

Details of Representations Received to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Reg19) February 2025

Colden Common

This document has been prepared to provide details of the representations received to the Proposed Submission Plan and the Council's response. It draws upon information contained within the submitted documents SD07b [Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation Part 2 \(November 2024\)](#) and SD16 [Regulation 20 representations \(November 2024\)](#). It is not considered that this document contains information which is substantially different to that set out within those submitted documents, but it has been prepared to assist in navigating and considering the representations received and Council Response.

For each plan policy or associated document, it sets out some key information from the regulation 22 statement regarding the number of representations received, representation numbers, an overall summary of responses made, and a list of the main issues raised by the representations. It then contains all of the representations recorded against that Plan policy or document, along with links to supporting documents. Finally, it sets out the Council's response to the representations made for that Plan policy or document, and any changes the Council now recommends are made to the Plan policy or document, alongside any other relevant information.

This has been updated to include comments that were submitted by Historic England but were not entered onto Citizenspace and therefore they were not included in the original version of this report.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy CC1 Clayfield Park	
Total Number of Representations received	7	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	3	1
Sound	2	4
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	4	0
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>The Local Education Authority raises the issue of a possible need for additional primary and secondary education places, depending on the nature of the development.</p> <p>The statutory water and drainage supplier – Southern Water, support the inclusion of criteria to protect the groundwater SPZ, but suggest inclusion in supporting text of wording requiring developers to consult with the Environment Agency on the protection of the water supply source.</p> <p>There is a necessity for infrastructural improvements, such as footpath upgrades to support community connectivity. There are outstanding infrastructure funding issues in relation to highways issues related to Colden Common.</p> <p>The continued allocation of Clayfield Park was questioned given concerns regarding its deliverability and its relatively poor performance in sustainability assessments. The council's rationale for allocating the site was questioned.</p> <p>Alternative site suggested that performs better on sustainability criteria and is considered more likely to be deliverable.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/14/CC1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/24/CC1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/17/CC1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/17/CC1</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/12/CC1</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-32Q1-Z/2/CC1</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7/2/CC1</p>		
Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation		

- Education places;
- Water supply;
- Infrastructure improvements, e.g. footpaths; and
- Appropriateness of site selection.

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Ltd
Personal reference number	
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q1-Z/2/CC1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>CC1 DETAILED COMMENTS</p> <p>Pro Vision is acting on behalf of Bargate Homes, in regard to its specific interests in Coldon Common: SHELAA Sites CC04 (Land at Main Road) and CC05 (Lower Moors Road).</p> <p>We object to the repeated allocation of Clayfield Park (SHELAA Site CC19) based on the evidence of availability and deliverability and availability of alternatives in this sustainable settlement.</p> <p>Bargate Homes has control of site CC05 (Lower Moors Road), which appears to have been overlooked in the evidence base but represents a credible and likely more effective site option.</p> <p>CC19 was allocated for redevelopment in the Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2), which was adopted by the Council on 5 April 2017. In the more than 7 years since there has been no progress in bringing that site forward for the form of development proposed by the allocation. There have been 2 planning applications at the site since April 2017, though neither of them for residential development associated with the site allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18/02847/FUL for the demolition of an existing storage building and the erection of new workshop and store; and • 24/01557/FUL for a single storey extension to the workshop subject of 18/02847/FUL. The assessment of CC19 in the SHELAA (2023) is therefore out of date and erroneous in reporting that there is no planning history. There is recent planning history, and this indicates that commercial uses are continuing on the allocated site rather than efforts to bring the site forward for the allocated housing. <p>We also note that there is no information on availability and achievability in the SHELAA 2023 site assessment pro forma for Site CC19, which again indicates that the selection of this site for re-allocation is not justified by the evidence base.</p> <p>Pro Vision have reviewed the Council data contained within the Site Assessment Proformas from Appendix F of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) that supports the Regulation 19 version of the emerging Local Plan (the Local Plan) at face value and without any weighting, and have ascribed notional scores to each IIA. Please see the attached Pro Vision analysis of the Colden Common IIA.</p>

The results of this exercise, on the Council's own conclusions, clearly indicate that the Lower Moors Road site (CC05), promoted by Bargate Homes for around 45 to 55 homes² scores better than the site that is proposed for re-allocation (CC19 Clayfield Park) allocated for 48 units.

We also note from our wider analysis of the IIA that CC19 site is the worst scoring site of any of the proposed allocations in the plan.

It is recognised that CC19 is a previously developed site and therefore, on the face of it, fits with the 'brownfield first' approach, but in the context of the significant question marks over its deliverability, this benefit may be irrelevant. As PDL, it also means that the site would be expected to yield fewer affordable homes, compared to greenfield alternatives (policy H6), and be more vulnerable to viability issues. In the context of the major issue of affordability in the district (please refer to our comments on Strategic Policy H2 and Policy CC3) this consequence is highly relevant.

We note that the Parish Council's own assessment shortlisted six sites, including CC05. It then selected three of those short-listed sites and omitted three, including CC053.

CC05 was a locally shortlisted site, and combined with the stronger scoring on the IIA, is a logical site allocation.

Why was CC05 omitted? With reference to the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 (DSSS), the only possible explanation for the omission of CC05 is that it was not one of the three locally preferred sites at the time of the Parish Council consultation. It is the only SHELAA site in Colden Common that is not discussed at DSSS paragraph 6.35, which provides the commentary to justify the Local Plan site selection for the village. Therefore, all of the SHELAA sites for the settlement are accounted for in the evidence base, with the exception of CC05. Our concern is that the merits of CC05 have not been properly considered and it has 'fallen between the gap' of the IIA and the Parish assessment. It is also important to note that the Clayfield Park site is in two separate ownerships (HP643929 and HP854756), as is the Lower Moors site (HP765366 and HP621215). While the two parts of the Clayfield Park ownership are held by the same owner, there is a further leasehold (HP786078) recorded as affecting the eastern part of the Clayfield Park holding, with a 15-year lease that commenced in Sept 2012 (so runs until Sept 2027). The Clayfield Park site is also not recorded as optioned to a developer. In contrast, the two Lower Moors land holdings are both optioned to Bargate Homes. Allocation of site CC19 in the adopted Local Plan has therefore so far proven to have been ineffective as the site was not, and has no indication of being, delivered over the plan period.

In the absence of firm evidence of availability and deliverability, indeed indication that it is continuing in commercial use, rolling that site forward to the new Local Plan without reevaluating its planning merits against alternatives, risks this problem of soundness (the effective test) being repeated (NPPF 35).

In this context of uncertainty over availability of Site CC19, national policy is relevant. NPPF 126 directs that the LPA should review whether there is reasonable prospect of an application coming forward and may even be appropriate to reallocate the land for other uses or deallocate the undeveloped site.

It is clear that the Lower Moors site (CC05) has the advantage of being available and deliverable (by a developer with a proven track record in the local area), on a higher scoring site than one that is proposed for

	<p>re-allocation in the Local Plan. Allocation of CC05 would be a more effective policy option. Re-allocation of CC19 is not supported by evidence and is simply a carry forward from the adopted plan without reading market signals that the site looks unlikely to be delivered.</p> <p>Alternatively, the addition of CC05 alongside re-allocation of CC19 would be an option to strengthen delivery in the context of needing to boost supply.</p> <p>We resubmit Bargate Homes' concept master plan that indicates how site CC05 can deliver a high-quality residential development, with affordable housing, within the plan period. Table and diagram separately on LP website.</p>
<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	<p>Our proposed modification to strengthen the effectiveness of Policy CC1 is either the deletion of Site CC19 (Clayfield Park) because of uncertainty over its availability and deliverability and its relative poor performance in the IIA, and the allocation of Site CC05 (Lower Moors Road) in its place, or the inclusion of CC05 to strengthen the supply, including boosting the supply of affordable homes. Updates to the SHELAA are also necessary for Site CC19.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (commenting on policies - includes pictures and tables)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Ltd
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7/2/CC1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>CC1 DETAILED COMMENTS</p> <p>Pro Vision is acting on behalf of Bargate Homes, in regard to its specific interests in Coldon Common: SHELAA Sites CC04 (Land at Main Road) and CC05 (Lower Moors Road).</p> <p>We object to the repeated allocation of Clayfield Park (SHELAA Site CC19) based on the evidence of availability and deliverability and availability of alternatives in this sustainable settlement.</p> <p>Bargate Homes has control of site CC05 (Lower Moors Road), which appears to have been overlooked in the evidence base but represents a credible and likely more effective site option.</p> <p>CC19 was allocated for redevelopment in the Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2), which was adopted by the Council on 5 April 2017. In the more than 7 years since there has been no progress in bringing that site forward for the form of development proposed by the allocation. There have been 2 planning applications at the site since April 2017, though neither of them for residential development associated with the site allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18/02847/FUL for the demolition of an existing storage building and the erection of new workshop and store; and • 24/01557/FUL for a single storey extension to the workshop subject of 18/02847/FUL. The assessment of CC19 in the SHELAA (2023) is therefore out of date and erroneous in reporting that there is no planning history. There is recent planning history, and this indicates that commercial uses are continuing on the allocated site rather than efforts to bring the site forward for the allocated housing. <p>We also note that there is no information on availability and achievability in the SHELAA 2023 site assessment pro forma for Site CC19, which again indicates that the selection of this site for re-allocation is not justified by the evidence base.</p> <p>Pro Vision have reviewed the Council data contained within the Site Assessment Proformas from Appendix F of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) that supports the Regulation 19 version of the emerging Local Plan (the Local Plan) at face value and without any weighting, and have ascribed notional scores to each IIA. Please see the attached Pro Vision analysis of the Colden Common IIA.</p>

The results of this exercise, on the Council's own conclusions, clearly indicate that the Lower Moors Road site (CC05), promoted by Bargate Homes for around 45 to 55 homes² scores better than the site that is proposed for re-allocation (CC19 Clayfield Park) allocated for 48 units.

We also note from our wider analysis of the IIA that CC19 site is the worst scoring site of any of the proposed allocations in the plan.

It is recognised that CC19 is a previously developed site and therefore, on the face of it, fits with the 'brownfield first' approach, but in the context of the significant question marks over its deliverability, this benefit may be irrelevant. As PDL, it also means that the site would be expected to yield fewer affordable homes, compared to greenfield alternatives (policy H6), and be more vulnerable to viability issues. In the context of the major issue of affordability in the district (please refer to our comments on Strategic Policy H2 and Policy CC3) this consequence is highly relevant.

We note that the Parish Council's own assessment shortlisted six sites, including CC05. It then selected three of those short-listed sites and omitted three, including CC053.

CC05 was a locally shortlisted site, and combined with the stronger scoring on the IIA, is a logical site allocation.

Why was CC05 omitted? With reference to the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 (DSSS), the only possible explanation for the omission of CC05 is that it was not one of the three locally preferred sites at the time of the Parish Council consultation. It is the only SHELAA site in Colden Common that is not discussed at DSSS paragraph 6.35, which provides the commentary to justify the Local Plan site selection for the village. Therefore, all of the SHELAA sites for the settlement are accounted for in the evidence base, with the exception of CC05. Our concern is that the merits of CC05 have not been properly considered and it has 'fallen between the gap' of the IIA and the Parish assessment. It is also important to note that the Clayfield Park site is in two separate ownerships (HP643929 and HP854756), as is the Lower Moors site (HP765366 and HP621215). While the two parts of the Clayfield Park ownership are held by the same owner, there is a further leasehold (HP786078) recorded as affecting the eastern part of the Clayfield Park holding, with a 15-year lease that commenced in Sept 2012 (so runs until Sept 2027). The Clayfield Park site is also not recorded as optioned to a developer. In contrast, the two Lower Moors land holdings are both optioned to Bargate Homes. Allocation of site CC19 in the adopted Local Plan has therefore so far proven to have been ineffective as the site was not, and has no indication of being, delivered over the plan period.

In the absence of firm evidence of availability and deliverability, indeed indication that it is continuing in commercial use, rolling that site forward to the new Local Plan without reevaluating its planning merits against alternatives, risks this problem of soundness (the effective test) being repeated (NPPF 35).

In this context of uncertainty over availability of Site CC19, national policy is relevant. NPPF 126 directs that the LPA should review whether there is reasonable prospect of an application coming forward and may even be appropriate to reallocate the land for other uses or deallocate the undeveloped site.

It is clear that the Lower Moors site (CC05) has the advantage of being available and deliverable (by a developer with a proven track record in the local area), on a higher scoring site than one that is proposed for

	<p>re-allocation in the Local Plan. Allocation of CC05 would be a more effective policy option. Re-allocation of CC19 is not supported by evidence and is simply a carry forward from the adopted plan without reading market signals that the site looks unlikely to be delivered.</p> <p>Alternatively, the addition of CC05 alongside re-allocation of CC19 would be an option to strengthen delivery in the context of needing to boost supply.</p> <p>We resubmit Bargate Homes' concept master plan that indicates how site CC05 can deliver a high-quality residential development, with affordable housing, within the plan period. Table and diagram separately on LP website.</p>
<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	<p>Our proposed modification to strengthen the effectiveness of Policy CC1 is either the deletion of Site CC19 (Clayfield Park) because of uncertainty over its availability and deliverability and its relative poor performance in the IIA, and the allocation of Site CC05 (Lower Moors Road) in its place, or the inclusion of CC05 to strengthen the supply, including boosting the supply of affordable homes. Updates to the SHELAA are also necessary for Site CC19.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (commenting on policies - includes tables and pictures)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bloor Homes Limited (River Reach, Unit 7 Newbury Business Park, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2PS)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/17/CC1
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Clayfield Park is an existing local plan allocation which has not been delivered. It is noted that there is a recent consent (24/01557/FUL) for a single storey extension to an existing workshop on a small part of site (granted in August 2024), which is understood to be occupied by Clayfield Caravans. Given the recent planning consent, the nature of the existing use and the size of the site, it is questioned whether there is potential for a suitable alternative site for the existing business to relocate to, to allow for redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (published July 2024) identifies significant negative scores in relation to sustainable economic growth (IIA8), biodiversity and geodiversity (IIA9), natural resources (IIA12) and water resources (IIA13) with minor negative effects likely in relation to climate change mitigation (IIA1), transport and air quality (IIA2) and access to services, facilities and jobs (IIA7) (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150).</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026).</p> <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Clayfield Park site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Clayfield Park is an existing local plan allocation which has not been delivered. It is noted that there is a recent consent (24/01557/FUL) for a single storey extension to an existing workshop on a small part of site (granted in August 2024), which is understood to be occupied by Clayfield Caravans. Given the recent planning consent, the nature of the existing use and the size of the site, it is questioned whether there is

	<p>potential for a suitable alternative site for the existing business to relocate to, to allow for redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (published July 2024) identifies significant negative scores in relation to sustainable economic growth (IIA8), biodiversity and geodiversity (IIA9), natural resources (IIA12) and water resources (IIA13) with minor negative effects likely in relation to climate change mitigation (IIA1), transport and air quality (IIA2) and access to services, facilities and jobs (IIA7) (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150).</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026).</p> <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Clayfield Park site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>Clayfield Park is an existing local plan allocation which has not been delivered. It is noted that there is a recent consent (24/01557/FUL) for a single storey extension to an existing workshop on a small part of site (granted in August 2024), which is understood to be occupied by Clayfield Caravans. Given the recent planning consent, the nature of the existing use and the size of the site, it is questioned whether there is potential for a suitable alternative site for the existing business to relocate to, to allow for redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (published July 2024) identifies significant negative scores in relation to sustainable economic growth (IIA8), biodiversity and geodiversity (IIA9), natural resources (IIA12) and water resources (IIA13) with minor negative effects likely in relation to climate change mitigation (IIA1), transport and air quality (IIA2) and access to services, facilities and jobs (IIA7) (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150).</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026).</p> <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Clayfield Park site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 148-150) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to</p>

	<p>Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Clayfield Park site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on policies, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/24/CC1
Legally compliant?	NoNo
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	CC1, vi - It should be noted that the Highways Contributions paid to Hampshire County Council in the previous Local Plan have still not been spent to alleviate the impact of the development. It is imperative that right of way 12 is significantly upgraded as this is a key footpath link for those living on the East side of Main Road to the school, shop, community centre, doctors surgery, The Council supports the inclusion of a new footpath suitable for cycles and pedestrians to be developed which links any new development to Spring Lane.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Infrastructure plans outstanding from the previous plan and any new development agreed as part of the planning process. Upgrade of footpath 12
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Morag Kirby
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/14/CC1
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The ICB supports the current policy statements.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Neil Massie
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/12/CC1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	All colden common allocations: 304 dwellings could generate up to 91 additional primary age pupils and 64 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Colden Common Primary School and Kings' School. These schools are under pressure, so depending on the type of dwellings proposed, further consideration would be needed as to the mitigation for the educational impact of this development.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	CC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Ryan Patrick Lownds
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/17/CC1
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy CC1 Clayfield Park: Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected Supporting Text: Our assessment revealed that the site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source is maintained and inform Southern Water of the outcome of this consultation.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)

such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

None.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm	
Total Number of Representations received	6	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	4	1
Sound	2	3
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	3	2
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>There is support from the South Downs National Park for the criteria viii) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. The SDNP seek inclusion of reference to the setting of the park in the policy and that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans to assist with understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Local Education Authority raises the issue of a possible need for additional primary and secondary education places, depending on the nature of the development.</p> <p>The statutory water and drainage supplier – Southern Water, support the inclusion of criteria to protect the groundwater SPZ and access to existing water infrastructure. Specific details are sought in respect of the size of easements. The need for developers to consult with the Environment Agency on the protection of the water supply source is also emphasized.</p> <p>There is a necessity for infrastructure improvements, such as footpath upgrades to support community connectivity, so there is support for criteria iv) that requires a link to the adjacent Sandyfields development and suggestion of upgrades to existing rights of way. There are outstanding infrastructure funding issues in relation to highways issues related to Colden Common.</p> <p>There was concern that Colden Common has poor public transport provision and it was suggested that the transport assessment in the evidence base is out of date.</p> <p>There was also concern regarding the phasing restriction on the development of the site until after 2030, which was seen to be unreasonable given concerns regarding the delivery of Claylands Park CC1 allocation and not aligned with national policy aims to significantly increase the delivery of housing.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32U8-B/Historic England (this representation does not have a full rep number because it was not directly entered into Citizenspace)</p>		

ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/22/CC2
ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/39/CC2
ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/12/CC2
ANON-AQTS-32NP-V/2/CC2
ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/26/CC2

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Relationship with South Downs National Park
- Education places
- Water supply, sewage and drainage
- Evidence on public transport
- Infrastructure improvements, eg footpaths
- Phasing of development

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	Guy Robinson
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32U8-B - Historic England
Full reference number	
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	We note the Heritage Topic Paper states that the capacity of the site for sensitive development is an “absolute maximum” of 45 dwellings. But the policy refers to “about 45 dwellings”. Surely the policy should refer to “up to 45 dwellings” or “no more than”?
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	“Land at Colden Common Farm, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for no more than about 45 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific requirements:”
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/39/CC2
Legally compliant?	NoNo
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>It should be noted that the Highways Contributions paid to Hampshire County Council in the previous Local Plan have still not been spent to alleviate the impact of the development.</p> <p>CC2, vi - In regard to encourage sustainable transport opportunities, Colden Common has poor public transport provision. It should be noted that no buses travel from the section of Main Road from the Church Lane roundabout to Spring Lane.</p> <p>CC2, vi - The Local Plan 2038 Transport Assessment in the evidence base is very out of date and shows the x9 bus service which no longer runs and has not for several years.</p> <p>A link from this site to the Sandyfields development is imperative and is welcome under CC2, iv.</p> <p>It is imperative that right of way 12 is significantly upgraded as this is a key footpath link for those living on the East side of Main Road to the school, shop, community centre, doctors surgery</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	Laura Cornborough
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NP-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NP-V/2/CC2
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>FHL support the allocation of Colden Common Farm through Policy CC2, however, we strongly object to the inclusion of a phasing restriction under criterion (i).</p> <p>All settlements should be allowed to naturally expand, particularly in an area designated as a 'larger rural settlement' described as being a 'thriving village' such as Colden Common. Colden Common scored highly in terms of 'Daily Facilities/Services' and 'Other Facility or Service' in the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Review and therefore represents a sustainable location for future growth. Despite this fact, Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm, Policy CC3 Land at Main Road and Policy CC4 Land adjoining 85 Church Lane are all subject to this same phasing restriction. It is not sound to artificially restrict a sustainable settlement's growth in this way.</p> <p>The only allocation within Colden Common that is not subject to the 2030 phasing is Clayfield Park (Policy CC1). This allocation has been carried over from the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) which was adopted in 2017. Existing commercial uses on the site as well the potential for the requirement for remedial measures as a result of current uses and historic use of the Clayfield site as a brick works mean that this isn't a straightforward site to bring forward for development and yet it is included in the Council's five-year housing land supply with development anticipated to commence in 2027/28 . No evidence has been provided to demonstrate why this site, which has benefited from an allocation since 2017, is now considered deliverable in the first five years of the plan. For this reason, other sites in Colden Common should be able to be brought forward earlier, including land at Colden Common Farm.</p> <p>As detailed in our response to Policy H2, the phasing restriction is unsound and wholly inconsistent with the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing in line with Paragraph 60 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the Written Ministerial Statement of July 2024 confirms the existence of acute housing needs and a national crisis of housing, which must be addressed now. The phased approach to Policy CC2 has not been positively prepared to align with Government's clear direction of travel to increase the delivery of homes. There should not be barriers placed on the delivery of housing on sites that are immediately available, suitable and can be built out quickly.</p>

<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	<p>The phasing restriction in criterion (i) of Policy CC2 should be removed.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>Remove criterion (i) of Policy CC2.</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Supporting information (comments on policies)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	Morag Kirby
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/22/CC2
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The ICB supports the current policy statements.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	Ryan Patrick Lownds
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/26/CC2
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy CC2 Colden Common Farm: Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing underground infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected Supporting Text: This is because our initial assessment of this site ascertained that Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site, which needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Our assessment also revealed that the site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source is maintained and inform Southern Water of the outcome of this consultation.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session

<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)</p>
---	---

Policy/Evidence base document	CC2
Name of respondent (or client)	South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/12/CC2
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Email (Commenting on NE8) Letter (Commenting on policies) Email correspondence (Re policy NE8)

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification to Local Plan policies map](#) to include the boundary of the South Downs National Park in the allocation and inset maps.

[Proposed Modification](#) to criterion vii to Policy CC2 in respect of the capacity of the site in response to comments from Historic England.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy CC3 Land at Main Road	
Total Number of Representations received	7	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	3	1
Sound	2	4
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	3	1
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>There is support from the South Downs National Park for the criteria ii) and viii) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. The SDNP seek inclusion of reference to the setting of the park in the policy and that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans to assist with understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Local Education Authority raises the issue of a possible need for additional primary and secondary education places, depending on the nature of the development.</p> <p>The statutory water and drainage supplier – Southern Water, support the inclusion of criteria to protect the groundwater SPZ. The need for developers to consult with the Environment Agency on the protection of the water supply source is also emphasized.</p> <p>There was concern that Colden Common has poor public transport provision and it was suggested that the transport assessment in the evidence base is out of date.</p> <p>There was concern regarding the phasing restriction on the development of the site until after 2030, which was seen to be unreasonable, delaying the delivery of affordable housing and not aligned with national policy aims to significantly increase the delivery of housing.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32U8-B/Historic England (this representation does not have a full rep number because it was not directly entered into Citizenspace)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/5/CC3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/4/CC3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/3/CC3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/6/CC3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-32Q1-Z/1/CC3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7/1/CC3</p>		

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Relationship with South Downs National Park
- Education places
- Water supply, sewage and drainage
- Evidence on public transport
- Infrastructure improvements
- Phasing of development

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	Guy Robinson
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32U8-B - Historic England
Full reference number	
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
--------------------------------------	-----

Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Ltd
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q1-Z
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q1-Z/1/CC3
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>CC3 DETAILED COMMENTS</p> <p>Pro Vision is acting on behalf of Bargate Homes, in regard to its specific interests in Coldon Common: SHELAA Sites CC04 (Land at Main Road) and CC05 (Lower Moors Road).</p> <p>Land at Main Road is allocated for development under Strategic policy H2 and Policy CC3.</p> <p>Bargate Homes continues to support the allocation of this site and is committed to bring it forward. It performs well in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), as we discuss below. Its selection as one of the allocated sites for the village is justified by the evidence base.</p> <p>We support Policy CC3, supporting its indicative capacity for “about 35 dwellings”. And for the most part, we support the development criteria to guide further development proposals.</p> <p>We object however to the first criterion, which delays development of the site. This policy decision is holding back a deliverable site, with the commitment of Bargate Homes to bring it forward, and the associated affordable housing in the context of an acute affordability issue in the district and a significant scale of unmet need from neighbouring authorities. As reported by officers in meetings to discuss the timing of the submission of the Local Plan (in the context of the new standard method arising from revisions to the NPPF by the new government) “Delivering affordable housing remains a key priority and is one the greatest challenges facing the district”. That is reflected at paragraph 9.36 of the Local Plan, where delivering affordable homes is “a major issue” and “critical priority”. National policy (NPPF 60) remains clear that plan-making needs to boost housing supply and avoid unnecessary delays to getting land consented for development and delivering the homes that are needed.</p> <p>(Please also refer to comments made by tor&co on behalf of Bargate on the Spatial Strategy4).</p> <p>4 Representor 321953529.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Our proposed modification is the removal of the first criterion, allowing delivery of homes and affordable homes at the earliest opportunity.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (commenting on policies - includes pictures and tables)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Ltd
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32Q8-7/1/CC3
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>CC3 DETAILED COMMENTS</p> <p>Pro Vision is acting on behalf of Bargate Homes, in regard to its specific interests in Coldon Common: SHELAA Sites CC04 (Land at Main Road) and CC05 (Lower Moors Road).</p> <p>Land at Main Road is allocated for development under Strategic policy H2 and Policy CC3. Bargate Homes continues to support the allocation of this site and is committed to bring it forward. It performs well in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), as we discuss below. Its selection as one of the allocated sites for the village is justified by the evidence base.</p> <p>We support Policy CC3, supporting its indicative capacity for “about 35 dwellings”. And for the most part, we support the development criteria to guide further development proposals.</p> <p>We object however to the first criterion, which delays development of the site. This policy decision is holding back a deliverable site, with the commitment of Bargate Homes to bring it forward, and the associated affordable housing in the context of an acute affordability issue in the district and a significant scale of unmet need from neighbouring authorities. As reported by officers in meetings to discuss the timing of the submission of the Local Plan (in the context of the new standard method arising from revisions to the NPPF by the new government) “Delivering affordable housing remains a key priority and is one the greatest challenges facing the district”. That is reflected at paragraph 9.36 of the Local Plan, where delivering affordable homes is “a major issue” and “critical priority”. National policy (NPPF 60) remains clear that plan-making needs to boost housing supply and avoid unnecessary delays to getting land consented for development and delivering the homes that are needed.</p> <p>(Please also refer to comments made by tor&co on behalf of Bargate on the Spatial Strategy4).</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Our proposed modification is the removal of the first criterion, allowing delivery of homes and affordable homes at the earliest opportunity.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (commenting on policies - includes tables and pictures)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/4/CC3
Legally compliant?	NoNo
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	CC2, v - In regard to encourage sustainable transport opportunities, Colden Common has poor public transport provision. The Local Plan 2038 Transport Assessment in the evidence base is very out of date and shows the x9 bus service which no longer runs and has not for several years. The transport provision in the village in line with policy T4 should be examined as part of local plan inspection as it is inadequate, incorrect and does not support the other climate change policies within the local plan. It should be noted that the Highways Contributions paid to Hampshire County Council in the previous Local Plan have still not been spent to alleviate the impact of the development.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	Morag Kirby
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/5/CC3
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The ICB supports the current policy statements.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	Ryan Patrick Lownds
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/6/CC3
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy CC3 Main Road: Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected Supporting Text: Our assessment revealed that the site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source is maintained and inform Southern Water of the outcome of this consultation.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	CC3
Name of respondent (or client)	South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/3/CC3
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park.

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Email (Commenting on NE8) Letter (Commenting on policies) Email correspondence (Re policy NE8)

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification to Local Plan policies map](#) to include the boundary of the South Downs National Park in the allocation and inset maps

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy CC4 Land adjoining 85 Church Lane	
Total Number of Representations received	6	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	4	1
Sound	3	2
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	4	1
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>The Local Education Authority raises the issue of a possible need for additional primary and secondary education places, depending on the nature of the development.</p> <p>The statutory water and drainage supplier – Southern Water, support the inclusion of criteria to protect the groundwater SPZ and the need for developers to consult with the Environment Agency on the protection of the water supply source is also emphasized.</p> <p>The Environment Agency have raised the issue of the importance of liaison with Southern Water on this site due to the proposed new water supply pipeline in the vicinity, however, Southern Water state that the route of the new water supply pipeline will now not affect site CC4.</p> <p>There was concern that Colden Common has poor public transport provision and it was suggested that the transport assessment in the evidence base is out of date.</p> <p>There was concern regarding the phasing restriction on the development of the site until after 2030, which was seen to be unreasonable, delaying the delivery of affordable housing and not aligned with national policy aims to significantly increase the delivery of housing.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32U8-B/Historic England (this representation does not have a full rep number because it was not directly entered into Citizenspace)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/7/CC4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/13/CC4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32UK-X - Environment Agency/7/CC4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/11/CC4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32MY-4/1/CC4</p>		
<p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education places • Water supply, sewage and drainage 		

- Evidence on public transport
- Infrastructure improvements
- Phasing of development

Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
Name of respondent (or client)	Guy Robinson
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32U8-B - Historic England
Full reference number	
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
--------------------------------------	-----

Name of respondent (or client)	Anna Rabone
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32UK-X - Environment Agency
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32UK-X - Environment Agency/7/CC4
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Whilst we have no comments on the policy itself, we strongly advise that the guidance in paragraph 14.80 and point viii. of the policy are followed, namely that Southern Water should be engaged with at an early stage of any proposals regarding their new water supply pipeline as this is important infrastructure for the region.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	No modifications are necessary.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/13/CC4
Legally compliant?	NoNo
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>The Parish Council supported this site going forward to allocate a maximum of 5 houses following the existing building line. The Parish Council object to more than 5 houses being allocated for this site.</p> <p>CC4, iv - It is imperative that the Ancient oaks fronting Church Lane are retained in accordance with policy</p> <p>It should be noted that the Highways Contributions paid to Hampshire County Council in the previous Local Plan have still not been spent to alleviate the impact of the development.</p> <p>In regard to encourage sustainable transport opportunities, Colden Common has poor public transport provision. The Local Plan 2038 Transport Assessment in the evidence base is very out of date and shows the x9 bus service which no longer runs and has not for several years.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i>	No

However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.



Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
Name of respondent (or client)	Morag Kirby
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/7/CC4
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The ICB supports the current policy statements.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
Name of respondent (or client)	Ryan Patrick Lownds
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/11/CC4
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy CC4 Church Lane: Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected Supporting Text: Our assessment revealed that the site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 2. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source is maintained and inform Southern Water of the outcome of this consultation. Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project: In our representations to the Regulation 18 Local Plan, we noted that three draft housing allocations (CC4 85 Church Land, KN1 Ravenswood and OT01 east of Main Road) were located entirely or partially within the broad corridor options we presented in our Summer 2022 consultation. We have now refined these corridors down to a preferred route and identified draft Order Limits in our Summer 2024 consultation. We can confirm that the draft Order Limits entirely avoid these three allocations and do not encroach on any other draft development allocations. Therefore, the criterion and wording below is no longer applicable. CC4 Church Lane viii. The development should ensure future access to planned water supply infrastructure in the vicinity in coordination with the service provider; 14.80 A new water supply pipeline is being proposed between Havant and Otterbourne, which Southern Water have identified as potentially affecting this site or its surroundings. Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with the development of this site.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>The criterion and wording below is no longer applicable. CC4 Church Lane viii. The development should ensure future access to planned water supply infrastructure in the vicinity in coordination with the service provider; 14.80</p>

	A new water supply pipeline is being proposed between Havant and Otterbourne, which Southern Water have identified as potentially affecting this site or its surroundings. Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with the development of this site.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Remove: viii. The development should ensure future access to planned water supply infrastructure in the vicinity in coordination with the service provider; 14.80 A new water supply pipeline is being proposed between Havant and Otterbourne, which Southern Water have identified as potentially affecting this site or its surroundings. Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with the development of this site.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	CC4
Name of respondent (or client)	The Clay Family
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32MY-4
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32MY-4/1/CC4
Legally compliant?	YesYes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>It is considered that CC4 (i) on phasing is unsound for the reasons set out in the attached representations - Policy CC4 allocates the land adjoining Church Lane for 'about 10 dwellings' which is strongly supported.</p> <p>The site is well related to Colden Common. It lies at the end of a row of housing and opposite housing. There are field boundaries containing the site. The proposed site forms a logical extension to the built up area following the grain of the settlement. The site has good visibility splays from its existing access and there is a pavement for pedestrians to use. It is good housing candidate site.</p> <p>The policy wording states that 'The development is phased for the latter part of the Local Plan period and permission for housing development will not be granted before 2030.' The proposed phasing of the development is not considered to be in accordance with the current NPPF or the Government's aspirations. As such, this requirement should be removed from the policy and all other policies where this phasing restriction is suggested to ensure that the Local Plan is found sound. Particularly given the over reliance on complex brownfield sites, in order to maintain a robust housing land supply and deliver the required homes, sustainable sites should not be prevented from coming forward in the early years of the plan.</p> <p>Requirements of the access to the proposed development as set out in the policy are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the applicant's aspirations to create high quality developments which encourage the use of sustainable transport and promote healthy active lifestyles. In addition to the access requirements, Policy CC4 sets out criteria for environmental requirements. All of these criteria have been reviewed and as previously mentioned several technical surveys and reports have been undertaken and it is believed that all of these policy requirements are achievable.</p> <p>The criteria relating to other infrastructure are duly noted and the development will of course make the required Community Infrastructure Levy payment and if there is a need to provide a financial contribution to further infrastructure, this will be discussed during the consideration of a future planning application.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the	Remove paragraph CC4 (i)

policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Other than deletion of Para CC4(i) no other changes are necessary
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification](#) to criterion viii of Policy CC4 and to the text at paragraph 14.80 in respect of new water pipeline infrastructure in response to the Southern Water representation