oversubscribed primary school giving safety concerns for parents.</p> <p>It is a greenfield site and the loss of chalk downland (an internationally rare habitat) is of concern. Chalk grass land can contain up to 45 species per square metre. How will this plan mitigate for this loss? (Data from the Downland Trust). Will the council create this habitat elsewhere to comply with the habitat regulations?</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3	<p>The development and policies proposed for South Wonston would break the boundaries of the village and start the consumption of natural open spaces that are vital for animals/nature and existing residents. It would lead to additional strain on existing road infrastructure, and on sewage and water infrastructure. With a re-draw of village/settlement boundaries it would potentially lead to additional instances of this occurring in future planning proposals as a precedent had been set for expansion of the village. At the very least assurances on this should be made.</p>	

	<p>There is inadequate public transportation already with a poor and expensive bus service that does not work well and is very infrequent.</p> <p>The primary school provides schooling for many local children with South Wonston and other local villages and the proposed new housing would put further strain on this provision. This is also the case for the local GP practice which may struggle with additional residents and there is no local alternative.</p> <p>There are large housing developments taking place in Winchester already, with several large, newly developed sites built that would accommodate local housing requirements and have sufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>With a development of this size proposed there would be a significant increase in large vehicles travelling into and out of the village during the development with inadequate access from the East and the main road, Downs Road locating the entrance to the primary school I believe this will put high risk to potential traffic accidents and risk to pedestrian life.</p> <p>Local residents, Parish and councillors are opposed to the expansion of the village outside the existing settlement boundary which additionally damages local wildlife and has negative environmental impacts and detrimental impacts on residents.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK6Q-H	<p>In your initial outline and vision for the future you stress the importance of 'brownfield' first in future development of the whole area</p> <p>The proposal for a new development of 40 homes on Westhill Road north blithely ignores this concept that states the need to prioritise the use of previously developed land over green fields.</p> <p>Furthermore this proposal has in the past been rejected by the parish council and residents on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building would be on green fields outside the settlement 	

	<p>boundary.</p> <p>2. The village does not have the infrastructure and services necessary for such a development</p> <p>3. The plans would impose hugely increased traffic with associated pollution and environmental damage to the area, within the village and also to the east along the ancient Drove roads</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y	<p>I believe the allocation of houses to SW01 has been based to a great extent on the Settlement Hierarchy score. This score is inaccurate and *gives a false perspective on the amenities of the village. Whilst I believe it has been amended in respect of the (very poor, infrequent and expensive) bus service, a number of inaccuracies remain.</p> <p>1. A score of 2 has been given for employment opportunities. We have the school (nearly all staff commute in from outside) and a small business in West Hill Road, where again employees drive in. Most residents commute out to work in cars; most households have at least two cars. Emissions from commuting are very high.</p> <p>2. A score of 2 has also been given for broadband, supposedly superfast. This is certainly not the case for the whole village, with many households struggling with a poor connection.</p> <p>3. The Hierarchy shows the village as having a pub. A pub would usually imply somewhere that is open most days and is able to provide food. This is not the case with the local club, the Drovers.</p> <p>4. The village is listed as having a health care facility. There is no longer a Doctors surgery in the village and the surgery used by the majority of villagers (Gratton Surgery, Sutton Scotney) is struggling to provide for an ever-increasing population.</p> <p>These are my objections relating to the Settlement Hierarchy score. I</p>	

	<p>have further, more generalised objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development is on greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land. The hedgerows and open farmland provide valuable habitat for wildlife, especially birds and bats. 2. Traffic will increase with consequent increase in pollution, congestion and risk of accident, especially as the proposed site is very close to the narrow, very tight bend at the corner of West Hill Road North and Alresford Drove. This latter road is unsuited to the increase in traffic it would sustain. 3. The village infrastructure is already under pressure, with issues with water-pressure, sewerage and availability of mains gas. 4. South Wonston is close to a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 5. The new housing in Worthy Down in the parish of South Wonston has not been taken into account in the figures. 6. The extensive views to the south, and especially to the north of the village are treasured by those who live in South Wonston and give it its unique character. They also provide extensive footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths, which are in constant use and highly valued. 7. Mental health is supposed to be a Government priority. It is access to areas such as the fields and tracks around this village that is so important to people's well-being. 	
ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5	I wish to register my opposition to the proposed development SW01 (previously SW07), in South Wonston, and to lay out my reasons, and those of many people here.	

	<p>WCC and HCC have declared a Climate Emergency and seek to reduce carbon emissions and the use of the car. You wish to encourage sustainable transport. All very laudable, but completely negated in this community if you build 40 homes on this site. 40 homes will mean up to 80 extra cars. Why? Because the bus service into and from Winchester is very poor. One bus every hour, with a two-hour gap in the morning and afternoon, last bus from Winchester at 7 p.m. An even poorer service on Saturdays, none at all on Sundays. The service is being reduced all the time. That is why there are so many cars in South Wonston and why carbon emissions are so high. 40 new homes equals yet more carbon emissions, not less as you aim to achieve, thus an unhealthy environment, let alone the added noise and congestion and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders at a very dangerous location. (See below).</p> <p>The evidence base is also highly inaccurate, which is either down to incompetence or wilful deceit. The scoring system (the Settlement Hierarchy) scores local transport too highly, claims we have a doctor's surgery which we don't, does not recognise that the school is full or that there is no potential for employment in the village, that we have superfast broadband which we don't, that there is no mains drainage at that end of the village. The Impact Assessment has been corrected and concludes that this site has NEGATIVE LANDSCAPE AND BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS. Why is it still being allocated new housing? Further this is a green field site beyond the village boundary. You are thus extending urbanisation into the countryside on a field over which red kites, kestrels and buzzards are frequently seen. Your declared aim is to develop brown field sites first. If the scoring system were to be correctly adjusted, South Wonston would not be a sustainable place to build new houses.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>There is inconsistency too between different communities: why can't South Wonston include the extra housing which has been built at Worthy Down, which, although separated from the village, is part of the parish and uses our school and shop. Wickham has been allowed to count development at Knowle, which is also in the same parish, but separate from it. Hursley has shops, pubs, better transport and facilities, yet has not been allocated any housing development. These inconsistencies are unjust and betray muddled thinking.</p> <p>Site location: this is a very serious issue and should weigh heavily in assessing the appropriateness of this development. There is no clarity as to where the access, onto/off West Hill Road North, would be. Any access would be on a very narrow road, where two cars can barely pass each other, larger vehicles cannot pass without squeezing into and onto the verge. There is currently no footpath, certainly no cycle way, and if even only a footpath were added, this would make the road even narrower, as there is no room for widening the road. A cycle path, another of your laudable objectives, could not be accommodated. If a footpath was added, this would mean the removal of an established hedgerow, and the same thing would be necessary for the visibility splays at the access point. The corner of West Hill Road North and Alresford Drove is a blind 90-degree bend leading onto an even narrower section of road on Alresford Drove. This has already become a rat-run with frequent incidents and where pedestrians etc are at continual risk. Add another 80 cars who will clearly use Alresford Drove as their exit out of the village, and the traffic situation becomes untenable, dangerous and polluting.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKFW-7	<p>Proposal is unacceptable because: It was rejected by the community during previous consultation with residents and the Parish Council It is on green field site going against commitments to build on brownfield first</p>	

	<p>It will mean building in the countryside outside the settlement boundary It will impose more traffic, pollution and environmental damage on the village Incorrectly assumes infrastructure and services the village does not have - school is already overburdened, as is the drainage (frequent seasonal flooding on Downs Road and junction of Wrights Way/West Hill Rd North, and power system. Current development at Barton Farm, proposed developments at South Winchester Golf Course and St John Moore Barracks - huge developments in central Winchester are not being underpinned with infrastructure improvements. Cannot see why additional housing is required in surrounding villages as well - will compromise the rural landscape even further. Michael Gove's confirmation that the levelling up bill will be amended to abolish mandatory housebuilding targets for councils - surely this must mean Winchester needs to review and revise this proposed development. The allocation of new homes must be based on accurate information, should be on brownfield sites first and foremost and should have the support of the local community.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F	<p>Paragraph 14.127 acknowledges the existence of The Drove Road as a PROW with the status of a restricted byway. This means there is a right to ride and drive a horse along this historic route but motorised vehicles are excluded. The policy SW01 in criterion ii. should say 'public rights of way' rather than 'footpaths' in recognition of the importance and higher status of the rights of way network that surrounds the settlement including the restricted byway along the northern boundary of the site.</p>	<p><i>Identical representation to BHLF-KSAR-N8TZ-5 above.</i></p> <p>See response provided there.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKR3-F	<p>I object because: 1. This is a green field site outside the existing settlement boundary. The plan should look to utilise brownfield sites and sites within existing settlement boundaries first.</p>	

	<p>2. The entry to the development will be very close to a sharp right angled bend in the highway. This corner is difficult and dangerous to negotiate at present. With an additional 40 houses, possibly 80 or more cars entering and exiting not far from the bend the danger will certainly increase.</p> <p>3. The infrastructure in South Wonston is struggling at present and cannot reasonably cope with such a large increase in population.</p> <p>4. The school is normally full or almost full.</p> <p>5. The Gratton Surgery is also struggling with long waits to see a GP.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T	<p>I barely know where to start since there are so many reasons why developing a greenfield site at South Wonston (SW) is so wrong and I am angry about the injustice of it:</p> <p>SW has been mis-ranked in the settlement hierarchy. Other settlements have not been given an allocation of housing. SW residents and SW Parish council have said 'NO' to any allocations Existing site SW01 supports biodiversity and wildlife. 40 more houses destroys the biodiversity and wildlife that lives on SW01 It brings another 80 cars and commuters as there is no employment in SW and this increases carbon emissions. Developing this greenfield site it totally against all the carbon neutral aims of the council and of those stated in the local plan and climate emergency action plan.</p> <p>Added to this the road services are already under strain. West hill road is not wide enough for this kind of development. There is nowhere to put a pavement on the west side of West Hill Road. This would mean pedestrians having to cross West Hill Road which would be dangerous with cars rounding the 90 degree bend with Alresford Drove.</p> <p>The scoring system (the Settlement Hierarchy) scores says that SW has</p>	

	<p>potential for employment in the village and gives 2 points. 2 points is the same as Winchester. This is madness and totally wrong. SW has one small business- Venta and that's it! 2 points for employment must be removed. SW01 is scored as having superfast broadband which we don't at this end of the village. 2 points for superfast broadband should be removed. SW01 has no mains drainage. For similar reasons (lack of mains sewage) , Sutton Scotney has been excused any housing allocation !</p> <p>The Impact Assessment has been corrected and concludes that this site has NEGATIVE LANDSCAPE AND BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS. Why is SW01 still being allocated new housing? Further this is a green field site beyond the village boundary. You are thus extending urbanisation into the countryside on a field over which red kites, kestrels and buzzards are frequently seen. Your declared aim is to develop brown field sites first. If the scoring system were to be correctly adjusted, South Wonston would not have any benefits and therefore nothing to recommend it as a place to build new houses.</p> <p>When site SW01 was assessed it was wrongly given a positive for Doctor's surgery which has not been corrected in the IIA. South Wonston DOES NOT HAVE a Doctor's Surgery</p> <p>There is inconsistency too between different communities: why can't South Wonston include the extra housing which has been built at Worthy Down, which, although separated from the village, is part of the parish and uses our school and shop. Wickham has been allowed to count development at Knowle which is also in the same parish, but separate from it. Hursley has shops, pubs, better transport and facilities, massive employment potential from IBM and yet has not been allocated any housing development. These inconsistencies are unjust.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Site location: this is a very serious issue and should weigh heavily in assessing the appropriateness of this development. There is no clarity as to where the access, onto/off West Hill Road North, would be. Any access would be on a very narrow road, where two cars can barely pass each other, larger vehicles cannot pass without squeezing into and onto the verge. There is currently no footpath, certainly no cycle way, and if even only a footpath were added, this would make the road even narrower, as there is no room for widening the road. A cycle path, another of your laudable objectives, could not be accommodated. If a footpath was added, this would mean the removal of an established hedgerow, and the same thing would be necessary for the visibility splays at the access point. The corner of West Hill Road North and Alresford Drove is a blind 90-degree bend leading onto an even narrower section of road on Alresford Drove. Add another 80 cars who will clearly use Alresford Drove as their exit out of the village, and the traffic situation becomes untenable, dangerous and polluting.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8YS-3	<p>Greenfield site outside the settlement boundary. Would impose more traffic and there are already significant issues Alresford Drove which is the access point from the west of the village. There isn't the infrastructure and services to support this number of extra homes.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7	<p>My main objection come in my point 10. However, firstly there are a number of inaccuracies in the rating for this development.</p> <p>1) We do not have a health centre in the village, we only a small building in which occasional surgeries are held and vaccinations take place, in the 32 years that I have lived in the village, I have been in that building once. It is administered from the Gratton Surgery. This surgery is already very busy, (over 2 weeks to get an appointment and repeat prescriptions take 5 working day to be prepared), how can you expect it to cope with another 40 families?</p> <p>2) This village is a dormitory village where traveling to work by car is almost essential. The village already has a high level of pollution from road traffic and this development would only make this worse. Please</p>	

	<p>don't say that they will all be driving electric cars.</p> <p>3) Although the power supply to the village was improved about 20 years ago there has been a lot of development since then, and with the advent of each of these houses having to have an electric charging point, will we go back to the days where power failures were a frequent occurrence in the village?</p> <p>4) You rate the broadband in the village as very good, it is not consistent across all areas and struggles in the late afternoons and evenings.</p> <p>5) opening up this area to development will create a precedent for development all along the north side of the village to Stainers Farm, To say that it will not have an adverse affect on the countryside as viewed from the road from Sutton Scotney, is untrue, The village at the moment appears as a thin ribbon of mainly bungalows and primarily their back gardens. building further down the slope will create a appearance of a built up hillside, especially if further estates follow, as surely they will. No amount of trees will hide it.</p> <p>6) There is no mains drainage to the north side of the village and no feasible way of providing a treatment works for increase demand, there not being any significant water course into which it could feed. Pumping it to the main drainage system would put the area at risk of significant pollution should this system fail and lead to a similar situation that is being faced in Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>7) to say that the village needs another park, is ridiculous, within 5 minutes of any house in the village we have wonderful open countryside and a good park.</p> <p>8) The village has one small shop (good as it is) and a club, the rating for facilities is therefore too high. How come every day there are multiple numbers of delivery vans polluting the village.</p> <p>9) Buses are insufficient for reducing car usage and not convenient for the elderly to get to the doctors or for prescriptions (no longer sent to the shop). I help a neighbour almost every week to get to the surgery or</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>hospital, and others help them too.</p> <p>10) BUT my main objection is that this is a greenfield site - Once lost, it cannot be restored - With World Food Security teetering on a knife edge, the loss of any agricultural land, no matter how poor, is a reduction in this country's resilience against a future when we are going to have to feed the nation and reduce our reliance on food imports which cause food miles, water poverty in other counties and fuels Global Warming. The increasing isolationist policies of all countries, warfare (such as in Ukraine) and weather extremes causing crop failures are already leading to food shortages and the increased cost of living. It is vital that we stop taking away our children's heritage of the British countryside. Not only do green space allow us to choose whether it is used for agriculture, species retention and biodiversity, but also land holds water which reduces flooding, captures carbon, helps reduces global warming and promotes well-being and improves mental health. We lose it at our peril.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8YA-H	<p>The site is unsuitable for the proposed development allocation and the policy should be amended to remove the allocation from South Wonston parish, which has recently accommodated a significant housing development at Worthy Down. The local plan talks of priority being given to developing brownfield sites yet this is clearly a greenfield site.</p> <p>The main reasons why the site is unsuitable are related to access and local infrastructure.</p> <p>The junction of The Drive and West Hill Road is already a problem which the parish council is struggling to solve; adding the traffic from 40 extra dwellings will make the problem worse to the point of being a safety issue.</p> <p>Furthermore 40 extra dwellings in a village with very limited public transport will simply drive up private car usage. Winchester City Council</p>	

	declared a climate emergency in June 2019 so it should adopting development policies which reduce car usage not drive it up.	
ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B	<p>Settlement Boundary Change (p493; SHELAA SW03).</p> <p>1. [Settlement Boundary Change (p493; SHELAA SW03)] This countryside site has only been earmarked for 3 new homes. It will not deliver any benefit to the local or wider community; it is over a mile from the nearest main road with only one route into the site. The route in goes down a narrow residential cul-de-sac that is used for children's play and through the front drive of existing homes. There are very poor amenities in the parish, already stretched by the delivery of over 100 new homes in the last 5 years. Why has an allocation of a remote site with space for 3 homes been included?</p> <p>2. [Settlement Boundary Change (p493; SHELAA SW03)] There are few employment opportunities in the village, so residents of these new homes will have to commute. Apart from one tenuous link to the North edge of the village, this site is not connected to any developed land, current or proposed. It does not enable other development and may even hinder it. How will this allocation address the climate emergency when it is an inefficient use of land, it will create more avoidable traffic, cause environmental damage and brings no benefits?</p> <p>SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495).</p> <p>1. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] This countryside site is right on the end of a line of residential property and apart from two adjacent bungalows, is surrounded by countryside on all 4 sides – although there is a rural exception site to the East. It is over a mile from the nearest main road with only one route into the site – Alresford Drove is not considered as a suitable route for traffic by the Highways Authority. This site can only be developed with considerable expenditure on access improvements.</p> <p>2. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] There are very poor amenities in the parish, including an infrequent and patchy bus service.</p>	

	<p>Amenities have already been stretched by the delivery of over 100 new homes in the last 5 years. There are few employment opportunities in the village, so residents of these new homes will have to commute. How will this allocation address the climate emergency when it will generate more traffic, it will create more environmental damage and brings no significant benefits?</p> <p>3. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] SW07 is firmly in the countryside and has not been developed previously. Hampshire County Council's emerging new Local Transport Plan calls for transport (and other developments) to follow its principles, including reduce dependency on the private car; support local living; encourage sustainable travel; protect the environment; place climate change at the heart of decision-making. Including SW07 in the site allocations goes directly against these principles. Why is including SW07 as a suitable site for development considered more important than achieving the principles of the Local Transport Plan?</p> <p>4. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] The Local Plan is supposed to have the Climate Emergency at the heart of all policies and allocations. This site will generate more traffic, destroy open countryside and cause more environmental harm than brownfield sites or those adjacent to major settlements. How can the Climate Emergency be addressed by development of this site?</p> <p>5. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] With the increase in population, increased walkable and / or cycle access to local facilities such as GP surgeries, pharmacies, schools and shops will need to be part of the local plan to reduce car dependency to align with the declared climate emergency and net zero emission agenda. This is in Policy T1 Sustainable Travel and this policy is supported. However, this allocation of land for residential development is in the countryside and is a great distance from these important amenities, so it is hard to see how the objectives of policy T1 can be achieved by this allocation.</p> <p>6. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] This small allocation of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>homes is better allocated to a brownfield site such as Sir John Moore Barracks, where it will not be opposed.</p> <p>7. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] Policy NE5 is supported but is ignored in this allocation of rural land that is rich in biodiversity site. New homes on this site will impact on the biodiversity of the whole village.</p> <p>8. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] Policy CN3 is supported. Our expectation is that any new homes build should be held accountable to rigorous building standards of zero emissions and carbon neutrality. In the light of the climate emergency declared by the parish council and Winchester City Council we expect the homes to be built with non-fossil fuel heating and energy options such as ground source heat pumps and solar panels.</p> <p>9. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] Policy H6 is supported. Any housing development needs to include a range of housing to ensure a proportion are affordable to promote inclusion and equality.</p> <p>10. [SW07 Land off West Hill Road North (p495)] If this allocation is to be retained in the Local Plan, it should include a community growing space to supplement or replace the existing allotment provision that is on private land on a short-term licence.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8GV-M	<p>I would like to express my objection to the proposed development of West Hill Road North.</p> <p>The only viable entrance to the village will be down downs road at over a mile long the increase in traffic will be immense with the potential of 80 extra vehicles trying to enter/ exit the village at peak times.</p> <p>The entrance to the village via Alresford drive road is completely unsuitable as an access way. As it is there are frequent incidents that are reported in the village Facebook page.</p> <p>There are more suitable options that have much more appropriate right</p>	

	<p>of access and wouldn't be expanding the village boundary and destroying our countryside.</p> <p>I explore you not to ignore the villagers who have opposed this development.</p> <p>The current infrastructure is poor as it stands. The primary school is oversubscribed. The doctors are already under enough pressure as it is.</p> <p>The power provision is also a problem we currently suffer from power cuts from a substation that is not coping with the current level of development which has been exasperated by back yard developments to which another two extra dwelling have been constructed in the last two years. If there is continual extra pressure out on our resources it only makes the issues worse.</p> <p>I'd like to remind you that Councillors Horrill, Godfrey and Cunningham are also opposed to this development.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N	<p>Having tried my best to wade through the Local Planning Documents, I have to say that this document appears to be written in such an intimidating manner that its main objective is to put people off opposing the Local Plan. The opinion of local residents with regards to the local plans are surely a very important part of the decision-making process. We live in South Wonston, we see the day-to-day activity and know the area better than most in the local planning department.</p> <p>I wish this email to be considered and registered as my opposition to the proposed development SW01 (previously SW07), in South Wonston, My reasons are based on what I consider real and important facts, and I hope that you take in to consideration all points made by the residents of our village.</p>	

	<p>First of all, the scoring system of The Settlement Hierarchy is wrong, I am bemused as to how this could happen. It scores 2 points stating that the village currently has high speed broadband, I can assure you we don't. It scores 2 points for employment opportunities, we are a small village, with a small school, and a village shop, we cannot be considered an area that offers employment opportunities, any residents of new houses in the village will have work that will almost certainly be outside the village. Also it stated we have a doctor's surgery, well we do not, you cannot make an appointment to see a GP in the village, you cannot get access to a pharmacy in the village there is no permanent member of staff from the surgery based in South Wonston, you have to phone or go to Gratton Surgery in Sutton Scotney. If the scoring system was based on reality and not some dreamt up facts and figures South Wonston would not be liable for having housing allocation.</p> <p>Any new development on SW01, will break the Village boundary, and as such is a designates Green Field site, my understanding is that one of the objectives of the planning committee is not to build on Green Field sites but to build on Brown Field Sites first. The proposed site supports a lot of wildlife, bats are often seen flying over the area.</p> <p>As you are aware South Wonston School is full, it has already been reported that a substantial number of children from Worthy Down have been unable to gain a place. Building 40 to 50 more houses in the village this will only exasperate this issue. Worthy Down is part of the Parish, but for some reason only known to the planning department the extra housing built at Worthy Down has not been included in our housing numbers, unlike other parishes, this lack of consistency is questionable, and to my mind shows a level of incompetence.</p> <p>The actual site location itself is so questionable and I am bemused why this particular site was even considered. The access to any new</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>development will be via West Hill Road North, and, or Alresford Drove. The junction of these two roads is at a right angle, with zero visibility you cannot see what is coming at you from either side, it is very dangerous. The width of West Hill Road North at best will allow two cars to slowly pass. The part of West Hill Road North where the proposed new site is has NO FOOTPATHS, and no space to build one. If SW01 were to go ahead this situation would seriously impact the safety of anyone attempting to walk into the village, especially children. It would be a catastrophe waiting to happen! The immediate access to Alresford drove is via a single lane, again barley big enough for a car, let alone vehicles such as delivery lorries. Who in their right mind would propose the building of 40 or so houses with such access issues. The newly generated traffic will also add to the existing grid lock of Downs Road during school pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>I hope and trust that you will take my, and all of the local residents thoughts and arguments into consideration, and come to the only conclusion, that the proposed development at SW01 is not viable for many reasons, especially on the grounds of safety.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J	<p>South Wonston is surrounded by grade 3 agricultural farmland. There will be a significant negative impact for loss of greenfield land, the Present policy is that brownfield sites should be developed. and for good reason. The fields around South Wonston support many birds on the Red List eg.Redwing, Fieldfare, Skylark, Linnet, Mistletoe thrush, Yellowhammer, House Sparrow, Starling, and Songthrush. Destruction of their habitat does not correspond with an ethos of conservation and concern for the planet.</p> <p>Why have South Wonston and Otterbourne been the only 'smaller intermediate' rural settlements to be given a housing allocation?</p> <p>Worthy Down, in the parish of South Wonston, has been greatly</p>	

	<p>extended over recent years and this should carry the same treatment as eg. Wickham are allowed to take into account developments at Knowle, in the same parish. How is this different? This is not consistent.</p> <p>South Wonston has been identified as being in an area of the highest levels of emission per capita from commuting. This shows that it is not a sustainable location for further development. Local transport is poor so the vast majority of residents drive to work.</p> <p>South Wonston is close to Groundwater source protection zones (SPZ) Further development is not desirable.</p> <p>The reason most people choose to live in South Wonston is because of the surrounding countryside- the views, the walks, the wealth of animals, birds and insects. It has poor facilities and is poorly connected to other places but for residents the fact that we are surrounded by nature and have a real sense of community outweigh the downsides. Enlarging the village will destroy this.</p> <p>I have objected to the aspects of the scoring in the settlement hierarchy. Please see under comments.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N83N-R	<p>I would strongly object to this policy on several grounds, basically need for more housing, infrastructure in and around the village and adherence to Council Policy.</p> <p>In relation to the need for more housing in the village, a recent poll of residents organised by the Parish Council showed that there wasn't ANY requirement for more housing from the residents in the village.</p> <p>This means that these additional houses will put more pressure on the facilities and infrastructure in the village, for example:</p>	

	<p>There is no employment, and only a small village shop, so additional housing will inevitably mean more car journeys to work and shopping, so more traffic on Downs Road, or the Ox Drove. The former means more cars in the high pedestrian risk areas between the school and the village shop and along the drove (which has become a high-speed road since it was surfaced.</p> <p>The plan says that there would be a need to get sewage to the nearest point of adequacy but doesn't say that there is sufficient capacity in the network or at the treatment works, indeed the plan recognises that that parts of the village doesn't have adequate sewerage. If additional capacity is required, the scope of work under the OFWAT PRN 25 programme is currently being finalised, so if additional capacity is required, and this is quite likely, given that this development is not in the current Local Plan, it is unlikely that that it could be delivered before the end of AMP 9 in 2035, which doesn't fit in with the timescale in the draft plan, which further reinforces my view that so this part of the plan obviously hasn't been thought through properly.</p> <p>Is there capacity at the village school to accommodate the addition number of primary school pupils that 40 new houses would inevitably bring? 40 houses could well be another class, There has been a lot of expansion at the school over the years that we have lived in the village and it is hard to see how another classroom could be constructed without losing a significant part of the school playing field, but again the draft plan doesn't make any mention of this, which also suggests to me that the plan hasn't been though through in detail.</p> <p>Council Policies. This development would drive a coach and horses through several of the policies contained in the very same draft plan that it is contained in.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Firstly, the land is a green field site outside the village boundary, which would be a major change in policy and goes against commitments made by the council to develop brownfield sites first.</p> <p>Secondly, it contradicts SP1 contained in the same draft Plan concerning sustainable transport. As I have already said, there is no employment, shops, or recreation facilities in the village and very limited public transport and none after 7 PM or on Sundays, so development here will inevitably lead to more car journeys, not sustainable transport.</p> <p>SP2 seeks to promote walking and cycling, but whilst the village offers plenty of opportunities for recreational walking and cycling during daylight hours (largely based upon the use of the Drove), there aren't any walking or cycling routes suitable for getting to Kingsworthy, Harestock, Sutton Scotney or Winchester, in fact anywhere outside of the village, that are safe. Christmas Hill is a high-speed road, with no lighting, verge, or footpath, has reduced visibility and isn't wide enough for cars or lorries to pass without using the opposite side of the road, so it definitely isn't safe for either pedestrians or cyclists, so the requirement for planning applications to promote development in SP2 could not be met.</p> <p>And finally, development here would be a blatant disregard for Policy SP3. This land is designated as countryside and recognised as such in the proposal and SP 3 says that countryside would only be developed if there was a link to agriculture etc, or there is an exceptional need. The Parish Council survey established that there wasn't any need at all for affordable housing in the village, so the proposed development cannot be said to meet these criteria in any way.</p> <p>The lack of attention to thought and detail that has gone into this plan leads me to believe that it is nothing more than a speculative venture</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>intended to make somebody a great deal of money, rather than a carefully thought-out planning strategy.</p> <p>This proposal so obviously goes against the policies contained in the very same draft plan that contains this proposal, and a change of use of four acres of low-grade pasture to residential development would make someone millions of pounds, which means that I have got to ask, what is the real reason why the Council not only promoting and but actively seeking to enable this development?</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X	<p>South Wonston has increased its housing since the 1970's, prior to that it was mainly agricultural land.</p> <p>Since the 1970's the number of houses has been increasing with over 2,500 households. The main road in and out of South Wonston is 1.5km with housing, a primary school, part of which is now extended as a C of E church, one village shop, a social club, a village hall, and a doctor's surgery (part of Gratton Surgery, in Sutton Scotney).</p> <p>The village of South Wonston currently has a population of over 3,000 plus residents and development of land has been recently increased in Downs Road, 2020 - 2021; The old equestrian business ' Cloud Bank' earlier in 2012 and La Frenaye was completed in 2007 as so call affordable housing, although since they have been built some are now privately owned.</p> <p>The reason why I think this development should be rejected are as follows: -</p> <p>(1) The proposal of adding another 40 house dwelling on registered agricultural land which is OUTSIDE the village's development boundary.</p>	

	<p>(1.2) The current Government housing policy is to use Brown Field sites first over changing the use of agricultural land to build new houses.</p> <p>(2) Lack of safe exit road other than Downs Road, which is already a very busy road with traffic passing a Primary School, South Wonston Primary School.</p> <p>There are only two exits out of South Wonston Village, Downs Road and the only other alternative village exit to Christmas Hill is the Alresford Drove, which is just past the proposed development site, in West Hill North Road - SW01.</p> <p>(2.1) The Alresford Drove is not only the alternative village exit, it is a Restricted Byway from West Hill North to Stoke Charity or to Kings Worthy. It has a very narrow prioritised strip and a weigh restriction of vehicles up to 7.5 tonnes, and a 30 mph limit from Sanctuary Farm, into West Hill North Road. It is only possible for 2 vehicles to pass BEYOND the narrow strip.</p> <p>(2.2) Other Housing Guidelines for the Countryside Area survey 2006, stated that (1) Future planning should NOT increase the burden of traffic on the Alresford Drove - WDLPR 2006 - T2; WDLP1 - CP10 & NPPF - 35.</p> <p>(2.3) The ungenerous width of the Un-Adopted Road (Alresford Drove) has already proved to be a main factor in previous planning approvals being REJECTED by the H.C.C. And it was stated that future development, which could increase traffic on the Alresford Drove, (which has a speed limit increasing up to 60 mph after the 30 mph restricted limit, just past Sanctuary Farm), and it stated that it is important that new development should avoid danger to vulnerable users of this road, e.g., horse riders, cyclists, dog walkers, and</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>ramblers.</p> <p>Therefore the conclusion is that an increase in traffic on this narrow road with NO footpaths either side, will increase the risk of road traffic accidents, and possible collisions to vulnerable road users as described above.</p> <p>(2.4) Also, as the Alresford Drove has a weight limit of up to ONLY 7.5 tonnes, any development of West Hill North fields (SW01) will mean that all heavy lorries bringing in building supplies will have to come down the main road of the village past a large primary school, where there are already parking issues at school drop off and pick up times with school buses parked outside the school restricting the normal flow of traffic during travel peak times in the mornings and afternoons.</p> <p>(3) Lack of infrastructure for another 40 house dwellings. Reading the proposed plan on the website it says, ' parts of South Wonston' already has inadequate sewage or drain and this site will increase the load on the local sewage works at Harestock, which is already struggling with added housing being developed at Barton Farm, just up the road from the Harestock Southern Water managed.</p> <p>(3.1) If additional capacity is required at this sewage works the current scope of work under the OFWAT PRN 25 programme is unlikely to be delivered until after 2035 and this development, if it is built prior to this date, proposed date of construction from 2030 will increase, the local pollution into our waterways and into our rivers and then out into our Southern coastal areas. All, of Britain's rivers are currently pollution and we no longer have any BLUE flagged beaches on the South Coast, including I.O.W.</p> <p>(4) Other burdens on our failing infrastructure.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(4.1) Villagers are already struggling to get a Doctor's appointment, local surgery, Gratton Surgery is struggling to give doctor appointments.</p> <p>(4.2) The Primary school will require more teachers and a new classroom to take new pupils from the local area if more housing is added to the village.</p> <p>(4.3) There is no employment except the Primary School and Winchester and local area is mainly rural. Therefore, more traffic going onto the A34, M3, M27, A303 to commute to work.</p>	
BHLF-KSAR-N8RS-V	<p>The draft plan contains a proposed development in South Wonston of 40 dwellings at West Hill Road North and allowing development in the fields behind Wrights Way and Chaucer Cloe. Although we know we need to build new homes in the District, these proposals are unacceptable because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It was rejected by the community during previous consultation with residents and the Parish Council o It is on a green field site going against the commitments made to build on brownfield first o It will mean building in the countryside outside of the settlement boundary o It will impose more traffic, more pollution and more environmental damage on the village o It incorrectly assumes infrastructure and services the village does not have and therefore should be rejected. 	
ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3	<p>The development of 40 houses on SW07 would lead to 80 more cars in South Wonston which already has at least two cars per household. The carbon emissions in this area are already high. Mitigating climate change is already being negated by this proposed development.</p>	

Comments from other topics		
ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3	The policy is fine, but its implementation will not be possible if you propose developments in rural areas, where there is little public transport, as is the case in SW01. There is no employment in the village, so everyone needs to travel to work or shop. Most households in the village have at least two cars, carbon emission levels are already too high, the bus service is, if anything, being reduced. 40 extra houses means 80 extra cars, making a nonsense of your supposed desire to reduce carbon emission and promote active and sustainable transport.	

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA		
Comments from HRA		

Amendments to text for Policy SWO1:

14.127

~~Environmental~~

14.129

~~Access~~

Add additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –

As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they can provide safe and suitable access for all users and address highway safety issues on Alresford Drove.

14.130

Add additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –

As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to provide active travel links across the site and links to the surrounding network of PROW and other active travel routes.

14.131

Infrastructure

Add additional wording at end of paragraph as follows –

As the site is located on a principal aquifer, any proposed development will need to avoid any contamination to this aquifer. The site lies within the catchment areas of South Wonston Primary and Henry Beaufort Secondary School. Advice from the Local Education Authority has indicated that it is likely that the development could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.

Amendments to Policy SW01:

Policy SW01 Land at West Hill Road North

Land at West Hill Road North, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the about 40 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific requirements: Nature & Phasing of Development

- i. The development is phased for the latter part of the Local Plan period and permission for housing development will not be granted before 2030;
- ii. Provide an overall site plan indicating the general siting of development, open space, landscaping and access points that minimises wider landscape impacts, provides vehicular and pedestrian and cycle access to the site and indicates linkages to ~~the~~ **The Drove Road PROW**/existing footpaths around the site. Any applications for all or part of the site should demonstrate how the proposal will accord with these principles and achieve the form of development intended by this allocation as a whole;

Access

- iii. Provide a vehicular access to the site from West Hill Road North **at a safe distance from Alresford Drove**;
- iv. Provide a new footpath/cycleway links at the south-eastern ~~along eastern~~ edge of the site to connect with existing ~~as part of a routes~~ into the village centre;
- v. Provide pedestrian/cycle links through or around the site to the Drove Road PROW;

Environmental

- vi. Retain and enhance existing planting/trees/hedgerows around the borders of the site except where their removal is necessary for access and visibility purposes and increase screening with additional planting;
- vii. Provide landscape buffers to protect the amenities of existing properties to the south of the site and any wider views from South Wonston village to the north;
- viii. Provide on-site, informal green space and children's play space in accordance with the approach set out in policy NE3;
- ix. Provide a lighting scheme to enable a secure environment for residents and users of the site and minimises light pollution and visual intrusion into the wider countryside area;

Other Infrastructure

- x. Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network and/or make arrangements for appropriate water drainage/disposal in collaboration with the service provider;
- xi. **Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected;**
- xii. Contribute to infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms **including addressing any need for education provision (Primary and Secondary) to meet the needs of the development.**

SW07: Land at West Hill Road North

Proposed use: Residential use



IIA Objective	Score
IIA1: climate change mitigation	Minor negative (-)
IIA2: travel and air quality	Minor negative (-)
IIA4: health and wellbeing	Minor positive (+)
IIA7: services and facilities	Minor negative (-)
IIA8: economy	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA9: biodiversity and geodiversity	Minor negative (-)
IIA10: landscape	Minor negative uncertain (-?)
IIA11: historic environment	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA12: natural resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA13: water resources	Minor negative (-)
IIA14: flood risk	Negligible (0)

IIA objective 1: To minimise the District's contribution to climate change through a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources and facilitate the aim of carbon neutrality by 2031

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 1a: Minor positive (+); 1b: Minor positive (+); 1c: Major negative (--); 1d: Major negative (--); 1e: Major negative (--); 1f: Major negative (--); 1g: Major positive (++); 1h: Major positive (++); 1i: Major negative (--)

Justification: The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 401-800m of a primary school. It is not within 2,000m of a secondary school. It is not within 1,200m of a town centre. It is not within 800m of a district or local centre. It is not within 2,000m of a railway station. It is within 300m of a bus stop. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open county or registered common land. The majority of it is within an area where average commuting distance is in 81-100% range for the plan area.

IIA objective 2: To reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the District and improve air quality

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 4: To improve public health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities in the District

Overall effect: Minor positive (+)

Score by criteria: 4a: Negligible (0); 4b: Negligible (0); 4c: Negligible (0); 4d: Negligible (0); 4e: Minor positive (+); 4f: Major positive (++); 4g: Major positive (++)

Justification: The site is not within 500m of an AQMA. The majority of it is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are below 50 dB and the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are below 55 dB. The site does not lie within a noise contour associated with Southampton Airport. It is not within 400m of a wastewater treatment works or within 250m of a waste management facility. The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open county or registered common land. It is within 200m of a public right of way or cycle path.

IIA objective 7: To ensure essential services and facilities and jobs in the District are accessible

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 8: To support the sustainable growth of the District's economy

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is not in existing employment use.

IIA objective 9: To support the District's biodiversity and geodiversity

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 9a: Negligible (0); 9b: Negligible (0); 9c: Negligible (0); 9d: Negligible (0); 9e:

Justification: The site is not within an internationally or nationally designated biodiversity site or within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for 'residential' or 'all planning applications'. It is not within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland. It is not within 200m of a priority habitat. It is not within 100m of a water course. The site does not intersect with a county or local geological site.

IIA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

Overall effect: Minor negative uncertain (-?)

Justification: The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity

IIA objective 11: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment including its setting.

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is rated 'green' for risk of effects on heritage assets.

IIA objective 12: To support the efficient use of the District's resources, including land and minerals

Overall effect: Significant negative (--)

Score by criteria: 12a: Major negative (--); 12b: Minor negative (-); 12c: Negligible (0)

Justification: The majority of the site contains greenfield land. A significant proportion of the site ($\geq 25\%$) is on Grade 3 agricultural land or less than 25% of the site is on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Less than 25% of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

IIA objective 13: To protect the quality and quantity of the District's water resource

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site falls within a Source Protection Zone 2 or 3, falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (groundwater), or falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (surface water).

IIA objective 14: To manage and reduce flood risk from all sources

Overall effect: Negligible (0)

Score by criteria: 14a: Negligible (0); 14b: Negligible (0)

Justification: Less than 25% of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3. Less than 25% of the site has a 1 in 100 year or 1 in 30 year risk of surface water flooding.