

ED26

Examination of the Winchester District Local Plan 2020-2040 (the District Plan/the Plan)

Inspector: R Barrett MRTPI IHBC

Programme Officer: Ms Jill Taylor.

Address: Winchester City Council Local Plan Examination, Winchester City Council Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 9LJ.

Email: Programmeofficer@winchester.gov.uk

Telephone number: 07980 732035

Examination web pages: [Local Plan Examination - Winchester District Local Plan](#)

Inspector Note 9

Stage 1 (week 2) hearing agendas

I sent out my matters, issues and questions for examination in relation to the first stage hearing session some time ago (ED13 and 17). In light of the responses received, I have produced an agenda for the stage 1 (week 2) hearing sessions.

The hearing sessions will only cover issues about which I require further information, having read all written submissions. I expect to go round the table once on each item. Rebuttals of others' contributions are not encouraged and I will act to prevent the repetition of points made by previous speakers. However, I may myself seek further comment in the interests of clarification, or where there is a matter that I need to pursue further.

R Barrett
INSPECTOR

29 April 2025

10.00 Wednesday 30 April 2025 (Day 4)

Agenda

Inspector's opening announcements

Matter 6: Winchester housing and mixed use allocations

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

Winchester housing allocations

Policy W1 Barton Farm Major Development Area

1. This development has an extant outline planning permission for a development including 2,000 homes. That includes a comprehensive access strategy which incorporates the diversion and rerouting of the Andover Road. Is there any justification to promote a site allocation policy that differs from that outline permission?
2. Is modification to the policy required, for the purposes of soundness, to direct potential developers to the Lead Local Flood Authority in relation to groundwater levels in the northern part of the site?
3. Should sufficient distance between Harestock Wastewater Treatment Works and sensitive land uses, such as residential units, schools and recreational areas, be required given its proximity?
4. Given past delivery on this site allocation, what is the evidence that it would be delivered in its entirety within the Plan period?

Policy W2 Sir John Moore Barracks

1. Given site constraints including its location within a settlement gap as defined by Policy NE7, heritage, open space, Protected Sites, flood risk etc, SINC and candidate SINC, what is the evidence to justify the quantum and mix of development proposed in policy W2?
2. What is the evidence that it would retain the settlement gap's generally open and undeveloped nature so as to accord with Plan policy NE7?
3. Does it strike the right balance between protecting the special qualities of the locality and the need to ensure land is used efficiently in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 11a, 123 and 129?
4. Are the policy requirements justified, in particular those that require a park and ride facility and are the policy requirements clear and unambiguous in their intent? Would they provide adequate flexibility to bring forward a high quality scheme that enhances the locality? Would the policy ensure open space and outdoor sports pitches to meet the needs of the proposed development and contribute to provision in the local area?

ED26

5. Given the site's complexity what is the evidence that it would deliver in its entirety within the Plan period?

Policy W3 St Peter's Car Park

1. Would the proposed development of this city centre car park strike the right balance between contributing to the reduction of city centre traffic, improving air quality and providing homes in accessible locations?
2. Are the requirements in relation to flood risk adequate, clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Policy W4 Land West of Courtney Road

1. What is the justification for the site capacity, given the site constraints including proximity to the Barton Meadows Nature Reserve, and its location within the Winchester to Kings Worthy/ Headbourne Worthy settlement gap, proximity to the railway, biodiversity, and access and transport impacts?
2. How has the capacity had regard to the potential traffic impacts?
3. Would policy requirements in relation off site transport improvements and infrastructure be required for the purposes of soundness?

Inspector's closing remarks

14.00 Wednesday 30 April 2025 (Day 4)

Agenda

Inspector's opening announcements

Matter 6: Winchester housing and mixed use allocations

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

Winchester mixed use allocations

Policy W7 Central Winchester Regeneration

1. Policy W ii refers to a masterplan with no requirement for this to be produced. Policy W7i refers to a supplementary planning document? In this regard would the Plan be clear and thereby effective? Paragraph 12.71 refers to a supplementary planning document. Does this include a masterplan?
2. Given its complexity and site constraints, including land ownership, built heritage and archaeology, flood risk and securing nutrient neutrality, what is the evidence to justify indicative site capacity and that it will be delivered in the Plan period?
3. Should the policy criteria address healthcare provision? Would policy W7 xvii provide appropriate flexibility to accommodate other solutions? Would criteria xvi be clear?

Policy W8 Station Approach Regeneration Area

1. Given its complexity, land ownership and site constraints, including built heritage and archaeology, flood risk and securing nutrient neutrality, what is the robust evidence that it will be delivered in the Plan period?
2. Paragraph 12.75 states that the site has been defined in a broad way? On that basis what is the evidence to justify the indicative housing capacity?
3. Would the policy ensure appropriate co-ordination to manage movement, particularly trains, buses, pedestrians and cyclists to connect key locations in the town centre, in accordance with the Winchester Movement Strategy, given its potential role in reduction of transport emissions in the District helping to reach the target of net zero emissions by 2030?
4. Paragraph 12.90 sets out requirements for a masterplan. Are those adequately reflected in policy and if not would the policy be effective?
5. Would the policy appropriately secure provision for healthcare and education to ensure the development is acceptable in planning terms?

Inspector's closing remarks

10.00 Thursday 1 May 2025 (Day 5)

Agenda

Inspector's opening announcements

Matter 7 Housing allocations in South Hampshire Urban Areas (SHUA)

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

Policy SH1 Newlands (West of Waterlooville)

1. What is the evidence to support the delivery of additional dwellings at this site? Where would this take place and is clarification within the supporting text necessary for soundness? What would be the consequence on the delivery of employment uses? Would the provision of additional dwellings result in a high quality development that contributes to the needs of PfSH?
2. Should the policy map be modified to reflect the proposed changes?
3. Should policy SH1 require a Green Infrastructure Strategy to avoid harmful impacts on European sites?

Policy SH2 North Whitely

1. What is the evidence to justify the indicative site capacities, given site constraints, including Ancient Woodland and hedgerows?
2. Would policy requirements adequately address impacts on Ancient Woodland and hedgerows and positively promote active transport infrastructure?

Policy SH3 Whitely Green

1. Would the supporting text to policy SH3 at paragraph 13.31 accurately reflect the potential for the presence of waste water infrastructure in relation to the site?

Inspector's closing remarks

14.00 Thursday 1 May 2025 (Day 5)

Agenda

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

Inspector's opening announcements

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

Market towns

Bishop's Waltham

Policy BW1 The Vineyard/Tangier Lane

1. Should policy BW1 be deleted?

Policy BW4 Land North of Rareridge Lane

1. Would policy BW4 accord with the NPPF paragraph 182, which requires great weight to be attached to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks?
2. Given the existing use of the site, along with other site constraints, including ecological constraints, what is the evidence to justify the indicative site capacity and generation of required Biodiversity Net Gain?
3. Would the requirements of Policy BW4vii be clear in their intent so as to render the policy effective?
4. Policy BW4i would require a landscape led masterplan. Policy BW4 ix and x provide additional requirements that could be covered by that masterplan. Paragraphs 14.20 and 14.24 set out requirements of a landscape led masterplan also, some of which are excluded from the policy text. In so doing, would the policy be effective? In this regard, would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

New Alresford

Policy NA1 The Dean

1. Given this is an existing site allocation carried over from the extant Plan, what is the evidence that homes without planning permission will be delivered in 2026/27?
2. Would policy NA1 ensure adequate provision of necessary offsite infrastructure?

Policy NA2 Sun Lane

1. Would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

ED26

Policy NA3 Neighbourhood Plan Designation Area

1. What is the evidence to justify an approach to designate an additional site/sites in the Neighbourhood Plan?
2. When is the Neighbourhood Plan expected to be 'made'? What is the evidence that it will come forward in an appropriate and timely manner?
3. What is the evidence that there are suitable sites available for designation? Would this approach provide the necessary certainty for the development plan process? In taking this approach would the Plan accord with a Plan led approach?
4. Should policy NA3 address off site infrastructure needs? Would it be necessary for the purposes of soundness to address the requirement to liaise with water and

Larger rural settlements

Colden Common

Policy CC1 Clayfield Park

1. 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?

Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm

1. Policy CC2 ii requires a site plan. What is meant by this and would it be effective in controlling any impacts on the listed buildings and ensuring suitable access by motorised and active forms of travel?
2. 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?

Policy CC3 Land at Main Road

1. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?
2. Policy CC3ii 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?
3. Given site constraints, including the listed buildings and SDNP, would the indicative site capacity be justified by the evidence?

Policy CC4 Land adjoining 85 Church Lane

1. Would policy CC4 and its supporting text be effective in controlling development in relation to underground water infrastructure?
2. Given site constraints, including the listed buildings and ancient oak trees fronting Church Lane, would the indicative site capacity be justified by the evidence?

ED26

Denmead

Policy DEN1 Denmead Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area

1. Denmead Parish Council is updating its Neighbourhood Plan at present. When is the Neighbourhood Plan expected to be 'made'? What is the evidence that it will come forward in an appropriate and timely manner?
2. What is the evidence to justify an approach to designate an additional site/sites in the Neighbourhood Plan? What is the evidence to justify the housing target of 100 additional dwellings and would this ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable settlements?
3. What is the evidence that there are suitable sites available for designation? Would this approach provide the necessary certainty for the development plan process? In taking this approach would the Plan accord with a Plan led approach?
4. If the Neighbourhood Plan was not made in a timely manner, how would the housing shortfall be made up? Extant Neighbourhood Plan allocations have yet to deliver what is the evidence that they will deliver in the Plan period (28 dwellings)?
5. Should policy DEN1 address off site infrastructure needs? Would it be necessary for the purposes of soundness to address the requirement to liaise with water and waste water providers?

Kings Worthy

Policy KW1 Cornerways and Merrydale

1. As this is a brownfield site would Policy KW1i be necessary?
2. 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 2027/8?

Policy KW2 Land adjoining the Cart and Horses PH

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

Swanmore

Policy SW1 The Lakes

1. What is up to date delivery position of these sites?

Inspector's closing remarks

10.00 Friday 2 May 2025 (Day 6)

Agenda

Inspector's opening announcements

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?

Wickham and Knowle

1. Is modification to the introductory text required to removed reference to policy WK2?
2. What is the justification for a change to the settlement boundary and would it represent a consistent application of the settlement boundary methodology?

Policy WK1 Winchester Road housing and open space allocation

1. Policy WK1vii requires sports pitches to be provided on land at Mill Lane. Given that this element of the development has not been delivered, what is the evidence to justify this requirement?
2. What is the evidence to justify provision of open space at Mill Lane?

Policy WK3 Welborne Open Space

1. In seeking to retain the open nature of the landscape that separates Welborne Strategic Development Area and the existing settlements of Knowle and Wickham would the policy be effective and justified by the evidence?

Policy WK5 Mill Lane

1. What is the evidence to justify this allocation which sits beyond the existing settlement boundary? Would it ensure that the rural setting of the settlement was preserved and the scenic beauty of the SDNP conserved?
2. Would policy WK5ix provide adequate flexibility to accommodate the most suitable technical solution?
3. Given site constraints, including traffic impacts, parking, public rights of way, proximity to the SDNP, what is the evidence that the site would be delivered in the Plan period? Given those constraints what is the viability evidence to justify its delivery?

Policy WK6 Land at Southwick Road/School Road

1. Would the policy title appropriately describe the proposed allocation?
2. What is the evidence to justify this allocation which sits beyond the existing settlement boundary? Would it ensure that the rural setting of the settlement was preserved and the scenic beauty of the SDNP conserved?

ED26

3. Given site constraints, what is the robust evidence to justify its delivery in the Plan period?
4. Would Policy WK6 provide effective protection for any archaeological remains present?
5. Would policy WK6xiii in phasing occupation of development to align with delivery of sewage infrastructure, be justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Would it effectively protect underground water infrastructure?

Policy KN1 Ravenswood/Knowle

1. What is the robust evidence to justify the location of this allocation, given its siting with a settlement gap? How would the policy ensure that the open character of the settlement gap is not compromised?
2. Would the policy requirements effectively mitigate harmful impacts on European sites? In this regard, would the policy be effective?
3. Would the policy requirements at KN1ix provide appropriate flexibility, in relation to sewerage and water connection given the number of providers in the locality?

Intermediate Rural Settlements

Hursley

Policy HU1 Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area

1. The Plan states that it is expected that there is capacity for the development of about 20 dwellings in Hursley either through allocations in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan or windfall. Is this approach justified by the evidence? Would this approach result in a Plan led approach?
2. What is the evidence that there are suitable site/s available for designation? Would this approach provide the necessary certainty for the development plan process?

Otterbourne

Policy OT01 land East of Main Road

1. Housing need in Otterbourne is proposed to be met through an allocation in this Plan, windfall and net completions in or adjoining the settlement. In this respect would the Plan be positively prepared and robustly justified by the evidence?
2. Would the policy as submitted, ensure the archaeology on the site is conserved appropriately?

South Wonston

1. Would the adjustment to the settlement boundary at South Wonston be justified by the evidence and would it accord a clear and easily understood methodology that has been consistently applied?

Policy SW01 Land at the West Hill Road North

1. Would the policy make appropriate provisions for off site infrastructure needs?

ED26

Sutton Scotney

Policy SU01 Land at Brightlands

1. Give that this site would be outside the existing settlements boundary and the presence of the A30 road, what is the evidence to justify the location of this site in relation to the settlement of Sutton Scotney to further the aims of Plan policy SP1?
2. A number of site constraints have been identified including flooding and drainage, sewerage capacity, archaeology, access and road safety, biodiversity, use of best and most versatile land, off site infrastructure requirements, and noise. Would any site constraints be a barrier to delivery of this site in the Plan period?
3. Would requirements in relation to health care be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
4. Would the supporting text and policy SU01, in phasing development to align with and drain to the new sewerage infrastructure, be effective in ensuring adequate waste water and drainage?

Inspector's closing remarks

14.00 Friday 2 May 2025 (Day 6)

Agenda

Inspector's opening announcements

Matter 9 Meeting the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people

Issue: Would the Plan be positively prepared, and would it be effective in addressing the likely accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people?

1. What are the implications of the introduction of the updated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (12 December 2024) for the Plan's approach to gypsies and travellers?
2. With regard to the Winchester Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment, what are the minimum pitch and plot requirements for travellers and travelling show people for the plan period?
3. Is it the purpose of this Plan to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites to meet the objectively assessed needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people?
4. If so, what is the evidence that there would be on adoption of this Plan a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against locally set targets, and a supply of specific, developable sites, or broad locations for growth, for years 6 to 10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 as required by the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites?
5. Would the proposed policy criteria be effective in bringing forward the level of windfall sites necessary to meet the identified need for pitches and plots?

Inspector's closing remarks