

Examination of the Winchester District Local Plan 2020-2040 - Hearing Statement on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land - ANON-AQTS-32TT-6 Land at Springvale Road, Kings Worthy

Matter 1 – Procedural/legal requirements

Issue: Whether all Statutory and Regulatory requirements have been met?

Duty to Cooperate

- 1. Is there clear evidence that the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies in accordance with section 33A of the 2004 Act, in respect of strategic matters with cross-boundary impacts considered through the preparation of the Plan?*

Our representations on behalf of Taylor Wimpey have been primarily concerned with housing delivery. We conclude that the evidence suggests that the Council **has not engaged sufficiently, constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities** to formulate the plan.

We have stated within our submission on Matter 4 that the plan makes insufficient provision to address the unmet need in neighbouring authorities, despite having larger areas of unconstrained land than nearby authorities.

The Duty to Cooperate Statement (SD06) demonstrates that during the 6 years that the plan was under preparation in advance of submission, the LPA engaged with 4 neighbouring authorities beginning in 2020, and 4 further authorities beginning in Q4 2023 – quite late in the process in the run up to the Regulation 19 consultation. The degree of engagement was limited to a small number of meetings in each case. The issue of shared housing provision was raised in meetings with two of the eight adjacent authorities, resulting in a formal request from those authorities (Havant and Portsmouth) for assistance with delivering their required numbers. The spatial strategy set out at Regulation 18, before engagement had taken place with four of the eight adjacent authorities, is unmodified. The plan does make full provision for the requested numbers and will therefore be likely to contribute to a shortfall across the region as the evolving plans of those neighbouring authorities emerge.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 3. The SA tested five spatial strategy options: a development strategy based on the adopted Local Plan, focusing development on Winchester and the larger more sustainable settlements; a strategy based on a new strategic allocation/new settlement; a strategy based on dispersing development around the District largely in proportion to the size of existing settlements; and, a variation of option 1, known as option 1A, which provides for a higher total number of dwellings. It takes account of existing commitments, windfall allowance and has the effect of reducing development in the South Hampshire Urban Area and increasing it in Winchester and the Market Towns and Rural Areas. Given national policy that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should an option with a higher growth target have been considered?*

Yes. In accordance with the above and our submissions under Matters 3 and 4, which conclude that the overall number of homes provided for in the plan is too low, fails to fully address the need arising from neighbouring authorities, and fails to recognise the overall capacity of the District to accommodate more homes – including in the MTRA with which we are primarily concerned – **a higher growth target should have been considered.**