

ED13

Examination of the Winchester District Local Plan 2020-2040 (the submitted 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 2 V2

Stage 1 hearings

Matters, Issues and Questions

Introduction

This document sets out the Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) for stage 1 hearings relating to the legal and procedural requirements, District development needs and how they are proposed to be met in the submitted Plan. They do not intend to cover every issue raised in representations. They are based on the main issues identified by the Inspector, taking account of the views of the Council and other representors.

Prior to the forthcoming hearing sessions, responses are invited from participants on these MIQs. Further information about the Examination, hearings and format of written statements is given in my Guidance Note (Inspector Note 3).

Matter 1: Procedural/legal requirements

Issue: Whether all Statutory and Regulatory requirements have been met?

Duty to Cooperate

1. Is there clear evidence that the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies in accordance with section 33A of the 2004 Act, in respect of strategic matters with cross-boundary impacts considered through the preparation of the Plan?
2. In particular in relation to the unmet housing need in Partnership of South Hampshire area (PfSH) and individual adjoining Councils, especially Portsmouth and Havant and Basingstoke in relation to the establishment of a new community at the Popham Airfield and Micheldever Station?

Sustainability Appraisal

1. The Council has carried out an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). That comprises a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental

ED13

Assessment (SEA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA), and Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA).

2. In particular, does the SA adequately assess whether the emerging Plan's objectives are fully compatible with and actively contribute towards each of the sustainability objectives set out in the Sustainability Framework? Are the conclusions robust and justified by the evidence?
3. The SA tested five spatial strategy options: a development strategy based on the adopted Local Plan, focusing development on Winchester and the larger more sustainable settlements; a strategy based on a new strategic allocation/new settlement; a strategy based on dispersing development around the District largely in proportion to the size of existing settlements; and, a variation of option 1, known as option 1A, which provides for a higher total number of dwellings. It takes account of existing commitments, windfall allowance and has the effect of reducing development in the South Hampshire Urban Area and increasing it in Winchester and the Market Towns and Rural Areas. Given national policy¹ that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should an option with a higher growth target have been considered?
4. In terms of assessing site selection, data relating to services and facilities was only available at the District level (i.e. for areas within the boundaries of Winchester District only) and this is noted as a limitation. In this regard, are the scoring and conclusions reached in the SA reasonable, sufficiently accurate and robust to inform the Plan?
5. How has the SA informed the development of the Plan, including housing delivery and any mitigation measures? How has it informed the selection of strategic options, the development of policies and the selection of sites, all of which aim to identify sustainable development outcomes for the District?
6. In overall terms does the Plan meet the legal requirements of Section 19(5) of the 2004 Act and accord with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 32 and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in this regard?

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

1. In relation to the HRA, Natural England has raised concern regarding air quality impacts and nutrient impacts. The Council has produced a revised Nutrient Neutrality Topic Paper and Air Quality Assessment aimed to address Natural England concerns. It intends to update the HRA through an Addendum and produce a revised Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Natural England. When will the Addendum and SoCG be available?

¹ NPPF paragraph 11b

ED13

2. Given the above, has the HRA been undertaken in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017?

Local Development Scheme

1. Is the Plan compliant with the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) in terms of its form, scope and timing?

Community Involvement

1. Has the Council complied with the requirements of section 19(3) of the 2004 Act with regard to conducting consultation in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement?

Climate Change

1. Are the policies of the Plan, as a whole, designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change in accordance with Section 19(1A) of the Act?

Equalities

2. In what way does the Plan seek to ensure that due regard is had to the three aims expressed in s149 of the Equality Act 2010 in relation to those who have a relevant protected characteristic?

Superseded Policies

1. The submitted Plan in paragraph 2.7 explains that it will replace the adopted Local Plan Part 1- Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan Part 2-Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Development Plan Document in their entirety. In this regard, is the Plan clear in identifying the policies of the existing development plan which would be superseded by the Plan consistent with Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations?

Other Matters

1. The Plan provides a great amount of background, detail of processes employed, and in places repetition between supporting text and policy. Policy in places repeats national policy. In this regard, would the Plan provide the necessary clarity to enable consistent implementation so as to accord with NPPF paragraph 16, when read as a whole? That states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals and that Plans should serve a clear purpose avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area, including policies in the NPPF, where relevant.

ED13

Matter 2: Spatial strategy and distribution of development Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, H1, H2, H3, and E1 and E2

Issue: Whether the spatial strategy and distribution of development is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

1. The Settlement Hierarchy Review (2024) scores settlements and groups them which provides the settlement hierarchy in the District. Is the methodology used robust and the outcomes accurate? Is the distribution of development between the tiers of settlements justified and how has it been established?
2. Is the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy as set out in Strategic policy SP2 justified as an appropriate strategy, taking account of reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence?
3. Is the proposed distribution of housing and other development supported by the evidence in the SHELAA, settlement hierarchy, and IIA, and will it lead to an appropriate pattern of housing and economic growth?
4. Have settlement boundaries been defined in accordance with a clear and easily understood methodology that is consistently applied?
5. Have all realistic options for the distribution of development within the District been identified and considered robustly in the formulation of the Plan?
6. Would the Plan's spatial strategy strike the right balance between the need for development across brownfield and greenfield sites and any related impact on housing affordability?

Matter 3: The Plan's vision and strategic policies SP1, SP2 and SP3

Issue 1: Whether the Vision and strategic policies SP1, SP2 and SP3 are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

General matters

1. Having regard to NPPF 21, does the Plan make clear which policies should be regarded as 'strategic policies' and would they constitute a clear strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development in the District?
2. What is the justification for the Plan period of 2020 to 2040?

Policy SP1

1. The Plan sets out a vision and objectives to tackle climate and nature emergencies and create a greener District, living well, homes for all and a vibrant local economy. Those are given effect through Policy SP1. In so doing would that Plan be effective? Should the Plan objectives be incorporated within the Plan's strategic policies?

ED13

Policy SP2

1. Given the transitional arrangements set out in NPPF December 2024 paragraphs 234-236) would a modification requiring a Plan review within a stated timescale be clear and effective? Given the above national policy would such a modification be necessary for soundness?
2. To accord with national policy at NPPF paragraph 60, to boost significantly the supply of homes, should the numbers expressed in policy SP2 be stated as minimums?
3. Policy SP2 sets out housing targets for the three spatial areas in the District. In so doing, does it provide appropriate support for employment uses to meet local needs?

Policy SP3

1. Does the policy strike the right balance between protecting the countryside and promoting development to meet local needs? Should the policy explicitly recognise the sustainability of locations immediately adjacent to existing settlement boundaries or previously developed land;
2. Would policy SP3 accord with NPPF paragraph 89, which states that '... The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encourage where suitable opportunities exist.'?
3. Should the countryside designation afforded by policy SP2 remain on sites allocated for development in the Plan?
4. Does policy SP23 provide for the particular locational needs of essential infrastructure such as water and waste water infrastructure in accordance with PPG? Should it state that development should not increase flood risk and assessed any potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land ?
5. To ensure the policy promotes biodiversity should it align with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy?

Matter 4 Meeting housing need

Issue: Would the overall strategy and provision for housing development be justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Calculation of Local Housing Need (LHN)

1. The Council has calculated LHN using the Government's standard methodology. That gives a figure of 13,565 dwellings over the Plan period 2020-2040. That figure includes an affordability adjustment to take account of past under delivery. In this regard does the Plan accord with NPPF paragraph 61, which indicates that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing needs assessment conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance (PPG)?

ED13

2. Is there substantive evidence to demonstrate that it would be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates in this case as per advice set out in the PPG (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216)?

3. Are there other relevant factors to be taken into account in calculating the LHN?

The housing requirement

1. The Plan makes provision for 15,465 dwellings over the Plan period (2020-2040). That includes approximately 350 dwellings within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) part of Winchester District. Would that approach accord with NPPF paragraph 61?

2. SDNP Authority suggest a figure of 250 dwellings would be delivered with the SDNP in the Plan period. What would be the consequence should the lower figure deliver rather than the 350 accounted for in the Plan?

3. In addition, it includes an allowance of 1,900 dwellings to take account of any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring authorities. Given constraints in the District, including within the SDNP, is this figure, which exceeds LHN justified by the evidence?

4. In accordance with the approach set out in the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) position statement and ongoing cooperation with neighbouring authorities, Portsmouth City Council and Havant Borough Council have confirmed an unmet need. How has the unmet needs allowance in the Plan been calculated?

5. In stating an unmet need allowance as opposed to a figure intended to meet the need in each authority, would the Plan be effective? Would it accord with NPPF paragraph 61? If an intended figure were included in the Plan, how should that be expressed (as a percentage or specific numbers)?

6. Is there any substantive evidence to demonstrate that there should be an adjustment to the minimum housing requirement to help deliver affordable housing with regard to the PPG (Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 2a-024-20190220), and if so, would that be effective?

7. Would the Plan be positively prepared in assessing and reflecting in its policies the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community as per NPPF paragraph 62?

8. Taking account of completions since the start of the Plan period, extant planning permissions and other commitments, less than 25% would be delivered by new site allocations. In this regard, would the Plan be positively prepared? Would it be

ED13

effective, justified and consistent with national policy which aims to significantly boost the supply of homes (NPPF paragraph 60)?

9. Would the Plan period accord with NPPF paragraph 22, which requires strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption?
10. Given the Plan's start date of 2020, recent levels of 'overprovision' compared to the Standard Method figures are taken into account. Is such provision already reflected in the Standard Method calculation in terms of affordability uplift going forward on the basis of a link between completions and house prices?
11. Neighbourhood Plans are in preparation for New Alresford and Hursley. Denmead has a Neighbourhood Plan which the Parish Council intends to review. Can the Council provide an update in this regard?
12. NPPF paragraph 67 expects strategic policies to set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Would the Plan accord with this expectation?
13. The Council has produced a Housing Topic Paper Update (ED02). That updates housing supply in accordance with the most recent Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (2024). It identifies corrections and updates to the housing supply and consequent changes to the housing requirement. In this regard are modifications to the submitted Plan required for the purposes of soundness?

The overall supply of housing

1. Would the housing trajectory provide a sound basis for meeting the identified housing need and accord with NPPF paragraph 78, which requires a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, and all plans should consider whether it is appropriate to set out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites? Does it identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended adoption and specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for the subsequent years 6-10 and, where possible for years 11-15 of the remaining Plan period, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 69?
2. Is the housing trajectory realistic and deliverable? Are there any threats to delivery?
3. Is the contribution towards housing supply from windfall justified? Is there compelling evidence that they provide a reliable source of supply in accordance with NPPF paragraph 72?
4. In broad terms, is the housing development proposed in the Plan and set out in the trajectory based on a sound understanding and robust evidence?

ED13

5. Policy H2 holds back permissions for new greenfield site allocations until 2030 to prioritise previously developed land, achieve a more even housing trajectory and level of development over the Plan period. What would be the expected impacts on housing land supply, 5 year housing land supply, delivery of a variety of sites and matters such as nutrient mitigation and thereby nutrient neutrality requirements and electricity grid capacity?
6. In the absence of a stepped trajectory would the approach taken by the Council be effective, justified and consistent with national policy to significantly boost the supply of homes (NPPF paragraph 60)?

Respondents are directed to the Council's Housing Topic Paper Update (ED02) and the most recent AMR. Those summarise the Council's evidence to date of completions since the beginning of the Plan period, existing commitments, site allocations, windfalls and any other sources of supply on which it relies.

The Council should produce a detailed spreadsheet setting out how many dwellings each committed and allocated site is expected to deliver in each year of the Plan period, and what any windfall allowance for each year is. (Guidance on what constitutes a realistic windfall allowance is at NPPF paragraph 71.) The spreadsheet should be accompanied by evidence to justify the delivery information it contains, as appropriate.

Five year housing land supply

In the Council's Housing Topic Paper Update (ED02) it states that the Plan is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply on adoption of 6.7 years against an annual requirement of 679 dwellings home per annum (2025-2031).

1. Will the Plan provide for a five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites on adoption with specific regard to the definition of deliverable in NPPF annex 2?
2. Which specific sites make up the extant permissions included within the housing trajectory and what is the evidence that they are deliverable as per the NPPF definition?
3. What is the compelling evidence that windfalls will provide a reliable source of supply, in terms of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), historic windfall delivery rates, and expected future trends, as set out in NPPF paragraph 72?
4. The Council's calculation applies the 'Liverpool Method.' What is the reason for this and in so doing would this be sound and accord with NPPF paragraphs 69 and 77?

ED13

Matter 5 Site allocation methodology

Issue: Whether the site allocation methodology for proposed housing, mixed-use and non-residential site allocations is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Methodology and application

1. How have the proposed allocations been identified?
2. Do they accord with the Plan's spatial strategy as set out in strategic policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1, H2, H3 and E1-E3, in terms of the overall provision throughout the District?
3. How were the site boundaries, areas and dwelling/other capacities determined? Are the assumptions justified and based on robust evidence? In particular, are the indicative residential capacities, set out in the Plan's site allocations justified by the evidence and consistent with NPPF paragraphs 123 to 126?
4. How would the proposed allocations provide flexibility in the event that some sites do not come forward?

The Council is requested to address the above questions 1-4 in general terms in relation to the proposed allocations.

5. In addition, for each site allocation the Council should provide evidence to justify their delivery within the Plan period.
6. The Council has set out tables relating to housing supply in each of the settlements within the spatial areas in the 'Development Allocations' section of the Plan. In relation to each spatial area, the Council should provide robust evidence to justify the number of dwellings anticipated to be delivered in the Plan period, including net completions, outstanding permissions, windfall allowance, and development equivalents, Neighbourhood Plan allocations, extant Plan existing commitments, and new site allocations.

ED13

Matter 6 Winchester Site allocations

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

Please provide comment on the specific issues raised below. For those sites where representations have been made the Council is requested to respond to the particular issues raised. In doing this any updated information regarding planning permissions, sites under construction and existing uses should be included.

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. Does the policy appropriately align with the Plan aim to promote active travel?
5. 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 the length of the supporting text and policy requirements and repetition within both policy (criteria iv and xvii relating to existing buildings and facilities, criteria xiv and xvi relating to heritage assets) and supporting text (paragraphs 12.28, would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
2. The policy supporting text includes requirements of a masterplan. That includes some matters included in the supporting text that are not included in policy e.g. the need for a lighting strategy, the requirement to ensure air traffic control signals are not compromised through development. In so doing, would the policy be effective?
3. What would the status of the masterplan be and in dealing with matters to ensure the development of the site is acceptable in planning terms, would the policy be effective?
4. What is the robust evidence to justify criteria vii which requires 'access off Andover Road', particularly given proposals at Barton Farm to divert and reroute Andover Road through that development? Given criterion vii would the Plan be

ED13

clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

5. 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?
6. 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?
7. 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?
8. 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?

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. Does the policy adequately and appropriately address site constraints, including heritage and the need to maintain access to essential underground water infrastructure ?
3. 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. What is the justification for the indicative site capacity? How has the site capacity had regard to the provision of open space and community amenities, including parks and allotments in the locality?
4. Can the Council please confirm the status of this site allocation in relation to the Barton Meadows Nature Reserve and comments referred to in an Inspector's decision letter with regard to the Barton Farm development?
(APP/LI765/A/10/2126522) Is clarification in this respect required for the purposes of soundness?

ED13

5. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?
6. Would policy requirements in relation off site transport improvements and infrastructure be required for the purposes of soundness?

Winchester mixed use allocations

Policy W7 Central Winchester Regeneration

1. Would part of this site allocation be carried forward from the extant Plan or would it include a new allocation? In either case, would the Plan make this clear?
2. 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?
3. Is this a new or extant allocation? Is this clear?
4. In either case, 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?
5. 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 the length of the supporting text and policy requirements and repetition within both policy (criteria vii and viii) and supporting text (paragraphs 12.2812.76 and 12.80, would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
2. 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?
3. 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?
4. 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?
5. Paragraph 12.90 sets out requirements for a masterplan. Are those adequately reflected in policy and if not would the policy be effective?
6. Would the policy appropriately secure provision for healthcare and education to ensure the development is acceptable in planning terms?

ED13

Policy W9 Bar End Depot

1. Given the length of the supporting text and policy requirements and repetition within both policy (criteria vii and viii) and supporting text (paragraphs 12.103 and 12.106), would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
2. Would Policy W9 secure active travel routes for cycling and walking as part of the development in accordance with the Winchester Movement Strategy? Would it provide an appropriate framework for this area in accordance with the Winchester Movement Strategy?
3. Given the range of uses proposed, how has the indicative number of homes been defined?

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 and control its details to address mitigation of harmful impacts on European sites?

Policy SH2 North Whiteley

1. This site carries forward land allocated in the existing Plan whilst identifying additional capacity. Would policy SH2 make this clear?
2. What is the evidence to justify the indicative site capacities, given site constraints, including Ancient Woodland and hedgerows?
3. ED02 indicates the expected submission of a planning application for 90 dwellings on land off Bluebell Way, which is below the indicative capacity of 110 dwellings stated in the Plan. Should this be reflected in the policy?
4. Would policy requirements adequately address impacts on Ancient Woodland and hedgerows, positively promote active transport infrastructure the adequately?
5. Would the policy in its introductory paragraph 13.16 clearly set out the potential for additional capacity, particularly with regard to the provisions of an extra case scheme?

ED13

Policy SH3 A Whiteley 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?

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?

Market towns

Bishop's Waltham

Policy BW1 The Vineyard/Tangier Lane

1. Would policy BW1i, in requiring a masterplan with each application for development be effective? Would the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals? Would Policy BW1 iii be clear in its intent?
2. Would it adequately address requirements for offsite infrastructure? Would the policy adequately address the need to promote infrastructure for active forms of transport?

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?
5. Would the phasing of the latter part of this site allocation until 2030 be justified by the evidence?

ED13

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. What is the status of the masterplan for the west of The Dean? Policy NA1 seeks to ensure development reflects the principles established in that masterplan. In so doing would the policy be effective? And would this result in a plan-led scheme?
3. 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?
2. Would it appropriately address the requirements of offsite infrastructure, impacts on the Groundwater Protection Zone, promote active travel and enable its infrastructure?

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. If the Neighbourhood Plan was not made in a timely manner, how would the housing shortfall be made up?
5. 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 waste water providers?
6. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?

Larger rural settlements

Colden Common

Policy CC1 Clayfield Park

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

ED13

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

Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm

1. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?
2. Policy CC1 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?
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?

Policy CC3 Land at Main Road

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

Policy CC4 Land adjoining 85 Church Lane

1. Would the phasing of development until 2030 be justified by the evidence?
2. Would policy CC4 and its supporting text be effective in controlling development in relation to underground water infrastructure?
3. Given site constraints, including the listed buildings and ancient oak trees fronting Church Lane, would the indicative site capacity be justified by the evidence?

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?

ED13

4. What is the justification to phase development delivery until after 2030 and would this be justified by the evidence?
5. 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)?
6. 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. What is the justification for the allocation of this site for 45 dwellings or equivalent and would that be justified by the evidence ?
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 2027/8?

Policy KW2 Land adjoining the Cart and Horses PH

1. Would the phasing restriction set out in Policy KW2i be necessary?
2. Given the site's significant heritage and tree constraints, and proximity to the SDNP, would the indicative site capacity of 45 dwellings or equivalent be justified by the evidence? What is the evidence to justify delivery of this site from 2030/31?
3. Would the policy, as a whole, be effective in safeguarding the significance of heritage assets?

Swanmore

Policy SW1 The Lakes

1. What is the status of the Swanmore Village Design Statement? How has it informed the approach to Swanmore and policy SW1?
2. Would the approach to Swanmore, in terms of its place in the settlement hierarchy be justified by the evidence?
3. Would Policy SW1 effectively address the needs for offsite infrastructure?

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?

ED13

Policy WK1 Winchester Road housing and open space allocation

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?
2. 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?
3. What is the evidence to justify provision of open space at Mill Lane?

Policy WK3 Welborne Open Space

1. Would the title of this policy be misleading?
2. 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?
3. How would those requirements relate to Plan policy NE7?

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 the policy be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals? In particular would policy WK5ii and WK5v together be effective in seeking direct, safe and lit active travel links to the surrounding area? Would they provide appropriate flexibility?
3. Would policy WK5ix provide adequate flexibility to accommodate the most suitable technical solution?
4. Would the requirements for offsite infrastructure be clear and unambiguous?
5. Policy WK5i includes a phasing restriction. What is the robust evidence to justify this approach?
6. 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?

ED13

3. Policy WK6i includes a phasing restriction. What is the robust evidence to justify this approach?
4. Given site constraints, what is the robust evidence to justify its delivery in the Plan period?
5. Would Policy WK6 provide effective protection for any archaeological remains present?
6. 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. Hursley 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?
3. What is the evidence to justify the housing target of 20 additional dwellings and would this ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable settlements?
4. 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? If they are greenfield sites would they be subject to a phasing restriction?

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?

ED13

2. Policy OT01i includes a phasing restriction. Would this be justified by the evidence?
3. 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. What is the status of the South Wonston Village Design Statement? Would it be desirable for development of Policy SW01 to accord with that document? And if so, through what mechanism would this be secured?
2. Policy SW0i includes a phasing restriction. Would this be justified by the evidence?
3. Would the policy make appropriate provisions for off site infrastructure needs?

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. As this is a greenfield site a phasing restriction is included in Plan policy SU01ii. What is the evidence to justify this approach in relation to this site?
4. Given identified site constraints, what is the evidence that the site allocation would be viable based on the indicative capacity?
5. Would Plan policy SU01 be clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals, particularly in relation to SU01ix ('design process')?
6. Plan policy SU01 xi in relation to hydrogeological risks requires a risk assessment. How would it control any impacts on groundwater conditions and levels? In this respect would the policy be effective?
7. 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?

ED13

8. 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?

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?
-