

# **WINCHESTER LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION HEARING STATEMENT MATTER 8**

Prepared by Pro Vision on behalf of Bargate Homes

April 2025

WINCHESTER LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION HEARING STATEMENT MATTER 8  
PROJECT NO. 51740

**PREPARED BY:**

JAMES ILES, MRTPI  
DIRECTOR

**CHECKED BY:**

**DATE:**

APRIL 2025

**PRO VISION**

THE LODGE  
HIGHCROFT ROAD  
WINCHESTER  
HAMPSHIRE  
SO22 5GU

**COPYRIGHT:** The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written consent of Pro Vision.

## CONTENTS

1.0	Matter 8 Development Allocations the Market Towns and Rural Areas (MTRAs).....	1
-----	--	---

## 1.0 Matter 8 Development Allocations the Market Towns and Rural Areas (MTRAs)

### Colden Common

#### Policy CC1 Clayfield Park

***1. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?***

1.1 We have no comment at this stage.

***2. Given that this site is an existing allocation and has not delivered housing to date, what is the evidence that it will deliver from 2027/28 and within the Plan period?***

1.2 We have expressed our concerns about the Council's strategy of rolling forward this extant allocation (SHELAA Site CC19). In summary, lack of delivery under the existing allocation and recent market signals indicate that the land may no longer be available or achievable for residential development, the SHELAA evidence is deficient, and is out-of-date in respect of planning history<sup>1</sup>.

***3. Would the policy appropriately address the water supply constraints?***

1.3 We have no comment at this stage.

#### Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm

1.4 We do not have any comments on Questions 1 to 3.

#### Policy CC3 Land at Main Road

***1. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?***

1.5 No. The site (SHELAA site CC04) is available and suitable for development. Holding back delivery of such sites in the context of the "critical priority" to address affordability in the district<sup>2</sup>, and significant levels of unmet need from neighbouring authorities, is not positive planning. Whilst promoting the development of brownfield land is supported by national policy, holding back available sites in settlements such as Colden Common where there is no, or very limited, previously developed land capacity is not justified. The site with previously

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to representations at Regulation 19 on Policy CC1 on behalf of Bargate Homes.

<sup>2</sup> Local Plan paragraph 9.36 (SD01)

developed land in this settlement has already been allocated but failed to deliver (please see our comments above on Clayfield Park [CC19], Policy CC1).

- 1.6 This shows that plan-led housing delivery is already behind schedule in Colden Common, therefore, there is no justification to add further restraints.

***2. Policy CC2 ii requires a site plan. What is meant by this and would it be effective in controlling any impacts on the setting of Colden Common and the SDNP?***

- 1.7 (We note that this Question should refer to Policy CC3 ii).
- 1.8 The requirement for an “Overall site plan” is understood and supported. This will help to ensure that even if the site comes forward through an outline planning application, the expectation is that matters of site layout will be addressed early in the process so that local constraints and opportunities, including proximity to the National Park, are managed appropriately.
- 1.9 The other criteria of Policy CC3 (under the sub-headings of Access, Environmental, and Other Infrastructure) provides a framework for the planning application to ensure it addresses the specific local context.

***3. Would the proposed development have an acceptable relationship with the SDNP and would policy requirements ensure that its landscape and scenic beauty would be conserved and enhanced? Given site constraints, including the listed buildings and SDNP, would the indicative site capacity be justified by the evidence?***

- 1.10 The requirement for the “Overall site plan” puts appropriate emphasis on the importance of layout considerations in this proximity to the National Park.
- 1.11 The assumption of a lower density development (30 dph) is an appropriate guide for this site (as is used in the SHELAA for site CC04).
- 1.12 Criteria vi to x of Policy CC3 provide further development management requirements to respect the site’s setting, including the requirement for landscape buffers. Therefore, the policy provides a clear framework for managing the development impacts.

- 1.13 Bargate Homes has provided the Council with a vision for the site, including concept master plan. The site has also been subject to a planning application and s78 appeal (alongside the omission site, CC05 Lower Moors Road)<sup>3</sup> which has tested the planning context.
- 1.14 In considering the impact on character and appearance, including scrutinizing the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the Inspector concluded that *"due to the intimacy of the landscape, neither site is clearly inter-visible with the National Park. For this reason, combined with the sites' modest respective sizes relative to that of the National Park and the mitigation effect of potential landscaping works, the appeals developments would not have a significant effect on the context/setting of the National Park such that would be no conflict with Policy CP19 (South Downs National Park) of the LPP1"*<sup>4</sup>.
- 1.15 The Inspector went on to opine that *"Nor have I identified any particular harm to the character of the area arising from the proximity of heritage assets to either appeal site, such that I have not found any associated conflict with LPP1 Policy CP20 (Heritage and Landscape Character). In this regard I am mindful that the Council's case against both appeals does not raise heritage issues as regards the setting of designated or undesignated heritage assets"*<sup>5</sup>.
- 1.16 The Inspector did identify some harm to character and appearance of the area, principally because both sites are undeveloped and part of the countryside setting, therefore any development would have some impact. Ultimately, the Inspector determined that it was the departure from the adopted spatial strategy (neither site was allocated at the time), in the context of sufficient housing land supply at the time, that weighed against allowing the appeals.
- 1.17 This planning history provides reassurance that allocation of the Main Road site under Policy CC3 is justified.
- 1.18 It also provides justification for including the CC05 Lower Moors Road, a site that performs well compared to the alternatives in the sustainability appraisal, including the rolled forward site CC19 Clayfield Park, and would meet more of the local housing need, increasing the yield of affordable homes, and reduce the reliance on ad hoc windfall development.

---

<sup>3</sup> Appeal A, Ref APP/L1765/W/16/3141664 (12 April 2017).

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph 52.

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph 53.

- 1.19 CC05 has somehow been overlooked in the evidence base so we are concerned it has not been properly considered as an alternative or additional allocation. A review of the evidence base would justify its allocation<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> As explained in our Regulation 19 representation (Policy CC1 Clayfield Park), SHELAA Site CC05 Lower Moors Road is the only site omitted from commentary of alternative sites in the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 (SD10b) (paragraph 6.35).