

# **Winchester Local Plan Examination, April – June 2025**

Hearing Statement on behalf of Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Sir John Moore Barracks, Winchester (“the Site”)

**ANON-AQTS-32SB-K**

April 2025

**Matter 12 – High Quality , Well Designed Places and Living Well**

**Policy D5 – Masterplans**

**Policy D8 – Contaminated Land**

**Prepared by:** Robert Gardner

**Status:** Final

**For and on behalf of Avison Young (UK) Limited**

# 1. Policy D5 – Masterplans

**Question 1** *Would strategic policy D5 be clear in its policy wording and supporting text as to what development would require a masterplan (para 5.70 states ‘...assessed on a site by site basis...’, strategic policy D5 states at different parts ‘...on larger sites ... significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users...’) when they should be prepared, how they would be agreed by the local planning authority, and their status on that agreement? In this regard would the policy be clear and unambiguous so as to be effective?*

**Question 2** *Would its policy requirements provide appropriate flexibility so as to strike the right balance between ensuring high quality design and sustainable development is approved without delay?*

**Question 3** *Would this policy have a clear purpose, avoiding repetition in other Plan policies (e.g. site allocation policies and other design policies (strategic policies D1, D2, D3 and D4 in particular)?*

**Question 4** *Would the third paragraph of strategic policy D5 provide the necessary clarity to ensure effectiveness, in particular ‘... should be preceded by...’?*

**Question 5** *Given that the Plan should be read as a whole, what is the justification for strategic policy D5xiii, xiv and xv?*

**Question 6** *Would the requirements of strategic policy D5xiv accord with Plan policy CN3iv, in relation to all new residential development? 9 ED17*

**Question 7** *Would the requirement for a management plan as part of the masterplan process be overly onerous?*

**Question 8** *Should strategic policy D5xiii refer to green and blue infrastructure, for the purposes of soundness?*

**Question 9** *Overall, would the policy provide the necessary flexibility to ensure that sustainable development is not unnecessarily delayed?*

## Response

- 1.1 The DIO supports the broad objective of Policy D5, which seeks to ensure that large scale applications for significant new proposals deliver sustainable development and achieve high-quality place making outcomes.
- 1.2 As part of its “Reg 19” reps to the emerging Local Plan the DIO raised some general concerns over the mechanism and process through which an applicant is expected to discharge the responsibilities established by the policy.
- 1.3 The Concept Masterplanning (CMP) process for the Sir John Moore Barracks site has moved on since the Reg 19 reps were submitted. The CMP for the site has been endorsed by the Council’s Cabinet.
- 1.4 The DIO continues to maintain that the weight to be attached to a CMP in the determination of a planning application is a matter of planning judgement for a decision maker to assess at the time an application is determined.
- 1.5 Regardless of the endorsement of the CMP by the Council’s Cabinet, the DIO maintains that the following amended wording should be introduced to Policy D5 (p99) 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

*“Any application for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users should be ~~preceded~~ **accompanied** by, and is expected to achieve the following objectives proportionate to the scale of the site and proposed development **and be informed by pre-application engagement with the Local Planning Authority:**”*

- 1.6 The above would clarify an Applicant's obligations in respect of Policy D5.
- 1.7 The DIO has requested amendments to the site-specific policy for Sir John Moore Barracks (Policy W2) in order to ensure alignment with Policy D5. These are addressed in the DIO's Reg 19 response to the draft Local Plan and in its hearing statements prepared in respect of Policy W2.

## 2. Policy D8 – Contaminated Land

**Question 1** *Would the policy serve a clear purpose and would it be clear and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?*

### Response

- 2.1 The DIO supports the broad objective of Policy D8 to ensure that development on land which is known or suspected to be contaminated will only be permitted where there would be no unacceptable impacts on human health or the wider environment.
- 2.2 The DIO has requested amendments to Policy D8 to confirm that site investigations and risk assessments can be secured in response to a planning condition. This is a standard approach. Conditions can also secure remediation of any unexpected contamination which may be found. Details of the amendment requested are contained within the DIO's response to the Reg 19 version of the emerging Plan.

# Contact details

## Enquiries

Rob Gardner  
07919 047 959  
[Robert.Gardner@avisonyoung.com](mailto:Robert.Gardner@avisonyoung.com)

**Visit us online**  
[avisonyoung.com](http://avisonyoung.com)