



Winchester Local Plan

Matter 4 Hearing Statement

April 2025



[gladman.co.uk](https://www.gladman.co.uk)



01260 288888

MATTER 4 MEETING HOUSING NEED

Issue: Would the overall strategy and provision for housing development be justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Calculation of Local Housing Need (LHN)

2. Is there substantive evidence to demonstrate that it would be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates in this case as per advice set out in the PPG (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010- 20201216)?

- 1.1.1 Yes, Gladman would suggest that there is substantive evidence to demonstrate that it is appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates, through both unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities and affordability.

The housing requirement

3. In addition, it includes an allowance of 1,900 dwellings to take account of any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring authorities. Given constraints in the District, including within the SDNP, is this figure, which exceeds LHN justified by the evidence?

- 1.1.2 As one of the lesser constrained authorities in the PfSH area, Gladman would suggest that this figure is justified and it may in fact be appropriate for this figure to be increased.
- 1.1.3 With the introduction of the new approach to calculating housing needs, the unmet needs of the wider sub-region are only going to increase within the plan period and as such it may be appropriate to identify and include an increased figure in the housing requirement now so as not to delay the delivery of much needed housing.

5. In stating an unmet need allowance as opposed to a figure intended to meet the need in each authority, would the Plan be effective? Would it accord with NPPF paragraph 61? If an intended figure were included in the Plan, how should that be expressed (as a percentage or specific numbers)?

- 1.1.4 Gladman would suggest that the most appropriate mechanism would be through the identification of specific requirements and where this will be met is the most effective way of identifying where unmet need will be delivered.

6. Is there any substantive evidence to demonstrate that there should be an adjustment to the minimum housing requirement to help deliver affordable housing with regard to the PPG (Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 2a-024-20190220), and if so, would that be effective?

- 1.1.5 The latest affordability ratios indicate that Winchester is only slightly more affordable than at the start of the plan period, despite strong housing delivery in the same period. Median affordability ratios of 12.84 over the latest 5-year period is higher than the county average of 10.19 in the same period.

- 1.1.6 The Council's website also states the following:

There is a genuine shortage of affordable properties in Winchester, with demand for affordable homes massively outstripping supply and the number of people on the waiting list is increasing monthly. The council is constructing new affordable Council Homes and also working with Registered Providers (sometimes known as Housing Associations) to provide new affordable housing across the District.¹

- 1.1.7 In such circumstances, a policy response to increase levels of affordable housing delivery is clearly justified, not only for in Winchester itself, but the wider sub-region.

¹ <https://www.winchester.gov.uk/housing/new-affordable-housing>

9. Would the Plan period accord with NPPF paragraph 22, which requires strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption?

- 1.1.8 The latest Local Development Scheme indicates adoption of this Local Plan by Quarter 3 of 2025. If such timescales are adhered to the plan would have 15 years to run from adoption. If the more likely scenario of adoption beyond April 2026, the plan would only have 14 years to run on adoption, contrary to the NPPF. If such a scenario is to arise, at least an additional year will need to be added to the plan period and housing requirement.

The overall supply of housing

5. Policy H2 holds back permissions for new greenfield site allocations until 2030 to prioritise previously developed land, achieve a more even housing trajectory and level of development over the Plan period. What would be the expected impacts on housing land supply, 5 year housing land supply, delivery of a variety of sites and matters such as nutrient mitigation and thereby nutrient neutrality requirements and electricity grid capacity?

- 1.1.9 Gladman have objected to this approach throughout the plan making process to date. Holding back permissions is likely to result in a worsening of land supply in the short term rather than the initial boost often seen with the adoption of a Local Plan.
- 1.1.10 Restricting development on new greenfield sites would not allow for the choice and competition in the market required by the Framework.
- 1.1.11 Whilst there would likely be impacts on the need for nutrient mitigation, the Solent was one of the first areas to be impacted by nutrient neutrality and the market is therefore advanced in understanding the issue and how to ensure the timely delivery of housing. Lifting the restriction on new greenfield housing before 2030 would not change the onus on the developer to demonstrate nutrient neutrality.