

### Kings Worthy Omission Sites

<b>SHELAA reference number</b>	<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
KW01	BHLF-KSAR-N8BS-C	<p>Land east of Lovedon Lane should be allocated for up to 150 dwellings. It is approximately 7.6 hectares, currently used for agriculture and in single ownership. It is accessed from Lovedon Lane and is bounded by various hedges and tree belts. It is outside the Kings Worthy Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings within the immediate vicinity. The South Downs National Park (SDNP) lies to the east, but the site is outside any statutory nature designations, within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Kings Worthy is accessible and has a 15-minute travel time to the City via public transport or private car. The settlement's overall performance demonstrates that can accommodate additional growth. The site can provide mixed-use residential development, both open market and affordable, will be built to PassiveHaus standards using quality materials, embed energy efficiency and provide significant environmental and social enhancements to Kings Worthy.</p>	<p>The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document sets out the process that was followed to arrive at the site allocations in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. This makes clear that any sites selected by Parish Councils were then subject to further consideration by officers, including the application of the IIA sustainability criteria and a standardised set of considerations.</p> <p>The Parish Council's site consultation process gave respondents an indication of the type of factors that should be taken into account in site selection, which were broadly consistent with the IIA sustainability criteria. However, the consultation was intended to gain public views on the potential sites, not to be a technical exercise. The Parish Council's comments were taken into account by officers in the site selection process, alongside the IIA and other considerations.</p>

		<p>A landscape led development is proposed that will provide an extension to open space at Eversley Gardens, accessible for the wider community, and create an extension to the settlement gap. This will provide a long-term defensible boundary for the settlement and promotes pedestrian and cycle linkages and re-routing bus services.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The site would achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 150 dwellings to PassiveHaus Standard</li> <li>- A mix of uses, up to 1,000 GIA of commercial space</li> <li>- 60 affordable dwellings (40%)</li> <li>- New habitat creation and more than 10% biodiversity net gain.</li> <li>- A significant area of Public Open Space and extension to the green gap.</li> <li>- An active frontage along Lovedon Lane</li> <li>- Improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity and access to modes of sustainable transport</li> <li>- Reduced car dominance and traffic speeds along Lovedon Lane</li> <li>- A balanced community, created around nature, energy and living.</li> </ul> <p>The approach adopted in relation to</p>	<p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document also explains that the SA for each site was considered alongside assessments of impacts on the historic and natural environment, transport, landscape and relationship with the built-up area. The IIA criteria were one factor that fed into the site selection process, but not the sole site selection tool.</p> <p>The respondent has re-scored the IIA assessment criteria, based on assumptions about what each site could deliver. This suggests that the respondent's site performs best, but is based on a detailed vision for this site but no detailed knowledge of other sites' potential.</p> <p>The IIA assessed the principle of development without taking into account potential site layouts or opportunities to mitigate negative effects. This provides a more consistent basis for assessment than using indicative site masterplans or offers of infrastructure, which were not available for all site options. Consideration by the IIA of site layouts would also be inappropriately detailed. The IIA consultants have considered the points made and do not recommend any</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>site selection is questionable and relies on sites selected by the Parish Council. The Council failed to provide the Parish Council with the site assessment criteria in the IIA, calling into question the credibility of the IIA against SA regulations. The Council should review and update the scoring of KW01 which we have assessed and conclude is the most suitable site when measured against the IIA site assessment criteria (Vision document for the site and alternative site assessments provided).</p>	<p>changes to the IIA scoring for this site.</p> <p>Accordingly, the respondent's alternative site assessment is noted, but does not amount to a consistent comparative assessment, unlike the IIA and Development Strategy and Site Selection document. The IIA site assessments show that one of the allocated sites (KW12) performs better than the respondent's site (KW01), with the other allocated site (KW02) scoring similarly overall.</p> <p>It is concluded that the IIA provides an appropriate comparative assessment and that the other factors taken into account justify the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document's conclusion that <i>'the other greenfield sites around Kings Worthy (KW01, KW05, KW11, HW02) form parts of open fields where development would be significantly more prominent and intrusive than the proposed allocations. They are also more distant from the historic core of the village where most facilities, services and employment are located.'</i></p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change</p>
KW04	BHLF-KSAR-N8ZJ-U	<p>Promote land at London Road, Kings Worthy (KW04) for residential development. Whilst this is not considered large enough for allocation</p>	<p>The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted.</p>

		<p>in the draft plan, the SHEELA acknowledges that that this previously developed site is suitable and available for redevelopment of around 31 dwellings.</p> <p>Support the residential development of KW04 which is considered suitable for development as per Policy H3. There are no overriding constraints and the site is available for development. The site will therefore provide a significant contribution to housing supply in Kings Worthy.</p>	<p>The respondent is not seeking a site allocation and it is agreed that the site is, in principle, suitable for residential development. In fact it had 'prior notification' consent for residential conversion, which lapsed recently, and has been subject to a recent public consultation regarding a forthcoming planning application. There is, therefore, no need to allocate the site for development.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change</p>
KW05	ANON-KSAR-N81U-W	<p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 paper assesses sites against 11 out of 14 objectives contained within the Integrated Impact Assessment. My client controls land at Springvale Road (site ref KW05) and so it is appropriate to consider that site in comparison to the two draft allocations (KW02 and KW12).</p> <p>My client's site scored equivalent to the two draft allocations in respect of the IIA Objectives 1 (climate change), 2 (reducing need to travel), 7 (access to services), 8 (economic growth), 9 (biodiversity and geodiversity), 11 (historic environment), and 14 (flood risk). As such, KW05 scored equivalent to the draft allocations on 7 out of the</p>	<p>The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document sets out the process that was followed to arrive at the site allocations in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. This explains that the SA for each site was considered alongside assessments of impacts on the historic and natural environment, transport, landscape and relationship with the built-up area. This site was not selected by the Parish Council. The IIA criteria and Parish Council views were factors that fed into the site selection process, but not the sole site selection considerations.</p>

		<p>11 criteria.</p> <p>In respect of the remaining 4 criteria; for Objective 4 (health and wellbeing) KW05 scored equivalent to KW12 with a minor positive effect whereas KW02 scored a 0 (negligible effect likely) meaning KW05 scored higher than one of the proposed allocations. This also fails to take into account that my client is able to offer land north of the field identified within the evidence base as public open space.</p> <p>In terms of Objective 10 (landscape) KW05 scored equivalent to KW02 with a minor negative effect and KW12 scored a 0 (negligible effect likely). It is considered inappropriate to consider the effects of KW05 would be wholly negative in the context of the potential for the northern field to be converted to public open space. That land is currently private land however, the allocation of the site would bring that land into public use with the associated benefits of opening the landscaping to local residents. The land rises away to the west, meaning that views across a wider vista would also be possible from the land. As such, it is considered more reasonable to score KW05 a +/- (mixed minor effects likely) in respect of Objective 10. At present, formal playing</p>	<p>The respondent notes that the omission site scores similarly to the draft Local Plan allocations on some IIA criteria. They suggest that the site's score could improve if account were taken of proposals to provide open space to the north. However, this is based on a concept masterplan for this site but no detailed knowledge of other sites' potential.</p> <p>The IIA assessed the principle of development without taking into account potential site layouts or opportunities to mitigate negative effects. This provides a more consistent basis for assessment than using indicative site masterplans or offers of infrastructure, which were not available for all site options. Consideration by the IIA of site masterplans would also be inappropriately detailed.</p> <p>Therefore, criterion 10 of the IIA (landscape) considers the landscape sensitivity of the site, not the potential to mitigate this. Open space provision is likely to be a requirement of any substantial site allocation, so its provision would not necessarily be a unique benefit of this omission site. Given that sites KW02 and KW05 are greenfield sites and</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>pitches are provided at Eversley Park Recreation Ground on the eastern side of Kings Worthy, south of Lovedon Lane, and informal public open space is also located on the eastern side of the village south of Lovedon Lane, adjacent to the A33. The provision of informal public open space on the western side of the village through the allocation of site KW05 will deliver an important new community facility which is accessible on foot to existing and future residents.</p> <p>KW05 scored equivalent to KW02 in relation to Objective 12 (efficient use of land) in being scored as having a 'significant negative effect' whereas KW12 is scored as having a minor negative effect. The rationale behind this scoring is questionable given the presence of the buildings on the two other proposed allocations (raising a question over why they weren't scored equivalently to each other) but also because KW05 has very limited use at present and could offer a viable option to provide a significant quantum of development on a very sustainable site.</p> <p>The scoring of the remaining criteria, objective 13 (water resource), is also questionable given – KW02 and KW05</p>	<p>KW12 is a brownfield site within the built-up area, their respective scoring for criteria 10 and 12 is not unexpected.</p> <p>Criterion 13 (water resources) is based on whether the site is in a Source Protection Zone (not on drinking water quality) and it is therefore entirely appropriate that different sites will score differently for this criterion.</p> <p>Where the accuracy of the IIA has been questioned, comments were passed to the consultants responsible for the IIA, with a request to check or clarify the results. Accordingly, it is not accepted that the IIA has incorrectly scored sites at Kings Worthy but, even if some of the respondent's points were correct, most SHELAA sites adjoining Kings Worthy would receive similar IIA scores. As noted above, the IIA criteria were one factor that fed into the site selection process, but not the only consideration.</p> <p>It is not accepted that the site relates particularly well to the existing built-up area, or that it is visually well-contained. The sites allocated by the draft Local Plan perform similarly in terms of IIA criteria, and better on other factors. Therefore, the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document's</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>scored equivalent to each other with an alleged 'significant negative effect' whereas KW12 was scored as having only a 'minor negative effect'. The assessment is based on drinking water quality. The rationale behind the differentiation between the sites in terms of water quality is unclear however, KW05 has full access to clean drinking water and in this regard it is no different to existing or other future residential development in Kings Worthy.</p> <p>Drawing this together, KW05 scored equivalent to KW02 and KW12 on 7 out of 11 criteria, or 63%. Of the remaining 4 criteria, KW05 scored higher than one of the proposed allocations on one of the objectives (obj 4), can reasonably be upgraded to score equivalent to the proposed allocations on the second (obj 10), third (obj 12), and fourth (13).</p> <p>In terms of other merits, the site is located within an enclave. The residential neighbourhood of Springvale lies immediately to the north of the site. Furthermore, residential neighbourhoods lie immediately to the east. The site is adjacent to and fronts onto Springvale Road which provides good connections to the commercial</p>	<p>conclusion is justified, that <i>'the other greenfield sites around Kings Worthy (KW01, KW05, KW11, HW02) form parts of open fields where development would be significantly more prominent and intrusive than the proposed allocations. They are also more distant from the historic core of the village where most facilities, services and employment are located.'</i></p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>centre of Kings Worthy, including the school to the east. Whilst there are no footpaths on the site itself, there are a number in the immediate vicinity. There is good pedestrian and vehicular permeability with the settlement and as such, its location is inherently sustainable.</p> <p>The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 being at low risk from flooding. As such, the development of the site for residential purposes is acceptable and accords with the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>A Preliminary Ecology Assessment has been carried out which has not identified any International or National sites of Ecological importance on the site. As part of the early-stage concept proposals, those areas with most ecological value or potential have been excluded from the development parcel including the incorporation of appropriate buffers to offset development from those areas.</p> <p>The site is framed by mature tree cover on the northern, western and southern boundaries associated with transport corridors, whilst residential neighbourhoods frame the site to the east. As a consequence, there is a</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



		<p>strong sense of visual containment associated with the site.</p> <p>Taking all of the above into account, it can be demonstrated that site KW05 is a high quality site, in a sustainable location capable of providing much needed housing in a settlement well positioned to accommodate housing numbers to contribute towards provision in Winchester as a key settlement but also within the District as a whole.</p>	
KW06, KW07	BHLF-KSAR-N8BZ-K	<p>KW06/07 is a brownfield site (part) well related to the settlement boundary for Kingsworthy. It extends to approximately 1.2ha (using part of KW06 and all of KW07) and comprises commercial buildings, redundant agricultural buildings, undeveloped land and existing dwellings.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.72 acknowledges that there is capacity for the development of about 250 dwellings in Kingsworthy, which could be achieved through the delivery of approximately 100 new homes through new site allocations, 100 new homes through extant planning permissions, and approximately 50 new windfall dwellings. There are limited sites within the settlement boundary of</p>	<p>The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document sets out the process that was followed to arrive at the site allocations in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. These sites were not included in that document as they do not adjoin the defined built-up area of Kings Worthy and separated from it by a railway line and road. The sites were considered by the Parish Council to be potentially suitable as 'reserve sites', should additional sites be needed.</p> <p>Nevertheless, they were assessed in the IIA (as site KW07) and score similarly to other sites around Kings Worthy. They</p>

		<p>Kingsworthy, provision will need to be made for the release of land (including brownfield) beyond the settlement boundary to deliver new homes.</p> <p>KW06/07 is located in a sustainable location being walkable to a range of local facilities and services (including a convenience store – 13 minute walk; pharmacy – 20 minute walk; local pub with play area – 7 minute walk), and a regular bus service (bus stop – 6 minute walk). It is not located within a Conservation Area and is not within the setting of any listed buildings.</p> <p>KW06/07 presents an opportunity to make efficient use of unused land in an accessible location.</p> <p>The 2021 SHELAA confirms that the site is “deliverable/ developable”. KW06/07 presents an opportunity to make “efficient use of land and buildings” and to “prioritise the use of previously developed land/buildings in accessible locations” in accordance with draft policies SP2, D6 and H4.</p> <p>The NPPF#69 acknowledges that smaller sites “can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built up relatively quickly”.</p>	<p>are, however, separated from the built-up area of Kings Worthy by a railway line and road, with poor provision for pedestrian and cycle access and limited scope for improvement due to the constraints of the railway bridge. They are also relatively small sites that include some existing residential development, so the proposed mixed housing and employment development would be of a modest scale and make only a small contribution to the housing target for Kings Worthy, which is met by other more appropriate sites.</p> <p>Therefore the sites would not be suitable for allocation as they are poorly related to the main part of the village, more difficult to access by active transport and relatively distant from facilities and services. Equally, it would not be appropriate to extend the settlement boundary to include these sites as it would have the same effect of allowing development of the sites. The respondent refers to the 2014 Settlement Boundary Review but this did not result in the boundary being extended in this location.</p> <p>While development of suitable brownfield sites is encouraged, this does not mean that all brownfield sites are suitable for development, for the reasons above.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Small-scale development opportunities that are physically, functionally and visually related to existing urban areas, could be released through a review of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The 2014 Settlement Boundary Review (which formed part of the evidence base for the current Adopted Local Plan Part 2) defined a settlement boundary as “the limits of towns and villages, being the dividing line between built-up/urban areas (the settlement) and the non-urban or rural areas (the countryside) to define where policies apply”. It added “where there are any obvious and suitable candidates, boundaries could be adjusted to accommodate them and provide a degree of flexibility within the housing supply”.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries should have a degree of permanence to avoid constant change over time. KW06/07 is enclosed by residential development adjoining the western and southern boundaries, commercial development to the north, and along the eastern boundary by the railway line. The adjoining built form create a logical and defensible boundary which encloses</p>	<p>There may be scope for some conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings through ‘permitted development’ rights or within planning policies, but it would not be justified to relax the policies referred to (see also the sections relating to comments on those policies).</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>KW06/07 and establishes a logical and natural edge to the urban fabric.</p> <p>The Local Plan should allocate KW06/07 for a mixed use development comprising residential and small scale commercial (SME/start-up) in order to meet the identified housing and employment needs of the community and the wider area. If allocation of KW06/07 for development is not supported, the draft Local Plan should seek to amend the settlement boundary to include land at KW06/07 in any event.</p> <p>Alternatively, draft Local Plan policies SP2, D6 and H4 should employ some flexibility to make provision for the development of (brownfield) land in accessible and sustainable locations where it is well related to the existing settlement boundary. This would make a useful contribution to meeting a local need, whilst also meeting the District's overall development requirements, and in a sustainable location.</p>	
HW02	ANON-KSAR-N85C-F	The Local Plan needs to identify a greater number of specialist housing sites that can meet demand for sheltered housing and extra care housing. Land north west of Springvale	The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted. Comments regarding the Plan's provision for older persons' housing are addressed in relation to policy H5.

		<p>Road, Headbourne Worthy should be allocated for specialist retirement housing in order to assist in meeting the lack of provision for specialist housing for older people. An experienced retirement housing provider is connected the promotion of this land and can deliver the type of development advocated by the Mayhew Report.</p> <p>The site has been promoted through the various SHELAA exercises and has in part, been deemed to be both a deliverable and developable site, with an indicative yield of 103 dwellings, scoring 'Green' as part of its inclusion within the SHELAA 2020 (Site Ref: HW02) and in its inclusion within the preceding SHELAA 2019 and SHELAA 2018. The site scored identically to that of the allocated 'Land adjoining the Cart &amp; Horses PH' (SHELAA Site Reference: KW02) within the most recent SHELAA, so provides an alternative or additional appropriate site for allocation.</p> <p>The site has a potential site capacity of circa 120 units with associated strategic landscaping, particularly to the north and west to provide a landscaped backdrop. A new vehicular access point is proposed from</p>	<p>Nevertheless, substantial provision for older persons' housing is already made at Kings Worthy, including schemes for sheltered housing and a nursing home on land opposite this site. The Local Plan also allocates land for older persons' housing at Kings Worthy (policy KW2).</p> <p>This is one of a large number of sites promoted through the SHELAA which were found to be potentially suitable and available for allocation in the emerging Local Plan. However, not all such sites are needed and the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document sets out the process that was followed to arrive at the site allocations in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. This explains that the SA for each site was considered alongside assessments of impacts on the historic and natural environment, transport, landscape and relationship with the built-up area.</p> <p>The omission site rises from Springvale Road, with no clear features to break it up or contain the northern part. The area fronting Springvale Road (south-eastern edge) is within Flood Zone 3 and the remainder of the site is elevated, meaning that development would be intrusive and poorly related to the built-up</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Springvale Road, with emergency access from Down Farm Lane. The frontage would be set back from Springvale Road with a drainage attenuation feature located at the front of the Site. This also reflects the character of the nursing home on the opposite side of Springvale Road, creating a degree of synergy between the two sites.</p> <p>The integrated retirement community (IRC) provided on the site, would seek to deliver high quality specialist accommodation for older people through a mixture of assisted living (extra care and care home accommodation) and individual homes with access to care (sheltered accommodation) and communal facilities. The built form of development would be contained within the lower part of the slope, which has a lower landscape sensitivity (similar to that of allocated Site KW02). There is an opportunity to contribute to the landscape character of the northern and western area by enhancing the landscape across this part of the site and allowing public access.</p> <p>In addition to the previous assessment of the Site for development potential, it also has potential to provide</p>	<p>area of Kings Worthy.</p> <p>Therefore, the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document's conclusion is justified, that <i>'the other greenfield sites around Kings Worthy (KW01, KW05, KW11, HW02) form parts of open fields where development would be significantly more prominent and intrusive than the proposed allocations. They are also more distant from the historic core of the village where most facilities, services and employment are located.'</i></p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as part of the comprehensive development of the Site; and moreover, as an offsetting scheme for other developments where necessary.	
HW07 HW08	ANON-KSAR-N8G3-H BHLF-KSAR-N8TN-S	<p>The Local Plan should allocate land to the east of Down Farm Lane, Headbourne Worthy (HW07 and HW08) which is capable of providing a modest number of new homes including smaller units to meet the needs of those wishing to secure a foothold on the housing ladder and affordable homes.</p> <p>The site has vehicular access off Down Farm Lane, is free from flood risk and is not affected by any statutory landscape or ecological designations. The land is not elevated, is well contained, and development would not harm matters of sensitivity including heritage, important views, or sensitive residential amenity.</p> <p>The SHELAA gave the sites a 'green rating' and suggested they could accommodate up to 20 units. It will not require significant new infrastructure, will deliver new homes for local people helping to sustain the local community, and will not cause significant harm to</p>	<p>The attributes claimed for the site and the nature of development proposed are noted.</p> <p>Headbourne Worthy does not have a target for additional dwellings and is subject to an 'infilling' policy which development of these sites would fail to satisfy.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document sets out the process that was followed to arrive at the site allocations in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. These sites were not included in that document as they do not adjoin the defined built-up area of Kings Worthy and are poorly related to it.</p> <p>Nevertheless, they were assessed in the IIA and score similarly to other sites around Kings Worthy. They are, however, physically separated from the built-up area of Kings Worthy and therefore the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022 document's conclusions for other sites around the</p>

		<p>any matters of acknowledged importance.</p> <p>This type of site can help sustain local communities and in not allocating such sites the Council's emerging New Local Plan is disregarding those who desperately need housing in order to remain part of their established community.</p>	<p>village apply with at least as much force: <i>'the other greenfield sites around Kings Worthy.... form parts of open fields where development would be significantly more prominent and intrusive than the proposed allocations. They are also more distant from the historic core of the village where most facilities, services and employment are located.'</i></p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> No change.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------