

Local Plan Regulation 18 responses regarding the Settlement Hierarchy

Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8TG-J ANON-KSAR-N8QS-U ANON-KSAR-N85J-P</p>	<p>Methodology</p> <p>The scoring for public transport should better distinguish the differences in service available in Winchester, and settlements less well served such as South Wonston. The scoring for employment should better distinguish the differences between the availability of employment opportunities in Winchester and settlements with fewer employers.</p> <p>The methodology does not sufficiently reflect the differences between settlements.</p>	<p>As a point of detail, the methodology does allow for less frequent services, additional routes (under “other services and facilities”) to allow for greater differentiation between settlements than just the presence of a minimum hourly bus service. Similarly the revised methodology in the 2022 document does allow for some differentiation between settlements with more employment opportunities. Nonetheless, the limitations in the weighting of facilities is acknowledged in para. 4.7 of the document. However, the subsequent categorisation of settlements and development strategy in the emerging Plan does allow the difference in services to be reflected in the much larger amount of development directed towards Winchester Town.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N81S-U</p>	<p>Concern expressed that the 2022 SHR now groups churches, pubs,</p>	<p>Such facilities are not fully</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N8GS-H ANON-KSAR-N81U-W</p>	<p>village halls and cafe/restaurants into a single category 'Facility for Community to Congregate'.</p>	<p>interchangeable but there is enough scope for these to be used in more than one way – for instance, cafes in village halls - to justify their grouping together as one common function.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N81S-U ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N8GS-H ANON-KSAR-N81U-W</p>	<p>Concern pre-school facilities had been removed from the 2022 settlement hierarchy assessment.</p>	<p>Pre school facilities are considered important and remain in the 2022 settlement hierarchy as a daily facility</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK4E-3</p>	<p>Concern the process relies on local Parish Offices to provide the data with the potential for bias.</p>	<p>The process followed is set out in para. 4.10 of the Settlement Hierarchy document. The starting point for the presence of facilities is the parish facilities audit carried out in 2022, but the publication of the initial document in 2021 and the update in 2022 in support of the regulation draft local plan consultation has provided opportunities for its findings to be checked and queried.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK2A-W</p>	<p>One respondent queried why secondary schools were given a lower weighting than primary schools.</p>	<p>Comments are noted, but the weighting given seeks to recognise that pupil journeys to secondary school are more likely to be by bus and cycle than journeys by primary school pupils.</p>

		primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.
ANON-KSAR-NKB5-1 ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q	<p>Presence of facilities Respondents stated the following facilities were not present in the settlements. –</p> <p>South Wonston – Superfast Broadband, mains drainage, employment, GP surgery)</p>	<p>The 2022 hierarchy reflects there is not a GP surgery in South Wonston. Mains drainage has been removed from the methodology, primarily as it has less relevance for the need to travel. Paragraph 4.11 of the document sets out how the availability of broadband was assessed and this has been rechecked in response to these comments. Finally, it is considered there are sufficient employment opportunities in South Wonston to justify the scoring.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N81S-U ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N8GS-H	<p>Respondents stated the following facilities were present in the settlement –</p> <p>Waltham Chase - Post Office</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK4E-3	<p>Otterbourne - Bright Horizons Otterbourne Day Nursery</p>	
		<p>It is agreed the post office has relocated to the Village Store and this should be reflected in the Settlement Hierarchy.</p> <p>The facility is some way outside the settlement boundary of Otterbourne</p>

<p>BHLF-KSAR-N863-Z</p>	<p>Curdrige – Shop (at the petrol station) , bus service 28 is now daily and hourly, Reading Room play area, Library and postal services.</p>	<p>and it is considered not appropriate to include it in the assessment of facilities for that settlement.</p> <p>The shop is some distance from the settlement. Route 28 does not serve the settlement of Curdrige. The reading room play area is not considered sufficient facility to warrant inclusion in the scoring. There is no library or post office in Curdrige.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK2A-W ANON-KSAR-N81U-W</p>	<p>Swanmore – Post office in shop, pre school in village hall.</p>	<p>It is accepted there are post office facilities in Swanmore and this should be reflected in the Settlement Hierarchy. The pre-school is already recognised in the assessment.</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8ZS-4</p>	<p>Hursley – Post Office in convenience store, education, café and workshop in Incuhive, Built Leisure (Hursley Sports and Social Club), Warehouse, broadband, mains gas and mains drainage.</p>	<p>Some of these comments relate to the 2021 document. The 2022 Settlement hierarchy document already recognised the Post Office services, employment opportunities, high speed broadband. The Incuhive falls outside of the settlement boundary but in any event the education provision is not considered sufficient to warrant inclusion, and the settlement already receives a score for the presence of a facility for the community to congregate and for</p>

		<p>employment. The car storage warehouse is not in the settlement and it is considered would not add to the score Hursley already has for an employment opportunity. The Hursley Sports and Social Club is outside the settlement boundary. Access to mains gas and waste water are not included in the 2022 Settlement Hierarchy, primarily because they have less relevance for the need to travel.</p> <p>Proposed Changes:</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy should be updated to reflect the changes to Waltham Chase and Swanmore. The changes result in Swanmore being recategorised as a Larger Rural Settlement.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK4E-3 BHLF-KSAR-N8R7-Z</p>	<p>Other factors Respondents considered that other factors should be taken into account in the assessment as follows –</p> <p>Density of population and population growth (Colden Common)</p>	<p>The density of population and population growth does not have a direct bearing on the settlement's place in the overall hierarchy.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q</p>	<p>Deficit of Open Space (South Wonston)</p>	<p>It is recognised that South Wonston</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-NKTJ-8 ANON-KSAR-N83Q-U ANON-KSAR-N81S-U ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N8GS-H ANON-KSAR-NKZS-Q</p>	<p>The proximity to other, nearby settlements with additional facilities (Curdrige, Littleton, Waltham Chase, Otterbourne)</p>	<p>has a deficit of open space, but this is not considered appropriate to include in the methodology for the settlement hierarchy. Any development will be expected to provide open space in accordance with the standards set out in the ~Local Plan.</p> <p>The assessment of individual sites is informed by the IIA which considered the proximity services and facilities. However, when considering the please each settlement should have in the settlement hierarchy, it is considered more appropriate to focus on the services and facilities which are present in that settlement.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKB5-1</p>	<p>Inconsistencies One respondent asked why Sparsholt has a score of 0 despite the presence of the college and Lainston House Hotel, why Hursley has not been allocated further development and why development at Worthy Down cannot count towards South Wonston</p>	<p>Both the Lainsone House Hotel and Sparsholt College are some way out of the settlement of Sparsholt and it is considered they should not be counted as employment opportunities for that settlement. Hursley is in the process of preparing a neighbourhood plan which was already underway before its identification as an intermediate rural settlement. It is expected that the</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-N838-2 BHLF-KSAR-N8R7-Z</p>	<p>Respondents queried the following outcomes Denmead being assessed as being a larger rural settlement along with Wickham and Bishops Waltham Colden Common in the same category as Wickham and Bishops Waltham</p>	<p>Hursley Neighbourhood Plan may identify sites in and adjacent to the existing settlement in response to local housing needs. The distribution of development informed by the settlement hierarchy and it would not be appropriate for development in one settlement to be a substitute for development in more sustainable locations.</p> <p>The assessment of these settlements has resulted in them being categorised alongside others which are considered to be broadly similar in the amount of services and facilities they include. It is recognised that settlements vary in their character and size but on balance the broad categories are considered reasonable.</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8ZD-N ANON-KSAR-N858-4 ANON-KSAR-N85K-Q BHLF-KSAR-N86A-E ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F</p>	<p>Support for additional allocations Some respondents supported the categorisation of settlements (Colden Common, Kings Worthy, New Alresford and Denmead) and stated there should be additional allocations there in response to housing needs.</p>	<p>The approach to overall housing numbers is set out in the responses to Policy H1 and the Housing Background Paper, and the rationale and justification for the distribution of development is set out in the Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKB5-1</p>	<p>Other comments on impact of development</p>	<p>These are responded to in the responses to policy SWO1, and the</p>

	One respondent raised a number of further comments on the impact of proposed development in South Wonston.	Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper.
ANON-KSAR-N83Q-U BHLF-KSAR-N8ZS-4 ANON-KSAR-N81U-W ANON-KSAR-NK2A-W ANON-KSAR-N81S-U ANON-KSAR-N8UC-F ANON-KSAR-N8GS-H	<p>Specific reassessments of categorisation of settlements</p> <p>The replies from many respondents implied that they considered the categorisation of settlements such as South Wonston, Colden Common and Denmead were placed higher in the order than they should be. A number of other respondents specifically stated a view on which category settlements should be placed in as follows -</p> <p>Otterbourne should be a larger rural settlement Hursley should be a larger village Swanmore should be a larger rural settlement</p> <p>Waltham Chase should be a larger village</p>	<p>The comments here are noted. The detailed points raised by all representations have been considered and they have resulted in some amendments to the scoring and assessment of the settlements of Waltham Chase and Swanmore. This has resulted in the recategorizing of Swanmore as a larger rural settlement. The results of this process will be reflected in the a revised Settlement Hierarchy Paper and reflected in the Proposed Submission Plan.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKFA-H South Wonston Parish Council	<p>The South Wonston Parish Council and residents do not agree with your strategy plan to develop 40 new homes on the site located at West Hill Road North which is outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1. The timing of the publication of the plan and the setting of a housing figure is odd given the huge uncertainty surrounding the potential reforms to planning being considered by the Government and how it will derive future housing numbers. Basingstoke Council has delayed its plan because of this uncertainty.</p> <p>2. The current housing figures are based on out-dated information and the 2021 census data which is now available provides a more robust starting point.</p>	<p>Since this consultation we have had a change in Government and new announcements on changes to the planning system. On balance it is considered better to proceed to get in plan in place. National planning policy and guidance places an emphasis on the Government's standard method for</p>

	<p>3. The Council have included 1450 extra homes to cover the possibility of other districts not meeting their own requirement e.g. the south Hampshire authorities. The justification for the figure and how arrived at is not clear and seems premature as even the south Hampshire authorities don't know what the figures are and as recently as July of this year said the strategy setting out the overall housing requirement will not be published until much later next year</p> <p>4. As a consequence of this approach places like South Wonston have been allocated a site for housing which in effect are providing for an unknown requirement from areas in a different housing market.</p> <p>5. The flawed approach is compounded by the reliance on a settlement hierarchy which despite submissions by the Parish Council does not provide an accurate picture e.g. South Wonston scores the same as Winchester City under public transport and in the overall scoring based on daily facilities is only 2 points below the City.</p> <p>There seems to be an inconsistent approach to development that "counts" towards a settlements number. There has been significant residential development within the South Wonston parish at Worthy Down which doesn't appear in the table for South Wonston at all (p339). In contrast Wickham (p337) has been allowed to count development</p>	<p>calculating housing numbers which council are expected to meet. More detail on this is set out in the Housing Background Paper.</p> <p>Since the publication of the draft plan in 2022 PfSH has now published a position statement which identified a significant amount of unmet housing need across South Hampshire. The proposed submission plan set out how the Council intends to respond to that in this round of plan-making.</p> <p>The homes proposed at South Wonston (or any other settlement) are not specifically for unmet need arising elsewhere. All allocations contribute toward arriving at a level of development considered appropriate when considering the Council's obligations under the planning system, including national planning policy, evidence of local needs, and the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The tables in the Plan relate to each settlement. The position regarding Wickham and Knowle has now changed. Further information is set out in the Development strategy and Site Selection Background Paper.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>at Knowle (which is the Parish of Wickham but not part of the settlement) and is much further from Wickham settlement than Worthy Down is to South Wonston. Why is this?</p> <p>WCC have used “surgery” to mean any premises used for medically related purpose, including part time. South Wonston does not have a Doctor’s surgery in South Wonston anymore and the Gratton Surgery does not intend to reintroduce this facility in the near future The “surgery” is only now used for the community prescribing team and the care home team. This facility therefore should attract Nil points.</p> <p>6. Winchester City Council have declared a climate emergency. Please take note of the increases in pollution and the need to limit vehicle movements in an area that is already designated to have high levels of pollution. South Wonston currently is without detailed air quality monitoring capabilities, therefore restricting actions from being taken to reduce levels of pollution. With the prospect that the village now faces an allocation of 40 homes which will rely on the private car for most journeys, not forgetting the delivery vans, maintenance vans, refuse collection. How this will contribute to meeting the Council’s aim of a net zero district by 2030 is hard to understand.</p> <p>7. Access to the site and the movement of a significant increase in cars will result in the approach side road to the site that will become a severe pressure point for those wishing to traverse this road. In addition, it is stated that the main route which will be used to the site will be via Downs Road, avoiding Alresford Drove. This will not be the case, a high percentage of traffic flow will inevitably use the Drove Road.</p>	<p>Noted. The settlement hierarchy has been updated to remove reference to a GP surgery at South Wonston.</p> <p>The overall transport and air quality impacts of the proposed development of the Plan are set out in the Strategic Transport Assessment which is being published in support of the Proposed Submission Plan. In addition, the Council is bringing forward an Air Quality Strategy to address air quality issues. The Council is</p> <p>The Council has consulted with Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority and their response is available on the consultation website. It is considered that the proposed allocation policy for SWO1 provides an appropriate bases</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Alresford Drove, a very narrow road, formerly a track and is well documented as having significant problems with traffic movements and the call to protect pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders has been made numerous times. To-date the Parish Council has approached Hampshire County Council to ask them repeatedly to try to resolve some of the serious issues, unfortunately, at the moment, this is still work in progress.</p> <p>8. South Wonston parish council rejected all of the SHELAA sites for good reason. The West Hill Road Site is a sensitive landscape and distant from the centre of the village with no footpath adjacent to the site, poor access and importantly it is a green-field site which is not what the leader is promoting.</p> <p>It is therefore strongly requested that the West Hill Road Site be omitted from the next Strategy review.</p>	<p>for securing the acceptable development of this site. Further detail is set out in the responses to Policy SWO1.</p> <p>The Parish Council's position is noted and understood. There is a need for greenfield development and taking all things into consideration it is still considered that the allocation remains appropriate.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKDM-U	No Comment Left	

Appendix 1 – South Wonston Village Stores

