

Winchester District Local Plan

Local Plan Examination

April 2025

Prepared on behalf of: Blenheim Strategic Partners LLP

Date: 4 April 2025

Representor personal reference number:	BHLF-AQTS-3267-B
Matter	Matter 8 – Allocations in market towns and rural areas
Relevant questions	KW1: 1-3 KW2: 1-3 WK1: 1

Ref. RM/KW/EiP/03

Matter 8 – Development allocations the market towns and rural areas (MTRAs)

Issue: Whether the proposed housing site allocations in MTRAs would be justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

1. Larger rural settlements

Policy KW1 Cornerways and Merrydale

Question 1

As this is a brownfield site would Policy KW1i be necessary?

1.1 No.

Question 2

What is the justification for the allocation of this site for 45 dwellings or equivalent and would that be justified by the evidence?

1.2 Initial feasibility work suggests an 80 to 100 bed care facility can be accommodated as set out in the supporting text of SD01 page 441. It is unclear if the 45 dwellings attributes to the higher end (100 bed care facility) or lower end (80 bed care facility) which would be at a ratio of 4/9 (100 beds) or 4/7 (80 beds). The Council should provide justification for the specific ratio to determine the unit yield.

1.3 The justification and resulting equivalent number of dwellings should ensure these are net additions.

Question 3

Given the site's heritage constraints, would the indicative site capacity be justified by the evidence? What is the evidence to justify delivery of this site from 2027/28?

1.4 In addition to heritage constraints, the Council should have sufficient evidence that the key matters that influence the scale of appropriate development as well as the timescales for delivery are sufficiently considered. This includes considerations such as:

- Heritage constraints
- Drainage and management of surface water flooding
- Arboriculture and ecology
- Contamination (including ground and/or asbestos)
- Timescales for demolition works

1.5 It is anticipated that the requisite due diligence and appropriate planning permissions will likely lead to delays, particularly as there is no currently pending application, unless a robust programme of works is provided.

Policy KW2 Land adjoining the Cart and Horses PH

Question 1

Would the phasing restriction set out in Policy KW2ii be necessary?

- 1.6 No comment.

Question 2

Given the site's significant heritage and tree constraints, and proximity to the SDNP, would the indicative site capacity of 75 dwellings or equivalent be justified by the evidence? What is the evidence to justify delivery of this site from 2030/31?

- 1.7 As also set out in the Regulation 19 Representation (ref. BHLF-AQTS-3267-B/7/KW2 pg 17 and Appendix B pg 15), development of that site could have major adverse impacts on the existing settlement gap between Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy and would directly contravene policy NE7 (Settlement Gaps). This site should therefore be removed to safeguard the integrity of the settlement gap, otherwise there is a realistic risk the settlement gap would be eroded.
- 1.8 The site is clearly not in active agricultural use anymore, with a developed biodiversity whereby it would be unlikely achievable to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity. In light of the significant constraints and impacts on the settlement gap and existing biodiversity, this site is not considered deliverable.

Question 3

Would the policy, as a whole, be effective in safeguarding the significance of heritage assets?

- 1.9 No. Should policy KW2 remain included despite its detrimental impacts on policy NE7, the policy should provide stronger parameters to safeguard the significance of the adjacent conservation area and numerous heritage assets, including setting out which important views should be retained and setting out other parameters that outline an acceptable scale, density, heights and layout.

Wickham and Knowle

Policy WK1 Winchester Road housing and open space allocation

Question 1

The most recent AMR indicates that this site is under construction. The housing trajectory includes a remaining balance of 17 dwellings to be delivered in 2024/25? What is the status of the site and if built out, would its inclusion in the Plan be justified, effective, and consistent with national policy? Has it been occupied in accordance with policy WK1x?

- 1.10 As per the example provided in response to Question 2 of Section 4 (Five year housing land supply) of Matter 4, the site has an extant planning permission for 120 units (ref. 17/02615/FUL) approved in 2019 (prior to the plan period) which appears to have been completed. It is therefore unclear why the policy allows for 125 units rather than 120, and why additional 17 units are included with the years 2024/25, particularly as aerial imagery suggests that the site has already been completed.
- 1.11 This policy WK1 and the 17 units from the AMR should therefore be removed.