

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

Wickham

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 WK1 Winchester Road Housing Allocation and Open Space Allocation | |
| Total Number of Representations received | 9 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 6 | 1 |
| Sound | 2 | 6 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 5 | 3 |
| <p>Summary of Representations Respondents questioned the retention of this policy given that the housing element has been delivered. The proposed open space also features prominently, with 33% of respondents opposing the proposed sports facilities, suggesting these are financially unsustainable and not meeting local demand. Instead, there is a preference for an alternative such as a country park, that aligns better with financial and community priorities. Hampshire County Council highlighted the potential pupil yield from this level of development. The South Downs National Park Authority sought measures to protect the setting of the Park. The NHS ICB sought a further amendment to ensure any necessary contributions to infrastructure were considered.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named) ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/6/WK1 ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/30/WK1 ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/14/WK1 ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/4/WK1 ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/35/WK1 ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/3/WK1 BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/2/WK1 BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/3/WK1 BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/28/WK1</p> | | |
| <p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the policy should be amended in response to ongoing discussions regarding the deliverability of sports pitches and pavilion. | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Chris Knowles-Vollentine |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/3/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Further housing allocations to Wickham fail to take into consideration the current construction of 6000 dwellings a mere field away. Whilst in another authority the 'local need' for housing cannot possibly be argued to be not being met when 6000 dwellings are being constructed. Furthermore, WCC previously agreed that the 200 homes to be built at Ravenswood would be the allocation for Wickham and Knowle for the foreseeable future, this has been ignored before those houses have even been constructed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | No further housing allocations for Wickham beyond the Ravenswood development given the proximate building of 6000 dwellings at Welborne |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | No further housing allocations required |
| 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 | WK1 |
| 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/30/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Whilst there has been good collaboration between the ICB and WCC during the Local Plan process, our request is an amendment to the policy as outlined in the full response which has been submitted via email on 08/10/2024. - Whilst there is supporting text for healthcare infrastructure there is no inclusion within the policy that directly supports the need for sufficient healthcare infrastructure. The policy needs an inclusion to contribute to infrastructure |
| 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) |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr David Ellrich and The Milligan Trust |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/4/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This representation commences with comments on the Section entitled 'Larger Rural Settlement Wickham and Knowle'</p> <p>Paragraph 14.109 refers to a Table (unnumbered) which addresses completions, outstanding permissions etc. This provides statistics to 2023 presumably to March 2023. It is noted that Regulation 18 stage some respondents were complaining the figures were out of date. This still applies. The Plan is not programmed for adoption until the end of 2025. In all probability adoption will suffer slippage and will hopefully occur in 2026. The Regulation 19 Plan should be updated.</p> <p>Further reference to the Table reveals that on the second line it references WK1 and WK2. The Regulation 19 Plan only appears to have policies WK1, WK3, WK5 and WK6. What happened to WK2 and WK 4? Looking back at the Regulation 18 Plan it is evident that WK2 references the allocation at the south of the village known as 'The Glebe'. Referring now to the Map 'Wickham and Knowle' the former WK2 is not shown coloured green to indicate 'Carried Forward Sites'. This WK2 is referenced in the Table but not in the Map. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>Given that the dwellings at WK1 are now all erected and the only remaining work is some landscaping and the final course on the carriageway it is misleading to leave WK1 as a 'Carried Forward Site'. The open space off Mill Lane which was associated with the development should remain as to be 'Carried Forward' as its implementation has not progressed. This is understood to be in the hands of the Parish Council.</p> <p>In summary the Table following paragraph 114.109 and the Map on the following page need to be updated to make the plan sound.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>This representation commences with comments on the Section entitled 'Larger Rural Settlement Wickham and Knowle'</p> <p>Paragraph 14.109 refers to a Table (unnumbered) which addresses completions, outstanding permissions etc. This provides statistics to 2023 presumably to March 2023. It is noted that Regulation 18 stage some respondents were complaining the figures were out of date. This still applies. The Plan is not programmed for adoption until the end of 2025. In all probability adoption will suffer slippage and will hopefully occur in 2026. The Regulation 19 Plan should be updated.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Further reference to the Table reveals that on the second line it references WK1 and WK2. The Regulation 19 Plan only appears to have policies WK1, WK3, WK5 and WK6. What happened to WK2 and WK 4? Looking back at the Regulation 18 Plan it is evident that WK2 references the allocation at the south of the village known as 'The Glebe'. Referring now to the Map 'Wickham and Knowle' the former WK2 is not shown coloured green to indicate 'Carried Forward Sites'. This WK2 is referenced in the Table but not in the Map. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>Given that the dwellings at WK1 are now all erected and the only remaining work is some landscaping and the final course on the carriageway it is misleading to leave WK1 as a 'Carried Forward Site'. The open space off Mill Lane which was associated with the development should remain as to be 'Carried Forward' as its implementation has not progressed. This is understood to be in the hands of the Parish Council.</p> <p>In summary the Table following paragraph 114.109 and the Map on the following page need to be updated to make the plan sound.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>This representation commences with comments on the Section entitled 'Larger Rural Settlement Wickham and Knowle'</p> <p>Paragraph 14.109 refers to a Table (unnumbered) which addresses completions, outstanding permissions etc. This provides statistics to 2023 presumably to March 2023. It is noted that Regulation 18 stage some respondents were complaining the figures were out of date. This still applies. The Plan is not programmed for adoption until the end of 2025. In all probability adoption will suffer slippage and will hopefully occur in 2026. The Regulation 19 Plan should be updated.</p> <p>Further reference to the Table reveals that on the second line it references WK1 and WK2. The Regulation 19 Plan only appears to have policies WK1, WK3, WK5 and WK6. What happened to WK2 and WK 4? Looking back at the Regulation 18 Plan it is evident that WK2 references the allocation at the south of the village known as 'The Glebe'. Referring now to the Map 'Wickham and Knowle' the former WK2 is not shown coloured green to indicate 'Carried Forward Sites'. This WK2 is referenced in the Table but not in the Map. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>Given that the dwellings at WK1 are now all erected and the only remaining work is some landscaping and the final course on the carriageway it is misleading to leave WK1 as a 'Carried Forward Site'. The open space off Mill Lane which was associated with the development should remain as to be 'Carried Forward' as its implementation has not progressed. This is understood to be in the hands of the Parish Council.</p> <p>In summary the Table following paragraph 114.109 and the Map on the following page need to be updated to make the plan sound.</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>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</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>No</p> |
|---|-----------|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy House, Chair |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/3/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>This representation is made on behalf of Wickham Residents' Association (WRA) by its elected Committee. WRA has a membership of 283 adult residents of the village of Wickham. WRA's Committee's views expressed in this representation demonstrating that the Local Plan is not sound are based on the Committee's opinion of how members feel and an appreciation of the issues that the Plan raises as to its impact on and acceptability to residents. It has not conducted in the time available a formal survey of members' views. It does not therefore make unequivocal statements backed by the authority its members. In that respect it joins with the Parish Council in declaring the Plan unsound. Residents of the parish have not been directly consulted on matters affecting the parish which makes it unsound on grounds of not having been professionally prepared because it has not been objectively assessed and not justified because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Full representation includes detailed points I to VIII outlining concerns regarding the proposed use of land at Mill Lane for sport with associated development including a pavilion. Points raised include doubts regarding the need, inadequate consultation, and impacts.</p> <p>IX. An alternative use of the site as a country park has been proposed by the Parish Council and shown to be financially viable and is likely to receive strong majority support by residents including WRA's 280+ members. A costed plan illustrating the nature and financial viability of a country park has been completed by a landscape consultant expert in the field. The information has been incorporated into an analysis of country park v sports pitches for the site and is, at the time of writing, understood to be pending the Parish Council's review.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>X. The alternative use for the site proposed by the Parish Council will give greater BNG, be more acceptable to the adjacent SDNP, alleviate traffic intensity that will affect the rural Mill Lane, provide informal recreation space to the settlement, provide the desired access to the Meon Valley Trail</p> <p>An alternative site in the parish is available and supported by the Parish Council that will much better serve the sports pitch needs of the settlement and be more consistent with all the policies and criteria that the Mill Lane site fails to satisfy (see entries re Settlement Gap WK 3)</p> <p>Grounds for Objection:</p> <p>NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED: plan fails to consider WCC's own evidence of area's objectively assessed needs; is not a financially sustainable development; contradicts the provisions of policies NE8, NE 13, NE14; local consultation rejection of the planned provision</p> <p>NOT JUSTIFIED: there is better and more sustainable alternative use of the site in compliance with policies NE8, Ne 13, NE14; alternative use has support of residents; cannot be financially justified. If WPPS update calls for more pitches in Wickham an alternative site should be sought.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>The policy is based on a prior iteration of the Local Plan and needs to be changed based upon the evidence above to make it sound. It should reflect the work done by Wickham and Knowle Parish Council that did not find its way into this Regulation 19 Plan. It should reflect past consultation data that does not support Sports Pitches, together with the fact that there is an alternative that has support and is financially viable. And, that is sports pitches are needed they can be provided at an alternative and more suitable development site (Welborne Open Space – see separate submission on this subject.)</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>“The s106 allocating this site to Sports Pitches has been varied to alter its permitted use from Sports Pitches to Country Park following investigative financial and consultative work by the Parish Council and agreed by WCC”</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</p> | <p>Yes Form (commenting on policies)</p> |

supporting information?

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 | WK1 |
| 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/28/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 125 dwellings is likely to generate up to 38 primary age pupils and 26 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Wickham Church of England Primary School, and Swanmore College. A contribution towards expansion of all phases of education may be required. |
| 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 and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Philip Greenish |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/6/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The Winchester Road development is almost complete but the nature of the sports provision on the second part of the site is still to be determined. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| 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/35/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy WK1 Winchester Road: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.</p> <p>Supporting Text: Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for the area where this site is allocated. In accordance with this, we undertook an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposal at each site.</p> <p>The assessment revealed that local sewerage infrastructure in closest proximity to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposals for the number of dwellings at the site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement will be provided through the New Infrastructure charge, but Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of network reinforcement aligns with the occupation of the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.</p> <p>Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections to the sewerage network, even when capacity is limited. Planning policies and planning conditions, therefore, play an important role in ensuring that development is coordinated with the provision of necessary infrastructure, and does not contribute to pollution of the environment, in line with paragraph 180(e) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023).</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, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| 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)/14/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/2/WK1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy WK1 states the two adjoining sites at Winchester Road are proposed for residential development in conjunction with 3.5 hectares of land at Mill Lane being laid out and made available for the provision of sports pitches, pavilion and parking. 2. Although the housing element is complete, the sports pitches cannot be progressed and the Parish Council request that this deliverable is either changed to something affordable and wanted by the community, or the money is returned and WCC can use it to deliver sports pitches in a more affordable area. 3. WCC say in response to the Reg 18 consultation that comments re the nature, layout and impacts of the proposed open space and sports provision are noted but on balance it is considered that the delivery of this element remains appropriate and of benefit to provision in the settlement. 4. The development of sports sites is NOT of any significant benefit to the settlement. The 2018 Pitch Strategy used as evidence in the Local Plan does not flag a need for sports pitches in Wickham and has solutions to any pitch shortfalls in other areas of the district. 5. The sum of money provided to build this site is substantially less than required (we have evidence of costings if required). 6. The remaining money required (about 500k), once grants are exhausted, will have to come from a local government loan, which is paid off by the precept. This will impact all the residents of Wickham and Knowle, the majority of which will not be using the sports pitches. 7. Only 13% of the players of clubs interested in playing at Wickham come from the parish itself. 8. The results of the most recent consultation conducted by the Parish Council in 2022 demonstrating that support for a sports site at Mill Lane is negligible – 81% against. 9. The parish council has looked into providing an affordable alternative to sports pitches and a County Park could be delivered within budget. 10. WI24 Mayles Lane, is offering sports pitches, next to the Recreation ground, where there is already a Pavilion – this would be the Parish Councils preference if sports pitches are needed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the | Remove the reference to sport pitches and replace with Country Park |

| | |
|---|---|
| policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>There are two references to the sports pitches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Two adjoining sites at Winchester Road are proposed for residential development in conjunction with 3.5 hectares of land at Mill Lane being laid out and made available for the provision of a Country Park. ii. Provide and lay out 3.5 hectares of land at Mill Lane for the provision of a County 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? | 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> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Form (WK1)</p> <p>Form (WK5 & WK6)</p> |

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification](#) to table “Wickham Housing Sources” (page 453) to recognise removal of Policy WK2.

[Proposed Modifications](#) to Local Plan policy WK1 (page 457) and supporting paragraphs 14.110 to 14.112 to update the position on the delivery of open space and protect the setting of the South Downs National Park.

[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 WK3 Welborne Open Space | |
| Total Number of Representations received | 12 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 6 | 3 |
| Sound | 5 | 5 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 7 | 3 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>A number of respondents supported the principle of the retention of open space, given the allocation of Welborne for about 6,000 homes immediately to the south in Fareham Borough. One respondent considered Welborne should be shown on the policies map.</p> <p>Others objected to the policy, stating it was duplication of NE7, undeliverable, or inappropriate given the existing mixture of agricultural uses with the designated area.</p> <p>Others promoted sites for development within this area, or raised concerns about the prospect.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/1/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/4/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3278-D/1/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/1/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/1/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32T1-3/1/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/5/WK3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/1/WK3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council/2/WK3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-32YJ-1/1/WK3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/1/WK3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/1/WK3</p> | | |
| <p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The suitability of the additional or alternative housing site proposed for Wickham within this area; and | | |

- Whether this policy is necessary and appropriate given the area's identification as a Settlement Gap under NE7 and existing agricultural uses.

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Buckland Development Ltd |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T1-3 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T1-3/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Buckland consider Policy WK3: Welborne Open Space to be legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate, however the Policy is not considered to be sound.</p> <p>The name of the policy is unclear and imprecise, as the use of 'Open Space' would infer that the land functions in its entirety as space open to general public (including Welborne residents) for recreational uses. In reality however, only the SANG at Dashwood and the Meon Valley Trail is publicly accessible within this area, along with a limited number of Public Footpaths which span the area. The remainder of the land is within private ownership, and primarily used for agricultural purposes. Buckland therefore recommends that the policy be re-titled to more accurately and clearly define the purpose of the policy, for example the 'Knowle, Wickham and Welborne Settlement Gap'.</p> <p>The supporting text of Policy WK3, states at 14.115 that 'it may be possible to accommodate some natural green infrastructure on land within Winchester district, provided it does not include buildings', however this reads as contradictory to other policies within the Local Plan (eg. Policy E10: Farm Diversification and Policy E11: Visitor-Related Development within the Countryside, which are designed to support the Rural Economy). Given the context set out above, with much of the land forming agricultural holdings, it is clear that some limited built development, where acceptable under other local plan policies, may be acceptable in this location. Further to this, there are some parcels of land within this area which, if developed, would not compromise the openness, integrity or role of this gap (and as such would meet the criteria set out in NE7 – Settlement Gaps). As such, this text should be removed.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Rewording of policy title and removal of text related to buildings (see below) Buckland consider Policy WK3: Welborne Open Space to be legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate, however the Policy is not considered to be sound.</p> <p>The name of the policy is unclear and imprecise, as the use of 'Open Space' would infer that the land functions in its entirety as space open to general public (including Welborne residents) for recreational uses. In reality however, only the SANG at Dashwood and the Meon Valley Trail is publicly accessible within this area, along with a limited number of Public Footpaths which span the area. The remainder of the land is within private ownership, and primarily used for agricultural purposes. Buckland therefore recommends that</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>the policy be re-titled to more accurately and clearly define the purpose of the policy, for example the ‘Knowle, Wickham and Welborne Settlement Gap’.</p> <p>The supporting text of Policy WK3, states at 14.115 that ‘it may be possible to accommodate some natural green infrastructure on land within Winchester district, provided it does not include buildings’, however this reads as contradictory to other policies within the Local Plan (eg. Policy E10: Farm Diversification and Policy E11: Visitor-Related Development within the Countryside, which are designed to support the Rural Economy). Given the context set out above, with much of the land forming agricultural holdings, it is clear that some limited built development, where acceptable under other local plan polices, may be acceptable in this location. Further to this, there are some parcels of land within this area which, if developed, would not compromise the openness, integrity or role of this gap (and as such would meet the criteria set out in NE7 – Settlement Gaps). As such, this text should be removed.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>Buckland consider Policy WK3: Welborne Open Space to be legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate, however the Policy is not considered to be sound.</p> <p>The name of the policy is unclear and imprecise, as the use of ‘Open Space’ would infer that the land functions in its entirety as space open to general public (including Welborne residents) for recreational uses. In reality however, only the SANG at Dashwood and the Meon Valley Trail is publicly accessible within this area, along with a limited number of Public Footpaths which span the area. The remainder of the land is within private ownership, and primarily used for agricultural purposes. Buckland therefore recommends that the policy be re-titled to more accurately and clearly define the purpose of the policy, for example the ‘Knowle, Wickham and Welborne Settlement Gap’.</p> <p>The supporting text of Policy WK3, states at 14.115 that ‘it may be possible to accommodate some natural green infrastructure on land within Winchester district, provided it does not include buildings’, however this reads as contradictory to other policies within the Local Plan (eg. Policy E10: Farm Diversification and Policy E11: Visitor-Related Development within the Countryside, which are designed to support the Rural Economy). Given the context set out above, with much of the land forming agricultural holdings, it is clear that some limited built development, where acceptable under other local plan polices, may be acceptable in this location. Further to this, there are some parcels of land within this area which, if developed, would not compromise the openness, integrity or role of this gap (and as such would meet the criteria set out in NE7 – Settlement Gaps). As such, this text should be removed.</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?</p> | <p>Yes Letter (commenting on policies)</p> |

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 | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carl Dixon |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | I support the intent of this section, and think the current draft captures this fairly well. The preservation of the existing undeveloped nature of the present gap between Wickham, Knowle and Welborne is essential to preserve the historic character of the area. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Chris Knowles-Vollentine |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | I am pleased to see the proper protection of the Welborne Open Space in order to protect Wickham from encroachment by Welborne. This space must be fully preserved and not marginalised by small developments which would lead to the reduction of their efficacy and subsequent challenge as to their purpose. It is vitally important that Wickham does not build into this gap and reduce the value of it as an open space to separate Wickham from Welborne. |
| 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> | No |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Fareham Borough Council |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council/2/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Full response on website</p> <p>Policy WK3 – Welborne Open Space</p> <p>Fareham Borough Council acknowledge and welcome Winchester City Council's commitment to cooperate with FBC in achieving the strategic development of Welborne and recognise the value of ensuring separation between the Welborne strategic development and the existing settlements of Knowle and Wickham in order to retain the open nature of the landscape.</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? | |
| 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> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Letter (commenting on policies)</p> |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Graham Moyse |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32YJ-1 |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32YJ-1/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Policy MK3 (Welborne Open Space), which seeks to maintain the open and rural character of the land and secure its long-term management, represents an unnecessary duplication of Policy NE7, which subject to a comprehensive review will provide robust protection for settlement gaps, including the preservation of open, undeveloped land. Both policies effectively aim to prevent coalescence and safeguard the distinctiveness of settlements through similar provisions. This redundancy not only complicates the policy framework but also compounds the issues identified with Policy NE7, particularly the lack of up-to-date evidence to justify the extent and boundaries of the settlement gap. By overlapping the objectives of Policy NE7, Policy MK3 risks imposing duplicative restrictions that are both unjustified and ineffective. Deleting Policy MK3 would streamline the Local Plan, ensuring that the focus remains on a single, coherent policy that is properly evidenced and capable of delivering its objectives without unnecessary complexity or duplication. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Policy MK3 should be deleted for the reasons give above. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Policy MK3 should be deleted for the reasons give above. |
| 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? | Yes Form (commenting on policies) Letter (commenting on policies) |

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 | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Macra Ltd |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>This allocation has been prepared without the input or knowledge of landowners and there is no likelihood that this land will be brought forwards as ‘open areas’.</p> <p>This designation includes a number of residential dwellinghouses and their defined domestic curtilages, other buildings and a range of other land uses including land used for agricultural and equestrian purposes, over which there is currently no right of public access and indeed there would be no incentive to enable such access to be provided.</p> <p>The landowners have not been consulted regarding the proposed designation of the land in this manner, and indeed the proposed approach to Policy WK3 is in our view entirely irrational.</p> <p>There is absolutely no justification for this approach. No landowner party has confirmed that their land is available for this purpose and indeed there is no reason or incentive to enable the land to be brought forward. The Welborne Garden Village has been designed and arranged such that it provides for all of the public open space, SANG and other greenspace provision that was needed in order to meet the requirements of the Fareham Borough Development Plan, including The Welborne Plan (2015) and the direction of National Planning Policy set out within the NPPF. There was no reliance upon land outside of Fareham Borough to achieve this.</p> <p>Policy WK3 is misleading, as it appears to suggest that the land is integral to the delivery of the Welborne Garden Village and indeed forms part of the strategic development allocation (SDA), when as a matter of fact it does not.</p> <p>The Council are essentially duplicating the role and function of Policy NE7 – Settlement Gaps, through Policy WK3. The policy does not actually functionally appear to designate the land for any purpose other than to indicate that the land should be retained as open and undeveloped, but rather makes vague assertions that the land should ‘form part of open areas’.</p> <p>It is entirely unclear what ‘forming part of open areas’ entails, however, what is fundamentally clear is that this has not been developed through consultation with any of the landowners and moreover there is no prospect at all that these ‘open areas’ would become publicly accessible or designated open space, both for reasons</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>that there is no incentive for land to be brought forwards for such purposes, but also that the area designation includes private residential properties.</p> <p>We consider that the policy as drafted is both unreasonable and irrational and should be removed in its entirety. It serves absolutely no purpose other than to duplicate Policy NE7, and moreover is entirely incomprehensible on what it anticipates will occur.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that we fundamentally disagree with the proposed Policy WK3 of the PSLP, we entirely support and endorse the overarching principle of a carefully considered and joined up approach to the pattern of development at Wickham, Knowle and Welborne Garden Village. The delivery of the land to generate a substantial network of open greenspaces however needs to be properly and appropriately developed with landowners, including providing sufficient landowner incentive to bring the land forwards in a viable manner.</p> <p>We have explained in detail through a clear and justified rationale how development of Land at Mayles Farm, Wickham, which would enable a significant part of this identified land area to be formally brought forwards as publicly accessible greenspace which would directly connect with the developments at Welborne and Knowle, could be brought forwards and we would invite the EIP Inspector to consider this matter in detail at the time of the examination.</p> <p>We consider there is a clear opportunity to deliver a sustainable expansion to Wickham settlement in a manner which would properly meet its housing needs, and alongside this to deliver the significant public benefit of access to a connected network of greenspaces creating in essence a country park between the settlements, which would be maintained permanently open and fundamentally serve the purposes of the settlement gap.</p> <p>see PDF for further detail</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</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?</p> | <p>Yes Form (listing policies and submitted document)</p> |

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.

[Letter \(commenting on Policies and Evidence base\)](#)
[Supporting documents \(Landscape Appraisal and Maps\)](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| 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/4/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | no comments |
| 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 | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr Andrew Macleod |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I believe that the current settlement gap may now be under threat. I have recently become aware of a proposed "Agricultural access road" to the existing Mayles Farm leading from access on Hoads Hill . This in my opinion is yet another opportunity by the developers who own the land to make the site viable for Housing development.</p> <p>I am totally against any modification of the existing agreement that may allow Housing development on this very important strip of land separating Wickham village fro the extremely close Welbourne development.</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> | No |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr David Ellrich and The Milligan Trust |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Representation on the Map 'Wickham and Knowle' (page 454) The Map shows the existing and proposed commitments. However, the map gives an impression which is potentially misleading.</p> <p>The use of 'green' in a planning documents is usually associated with open space. In this instance the 'green' applies mainly to open space, but on examination of the legend it also applies to 'Carried Forward Sites'. This includes the site WK1 which it has been suggested elsewhere should be disregarded as it is built out. The large swathe of Welborne Open Space sits within a sea of paler green. All suggestive of a very green environment. However, the development of Welborne sits on the southern edge of the green swathe. It is outside the district, so it is not shown on the Map. Reference is made may times in the wording of the Plan to Welborne, for example in Paragraph 14.115 it states; '...the SDA is a strategic issue which the Winchester District Local Plan need to address'. The Welborne Special Development Area should be marked in some general way on this Map. It is very misleading to show the development area as green fields.</p> <p>Representation on Welborne Open Space Paragraphs 11.114, 14.115 and Site Plan and Wider context (page 459) The above paragraphs underline the significance of the Welborne SDA to Wickham. The open space is promoted for its role in providing open space and a settlement gap. Both the 'Site Plan' and the 'Wider context' fail to show the SDA. Just because the SDA is outside the District boundary it should not be ignored. It is very misleading to show the SDA as green fields.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Representation on the Map 'Wickham and Knowle' (page 454) The Map shows the existing and proposed commitments. However, the map gives an impression which is potentially misleading.</p> <p>The use of 'green' in a planning documents is usually associated with open space. In this instance the 'green' applies mainly to open space, but on examination of the legend it also applies to 'Carried Forward Sites'. This includes the site WK1 which it has been suggested elsewhere should be disregarded as it is built out. The large swathe of Welborne Open Space sits within a sea of paler green. All suggestive of a very green environment. However, the development of Welborne sits on the southern edge of the green swathe. It is outside the district, so it is not shown on the Map. Reference is made may times in the wording of the Plan to</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Welborne, for example in Paragraph 14.115 it states; ‘...the SDA is a strategic issue which the Winchester District Local Plan need to address’. The Welborne Special Development Area should be marked in some general way on this Map. It is very misleading to show the development area as green fields.</p> <p>Representation on Welborne Open Space Paragraphs 11.114, 14.115 and Site Plan and Wider context (page 459)</p> <p>The above paragraphs underline the significance of the Welborne SDA to Wickham. The open space is promoted for its role in providing open space and a settlement gap. Both the ‘Site Plan’ and the ‘Wider context’ fail to show the SDA. Just because the SDA is outside the District boundary it should not be ignored. It is very misleading to show the SDA as green fields.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>Representation on the Map ‘Wickham and Knowle’ (page 454)</p> <p>The Map shows the existing and proposed commitments. However, the map gives an impression which is potentially misleading.</p> <p>The use of ‘green’ in a planning documents is usually associated with open space. In this instance the ‘green’ applies mainly to open space, but on examination of the legend it also applies to ‘Carried Forward Sites’. This includes the site WK1 which it has been suggested elsewhere should be disregarded as it is built out. The large swathe of Welborne Open Space sits within a sea of paler green. All suggestive of a very green environment. However, the development of Welborne sits on the southern edge of the green swathe. It is outside the district, so it is not shown on the Map. Reference is made may times in the wording of the Plan to Welborne, for example in Paragraph 14.115 it states; ‘...the SDA is a strategic issue which the Winchester District Local Plan need to address’. The Welborne Special Development Area should be marked in some general way on this Map. It is very misleading to show the development area as green fields.</p> <p>Representation on Welborne Open Space Paragraphs 11.114, 14.115 and Site Plan and Wider context (page 459)</p> <p>The above paragraphs underline the significance of the Welborne SDA to Wickham. The open space is promoted for its role in providing open space and a settlement gap. Both the ‘Site Plan’ and the ‘Wider context’ fail to show the SDA. Just because the SDA is outside the District boundary it should not be ignored. It is very misleading to show the SDA as green fields.</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>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</p> |
| <p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i></p> | <p>No</p> |

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 | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy House, Chair |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This representation is made on behalf of Wickham Residents' Association (WRA) by its elected Committee. WRA has a membership of 283 adult residents of the village of Wickham. WRA's Committee's views expressed in this representation demonstrating that the Local Plan is not sound are based on the Committee's opinion of how members feel and an appreciation of the issues that the Plan raises as to its impact on and acceptability to residents. It has not conducted in the time available a formal survey of members' views. It does not therefore make unequivocal statements backed by the authority its members. In that respect it joins with the Parish Council in declaring the Plan unsound. Residents of the parish have not been directly consulted on matters affecting the parish which makes it unsound on grounds of not having been professionally prepared because it has not been objectively assessed and not justified because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>WK3 Pages 459 – 460</p> <p>14.115 "Green buffers are provided to ensure that Welborne does not coalesce with Wickham or Knowle. It is also necessary for this Plan to define the general extent of open land within Winchester district which should be retained as a gap between Welborne and these settlements. It may be possible to accommodate some natural green infrastructure on land within Winchester district, provided it does not include buildings and maintains the open and rural character of the land and enables its long-term management to be secured. The overriding requirement is to retain the open rural nature of this land and to prevent changes which would urbanise its undeveloped character. The uses and management of the area must help to secure an effective, viable and long-term gap between Welborne and the separate settlements of Knowle and Wickham."</p> <p>Observations:</p> <p>I. This site is a major part of the green buffer between Wickham and Welborne. A development proposal has been put forward for development at the northern margin of the settlement gap (SHELAA reference W124)</p> <p>II. WRA, on record, and residents of Wickham have consistently supported the need for and maintenance of the green buffer in the past. Nothing has changed to alter that position and if any movement to propose houses as in W124 is to be considered it must demonstrate that it has the majority support of residents. At the time of writing the only evidence to support sites in the parish was conducted in 2022. Now that this is the</p> |

final Local Plan before it goes to the Inspector if site W124 is to be considered it, like the other sites, should be subject to robust resident consultation.

III. The extent of the WK3 site makes a considerable contribution to the land area of the buffer, and so it is possible to see an argument that development might be allowed within the terms of Policy “NE7 Settlement Gaps”

IV. The potential development in WK3 (SHELAA reference Mayles Lane W124) has been put forward for 100 homes plus sports pitches at the northern boundary of the site adjacent to the village boundary. The proposal adds community benefits that the proposed sites in the Plan (WK5 and WK6) do not: additional sports pitches and a commitment to deliver to the ownership of the Parish Council a large parcel of open greenfield land in the settlement gap. The danger, as residents see it, to the possibility of erosion of the buffer over time as pressure of further housing development demand is a real concern. Therefore, if W124 were to be adopted for development as described and under the conditions offered by the developer, the potential for the community to ensure that the integrity of the settlement gap can, to a large extent, be maintained and controlled by the community, may be an attractive option for residents and deliver against the goal for settlement gaps “enables its long-term management to be secured.”(145.111). However, residents should be consulted on this important site – and they have not. They will need to be assured that scope creep does not follow and the commitment to parish ownership is legally binding and watertight.

V. Policy NE7 (page 157) states:

“Within these areas only development that does not undermine the function of the gap and its intended role to define and retain the separate identity of settlements will be permitted.” The site that is in the ownership of the developer extends to 210 hectares so the amount of green space remaining in the settlement gap that is part of that ownership would be enough to meet this criterion. However, when considering detailed plans, if this site is chosen, it is essential that the developer ensures that as little land as possible is developed for housing and that the impact on neighbouring homes to the north of the site is minimised and/or mitigated and the assurances to the Parish Council are robustly honoured. It is also essential that any development cannot be designed in such a way as to encourage later applications to build on the settlement gap.

V1. 7.6.1 (page 157): “In defining the extent of a gap, no more land than is necessary to prevent the coalescence of settlements should be included having regard to maintaining their physical and visual separation.” The development plan put forward for WK3/W124, but not chosen by WCC for inclusion in the Plan, must be shown not to infringe this principle if it is to be considered.

V11. 7.6.2 The Framework states that it will be individual Local Plans that will identify the location of gaps and include policies to set out the types of development which will be permitted, based on the following principles:- It would not diminish the physical and/or visual separation of settlements; and It would not individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development compromise the integrity of the gap. The landscape vista looking from south to north would obviously change but should still extend sufficiently to maintain the definition of a settlement gap. The proposed W124 development of 100 homes plus sports pitches at the northern boundary of the site immediately adjacent to the village boundary and existing sports

and leisure facilities must be shown to provide sufficient land for the green buffer – and meets the requirement that it should comprise “no more land than is necessary”

It might also be relevant to point out that in KN1 page 470 14.137 the following statement might also apply to the proposal for WK3: “The site falls within what is currently designated as a settlement gap under adopted LPP1 Policy SHUA4. However, the planning application, and associated technical evidence, has demonstrated that development of this site will secure a much larger part of the Gap to be safeguarded for the longer term, and in that context the loss of this part of the gap is acceptable.” It is possible that the same argument could be made with respect to the Mayles Lane site WK3/W124, which if approved, could offer the potential to secure another part of the settlement gap between Wickham and Knowle for the long-term. However, the proposed site at WK3 is much more prominent in importance to residents of Wickham than the site at Ravenswood and so proper local consultation should be made available to determine if there is similar support among residents for development in the gap so close to the boundary. At the very least, to satisfy local opinion, the sites must be “measured” for quantitative support side by side.

V111WK3/W124 includes the only brownfield site in the village and as such justifies consideration in comparison with others that only develop greenfield sites. Ref Local Plan page ii “This local plan takes the approach of ‘brownfield first’ – both in prioritising the use of previously developed land over green fields, but also in the phasing of development. Over 90% of the sites that developers put forward have not been included in this plan”.

VII The site has a farm access already onto Hoads Hill. This is a busy main road that already has numerous individual residential access points (turning in both directions) on the same side as the proposed access from the site. However, traffic will increase in both directions over time as Welborne is built out and steps that are understood to be planned for managing the traffic increase will have to incorporate the access from the site onto Hoads Hill. It would be preferable, if needed, to make road alterations to facilitate this site rather than those that are proposed at the Mill Lane site (see WRA representation re WK5). Safe entry/exit from the site onto a wide road with ample space for turning in both directions will be needed but should be deliverable. Car park facilities would be feasible as part of the sports pitch provision. Providing such parking would contribute to meeting the needs of the village where parking is considered by residents in the local plan survey of 2020 to be a significant problem. No other provision for additional parking is included in the proposed Local Plan and, if W124 is considered after due consultation, this opportunity should be taken.

VIII Consultation among residents conducted by the Parish Council in 2022 rated W124 as the most preferred for development. We understand that the Parish Council has submitted this data to WCC (but we note that no further update to that consultation has taken place, with specific respect to the Local Plan proposed development sites for housing – and so definitive current views have not been gathered relative to either of the proposed sites WK5 and WK6 – making the Plan unsound).

IX W124 is within walking distance of the settlement and is on a bus route potentially reducing car traffic thus speaking to WCC’s green agenda. These benefits are not offered by the proposed development at WK5 or WK6 or the Sports Pitches site at Mill Lane. If sports pitches are to be included in the Plan for Wickham, then

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>W124 would be a financially, locationally and topographically more viable option than those at Mill Lane WK1 page 455 (see separate representation on the Sports Pitches site at Mill Lane).</p> <p>X There is potential for this site to be considered the most appropriate option for the village. All three possible sites must be subjected to proper scrutiny.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>W124 could meet the requirements of the number of houses that the Plan requires. It may be the favoured choice of residents as claimed in the 2022 survey. BUT it does impinge on the sensitive settlement gap and must be subject of resident consultation and affirmation for it to be included. Nevertheless, there are potential benefits that may gain the support of consultees. Neither it nor the proposed development sites in the Plan have been fully objectively assessed by consultation with residents. W124 as an alternative to WK5 and WK6 has not been assessed – as indeed neither have they.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>There is no suggestion for wording.</p> <p>GROUND FOR OBJECTION: the Plan for development site selection for Wickham has not been professionally prepared and justified and therefore the Plan is unsound.</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)</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Philip Greenish |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/1/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I very strongly support policy WK3 which is consistent with policy NE7 and is essential to maintain the integrity of Wickham as a historic and discrete village. The development at Welborne directly abuts the boundary of the parish of Wickham (and of Winchester district) and the gap between Wickham village and Welbourne is of great strategic importance in providing a minimal separation between a major and dense conurbation to the south and the historic village of Wickham and the Knowle satellite. Any development on it whatsoever would have both a physical and visual impact. It would lead inexorably to the coalescence of the settlements of Wickham, Knowle and Welborne into greater suburbia and the loss of settlement identity, which is precisely what this long-standing policy aims to prevent.</p> <p>The policy should be deployed actively to resist pressure from developers, one of whom has bought land speculatively in the designated Settlement Gap. This developer is not invested in the community in any other way. Any permission to build housing in the Settlement Gap would create a dangerous precedent, would directly contravene established policy. It must not be allowed to happen.</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 | WK3 |
| 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/5/WK3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Policy WK3 (Welborne Open Space) Southern Water recognise that the preferred route for Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project passes through the Welborne Open Space designation under Policy WK3, though the construction of the pipeline will not undermine open and undeveloped and rural character of this land and will not conflict with Policy WK3 or Policy NE7 which is permissive of development that does not undermine the function of the gap and its intended role to define and retain the separate identity of settlements. |
| 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 WK5 Land at Mill Lane | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Total Number of Representations received | 17 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 12 | 2 |
| Sound | 6 | 9 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 12 | 3 |
| <p>Summary of Representations Respondents including Wickham and Knowle Parish Council, argue the decision-making process lacked adequate public consultation and transparency. Other respondents considered it a suitable option if development in Wickham is required. Alternative development sites were proposed.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about transport impacts, in particular congestion and the availability of parking in the locality.</p> <p>The site promoter has advocated the expansion of the allocation to include land to the north of the proposal for a larger scheme of around 100 homes. Objections were raised regarding the proposals for phasing the development, and securing pedestrian links and the treatment of the existing surface water overland flow route.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park Authority sought changes to ensure the setting of the SDNP is protected. Hampshire County Council advised the expected pupil yield from a development of this size.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/3/WK5 ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/20/WK5 ANON-AQTS-3278-D/2/WK5 ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/3/WK5 ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/11/WK5 ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/2/WK5 ANON-AQTS-32UH-U/1/WK5 ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/31/WK5 ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/2/WK5 ANON-AQTS-32MZ-5/1/WK5 ANON-AQTS-322W-7/1/WK5 BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/1/WK5 BHLF-AQTS-328E-U/1/WK5 BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/2/WK5 | | |

BHLF-AQTS-328C-S/1/WK5

BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/2/WK5

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/18/WK5

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- The need for this development given the nearby proposals for 6000 homes at Welborne, and the City Council's previous approach in the Regulation 18 Plan that that development in Knowle was an acceptable development strategy;
- Whether the proposed vehicular access via Mill Lane is acceptable, and if the proposed approach to securing pedestrian links is appropriate;
- Whether alternative sites in Wickham would be more appropriate.
- Whether the site should be expanded to the north to increase capacity to around 100 homes;
- Whether the policy should be amended to ensure the setting of the SDNP is protected; and
- Lack of opportunity for consultation prior to the publication of the regulation 19 Plan.

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| 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-8/31/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Bloor Homes broadly supports draft policy WK5. However, it has a number of concerns regarding elements of the policy.</p> <p>Representation makes a number of points regarding the proposed phasing of this site after 2030, and believes this requirement should be removed.</p> <p>We do not consider criteria v is necessary given that criteria ii seeks to ensure site is well connected to surrounding area by sustainable transport modes. Criteria v should be removed.</p> <p>In respect of criteria ix, we consider wording should be amended to include the following text: “Unless modelling/ evidence demonstrates otherwise.”</p> <p>Detailed modelling work will need to be undertaken in relation to surface water drainage to confirm the most appropriate strategy for dealing with surface water and therefore an element of flexibility is required within the policy to allow alternative strategies to be considered.</p> <p>With regards to criteria xii there is no identified concern around wastewater treatment/sewerage infrastructure set out in the Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, August 2024 in respect of this site; therefore, this should not be a reason not to bring the site forward earlier in the plan period. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the statutory undertaker to service sites with planning consent.</p> <p>Regarding criteria xiii, the wording is ambiguous. There is nothing in the supporting text to identify what supporting infrastructure is needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for the site to be extended to the north to include WI06. The addition of this land would enable the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) to be expanded, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100.</p> <p>By expanding WK5 to include WI06, the number of affordable housing units would be significantly elevated from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035) identifies that WI06 is equally and in some cases more sustainable than a number of sites that have been allocated. We therefore see no reason for holding back this sustainable site for development.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Representation refers to Vision document submitted for this site and outlines a range of opportunities relating to an expanded site.</p> <p>The detailed assessment for WI06 is set out on pages 1033-1035 of the IIA . It can be seen that with the exception of landscape, all of criteria have been similarly assessed as compared with the draft allocation. The justification for the lower scoring contained within the report is that “The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity.” This is not, however, explained.</p> <p>In relation to both the allocated site and WI06, the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (Appendix F) assesses the category ‘Biodiversity and Geodiversity’, as ‘significant negative’. This is on the basis that the site is located within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for residential planning applications, that it is within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland and is within a priority habitat. Whilst the site is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for Botley Wood and Everett’s and Mushes Copses and Waltham Chase Meadows SSSI, given the distance between the site and these designations It is considered unlikely that the development at Mill Lane would adversely affect either site.</p> <p>For the category ‘natural resources’ both the draft allocation and WI06 are assessed as ‘significant negative’. This is on the basis that the majority of the site is greenfield, that a significant proportion of the site is either grade 3 agricultural land or that less than 25% of the site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. It also identifies that a significant proportion of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is greenfield, the site is located in a highly sustainable location. Natural England data indicates that the site is undifferentiated grade 3, which is classed as good to moderate. Detailed surveys will be undertaken to determine the quality of land in due course.</p> <p>Whilst the site falls within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Mineral Consultation Area, this is not considered to be a constraint to development. It is noted that in response to an application for 120 dwellings adjacent to the site, which was approved on 24 June 2019 (ref 17/02615/FUL), HCC stated that the overlap of the minerals and waste consultation area was minimal and raised no objection.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Bloor Homes broadly supports draft policy WK5. However, it has a number of concerns regarding elements of the policy.</p> <p>Representation makes a number of points regarding the proposed phasing of this site after 2030, and believes this requirement should be removed.</p> <p>We do not consider criteria v is necessary given that criteria ii seeks to ensure site is well connected to surrounding area by sustainable transport modes. Criteria v should be removed.</p> <p>In respect of criteria ix, we consider wording should be amended to include the following text: “Unless modelling/ evidence demonstrates otherwise.”</p> <p>Detailed modelling work will need to be undertaken in relation to surface water drainage to confirm the most appropriate strategy for dealing with surface water and therefore an element of flexibility is required within the policy to allow alternative strategies to be considered.</p> |

With regards to criteria xii there is no identified concern around wastewater treatment/sewerage infrastructure set out in the Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, August 2024 in respect of this site; therefore, this should not be a reason not to bring the site forward earlier in the plan period. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the statutory undertaker to service sites with planning consent.

Regarding criteria xiii, the wording is ambiguous. There is nothing in the supporting text to identify what supporting infrastructure is needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

There is an opportunity for the site to be extended to the north to include WI06. The addition of this land would enable the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) to be expanded, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100.

By expanding WK5 to include WI06, the number of affordable housing units would be significantly elevated from 16 to up to 40 on the site.

The Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035) identifies that WI06 is equally and in some cases more sustainable than a number of sites that have been allocated. We therefore see no reason for holding back this sustainable site for development.

Representation refers to Vision document submitted for this site and outlines a range of opportunities relating to an expanded site.

The detailed assessment for WI06 is set out on pages 1033-1035 of the IIA . It can be seen that with the exception of landscape, all of criteria have been similarly assessed as compared with the draft allocation. The justification for the lower scoring contained within the report is that “The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity.” This is not, however, explained.

In relation to both the allocated site and WI06, the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (Appendix F) assesses the category ‘Biodiversity and Geodiversity’, as ‘significant negative’. This is on the basis that the site is located within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for residential planning applications, that it is within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland and is within a priority habitat. Whilst the site is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for Botley Wood and Everett’s and Mushes Copses and Waltham Chase Meadows SSSI, given the distance between the site and these designations It is considered unlikely that the development at Mill Lane would adversely affect either site.

For the category ‘natural resources’ both the draft allocation and WI06 are assessed as ‘significant negative’. This is on the basis that the majority of the site is greenfield, that a significant proportion of the site is either grade 3 agricultural land or that less than 25% of the site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. It also identifies that a significant proportion of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is greenfield, the site is located in a highly sustainable location. Natural England data indicates that the site is undifferentiated grade 3, which is classed as good to moderate. Detailed surveys will be undertaken to determine the quality of land in due course.

Whilst the site falls within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Mineral Consultation Area, this is not considered to be a constraint to development. It is noted that in response to an application for 120 dwellings

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>adjacent to the site, which was approved on 24 June 2019 (ref 17/02615/FUL), HCC stated that the overlap of the minerals and waste consultation area was minimal and raised no objection.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Bloor Homes broadly supports draft policy WK5. However, it has a number of concerns regarding elements of the policy.</p> <p>Representation makes a number of points regarding the proposed phasing of this site after 2030, and believes this requirement should be removed.</p> <p>We do not consider criteria v is necessary given that criteria ii seeks to ensure site is well connected to surrounding area by sustainable transport modes. Criteria v should be removed.</p> <p>In respect of criteria ix, we consider wording should be amended to include the following text: “Unless modelling/ evidence demonstrates otherwise.”</p> <p>Detailed modelling work will need to be undertaken in relation to surface water drainage to confirm the most appropriate strategy for dealing with surface water and therefore an element of flexibility is required within the policy to allow alternative strategies to be considered.</p> <p>With regards to criteria xii there is no identified concern around wastewater treatment/sewerage infrastructure set out in the Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, August 2024 in respect of this site; therefore, this should not be a reason not to bring the site forward earlier in the plan period. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the statutory undertaker to service sites with planning consent.</p> <p>Regarding criteria xiii, the wording is ambiguous. There is nothing in the supporting text to identify what supporting infrastructure is needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for the site to be extended to the north to include WI06. The addition of this land would enable the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) to be expanded, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100.</p> <p>By expanding WK5 to include WI06, the number of affordable housing units would be significantly elevated from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035) identifies that WI06 is equally and in some cases more sustainable than a number of sites that have been allocated. We therefore see no reason for holding back this sustainable site for development.</p> <p>Representation refers to Vision document submitted for this site and outlines a range of opportunities relating to an expanded site.</p> <p>The detailed assessment for WI06 is set out on pages 1033-1035 of the IIA . It can be seen that with the exception of landscape, all of criteria have been similarly assessed as compared with the draft allocation. The justification for the lower scoring contained within the report is that “The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity.” This is not, however, explained.</p> <p>In relation to both the allocated site and WI06, the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (Appendix F) assesses the category ‘Biodiversity and Geodiversity’, as ‘significant negative’. This is on the basis that the site is located within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for residential planning applications, that it is within 500m of a</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland and is within a priority habitat. Whilst the site is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for Botley Wood and Everett's and Mushes Copses and Waltham Chase Meadows SSSI, given the distance between the site and these designations It is considered unlikely that the development at Mill Lane would adversely affect either site.</p> <p>For the category 'natural resources' both the draft allocation and WI06 are assessed as 'significant negative'. This is on the basis that the majority of the site is greenfield, that a significant proportion of the site is either grade 3 agricultural land or that less than 25% of the site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. It also identifies that a significant proportion of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is greenfield, the site is located in a highly sustainable location. Natural England data indicates that the site is undifferentiated grade 3, which is classed as good to moderate. Detailed surveys will be undertaken to determine the quality of land in due course.</p> <p>Whilst the site falls within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Mineral Consultation Area, this is not considered to be a constraint to development. It is noted that in response to an application for 120 dwellings adjacent to the site, which was approved on 24 June 2019 (ref 17/02615/FUL), HCC stated that the overlap of the minerals and waste consultation area was minimal and raised no objection.</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 | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carl Dixon |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/3/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | I support the choice of these 2 locations within Wickham to meet the requirements for additional housing. The choice of both is logical given the recently completed developments in both locations. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carol Batterson |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328C-S |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328C-S/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Full response on website.</p> <p>At very short notice I heard from our Residents Association that we need to respond by Sunday to a citizenspace.com/planning /local plan regulation 19 re the new housing allocation for Wickham. Using the link supplied, I got onto the Website and found the appropriate page only to find that the only sites for Wickham are WK5 and WK6 and yet their favoured site is Mayles Farm, where the Parish Council would like the total allocation of 100 houses and a football pitch to be built. They are further proposing that the access would be off A32, Hoads Hill. I would strongly oppose this as only last night the road was closed after a serious accident. Not only is Hoads Hill a dangerous access point but the land itself is very sloping and rivulets of water run down every winter to collect in a large pool near Mayles Lane and is totally unsuitable for housing.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that the proposed entry to an estate of 100 houses and a football pitch from A32, Hoads Hill would be highly dangerous and that environmentally, it is an area which should not be built on as it is a wildlife corridor between farmland on one side and the river, golf course and more farmland on the other. Of the 2 plans which were on the form, Mill Lane (W5) has limited access but School Road (W6) already has access via a roundabout into an existing estate which they propose to extend. This seems to me to be the best option with as little disruption as is possible. It would be a good idea to put all 100 houses as an extension to that existing development.</p> <p>The new suggestion which we cannot comment on is to build on farmland to the South of Wickham village with an entrance off A32 Hoads Hill. I strongly object to this suggestion and cannot see why it is being considered. Firstly Hoads Hill is very busy with frequent accidents and the proposed entrance is very small. Secondly the land is very wet in winter, rivulets run down the fields to make a huge pool near Mayles Lane. Thirdly is land should be part of the strategic gap between Wickham village and Welbourne especially as there is farmland the other side of A32, then there is Mayles Farm which goes down to the River Meon with more Farmland the other side of the river. A development on that land would block that wildlife corridor which should be a major priority.</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? | |
| 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 | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Chris Knowles-Vollentine |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/2/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Further housing allocations to Wickham fail to take into consideration the current construction of 6000 dwellings a mere field away. Whilst in another authority the 'local need' for housing cannot possibly be argued to be not being met when 6000 dwellings are being constructed. Furthermore, WCC previously agreed that the 200 homes to be built at Ravenswood would be the allocation for Wickham and Knowle for the foreseeable future, this has been ignored before those houses have even been constructed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | No further housing allocations for Wickham |
| 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 | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Ed Kennedy |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MZ-5 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MZ-5/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Wickham Surgery believes that the proposed development of 40 homes behind the surgery does not meet the required criteria of being "sound," as outlined. We outline our concerns below in relation to each criterion:</p> <p>Positively Prepared: The proposal fails to adequately account for the increased strain on local infrastructure, particularly Mill Hill Lane. This road is already under significant pressure, and with Wickham Surgery expected to accommodate residents from the new Welborne development, the additional traffic would create dangerous conditions for both vehicles and pedestrians. Mill Hill Lane is simply not suitable to accommodate the increased traffic associated with a development of this size, making it a dangerous and inappropriate location. There are other sites with far more appropriate road access that could meet the housing target without these issues.</p> <p>Justified: The current road infrastructure and lack of parking facilities make this site an unjustifiable choice, especially given the potential negative impact on Wickham Surgery's operations and the safety of the surrounding area. There are alternative locations available that could meet the housing target with less disruption and more sustainable infrastructure, rendering this site an unnecessary and unjustified option.</p> <p>Effective: The proposed site will not effectively mitigate the increased traffic burden on Mill Hill Lane, nor has there been effective collaboration with local stakeholders, including Wickham Surgery, to address infrastructure challenges. The absence of proper traffic and parking solutions makes the proposal unsustainable in the long term, likely leading to unsafe road conditions and putting additional strain on the already limited parking facilities at Wickham Surgery and the nearby community center. Additionally, pedestrian or cycle access to Houghton Way, without addressing parking needs, could lead to residents using the surgery's limited parking facilities as overflow parking for the housing development, further straining resources essential for patient care.</p> <p>Consistent with National Policy: One of our primary concerns is the lack of privacy considerations for the surgery's patients. The new homes must not be positioned in a way that allows views into the surgery, as this could compromise patient confidentiality during medical consultations.</p> <p>In conclusion, Wickham Surgery believes that the proposal for 40 homes is not "sound" under the criteria of being positively prepared, justified, effective, or consistent with national policy. This development should not</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | be adopted when there are alternative sites that could better meet housing needs in a sustainable and safe manner—particularly in terms of road safety and access. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Kathryn Holladay |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-322W-7 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-322W-7/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>In early April, WCC suddenly required Wickham village to take 100 more homes (even though they had officially assured the parish that 200 homes at Revenswood, Knowle would satisfy the housing requirement). The Parish Council was given only one month to choose possible sites which was completely insufficient time to get residents' opinions on choice of site. Previously, in 2022, 5 sites in Wickham had been listed in the SHELAA in 2022, and the most supported was Mayles Farm followed closely by School Rd/Southwick Rd). Mill Lane was not as well supported as the others. (data available from Wickham & Knowle Parish Council). The Mill Lane site is on a narrow rural lane, the character of which should be sustained according to policy NE14 rural countryside page 171. It is only passable in a single direction, some passing places and is unsuitable for large volumes of traffic. This policy also discourages "physical remodelling" to avoid "unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character". This site is also in a crowded corner of the village where 3 vital community services have expanded rapidly in recent years (200 homes built in Wickham since 2000) - the primary school, surgery and Community Centre. Congestion on the narrow access road to these and increasing parking problems in the area around these facilities would be greatly exacerbated by having even more homes nearby.</p> <p>Since the residents have not had time to be consulted - there was NO CONSULTATION possible during August holidays, and soon after WCC arbitrarily imposed a plan for 40 homes at Mill Lane and 60 at School Rd/Southwick Rd.</p> <p>The lack of public consultation is completely against the Local Plan policy and therefore makes the WCC proposal unsound because it has not been positively prepared (the area's needs have not objectively been assessed; and not justified because it has not taken into account reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence).</p> <p>supported. due to narrow, rural, single passing place road for access</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | It is vital that the residents of both Wickham and Knowle are FULLY CONSULTED on choosing the preferred site for the 100 new homes imposed by WCC. Without this, the policy is NOT SOUND. |

| | |
|---|--|
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Following WCC's insistence that Wickham takes an extra allocation of 100 more homes in the Local Plan, in order for it to be sound, the plan needs to allow for a full consultation with residents to select the most acceptable site for development by the majority. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Macra Ltd |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/2/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Site WI02 – Land at Mill Lane, Wickham</p> <p>Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (WI02) would see Wickham settlement sprawl northwards outside of and beyond the current firm development boundary that is formed by the transition from the existing pattern of development at Houghton Way and the pastoral pattern of fields beyond. The site would be accessed from Mill Lane, which itself transitions in terms of its character and there is a very clear shift from what reasonably forms part of Wickham settlement to land which very much forms part of its rural agricultural context with little urbanising influence.</p> <p>The character of Mill Lane leaving the settlement changes. There are urbanising influences to the south comprised within the existing settlement boundary, but on approach to Site WI02, approximately 100m to the south, the character of the lane changes to a rural country lane with a strong degree of enclosure and absence of urbanising features. The enclosure provided by the tree line on both sides of the lane and native hedgerows provide a wholly rural character. On reaching the edge of site WI02, the character is firmly one of the countryside. There are no urban influences looking northwards and the context is solely of pastoral agricultural fields and mature trees and hedgerows as strong landscape features.</p> <p>The existing settlement edge is comprised of an existing mature hedgerow screen with juvenile hedgerow trees. This will become more robust over time, but it is evident that, when looking north, the land is intrinsically rural, and that new development would significantly and materially change its character.</p> <p>There are significant concerns with the impact of development on the character and function of Mill Lane, this is a low category road which is narrow and rural in its nature with hedgerow boundaries and poor sight lines. This emphasizes the rural setting of the site.</p> <p>There are currently no public rights of way across the land and the site has no clear connectivity in this respect. It is also noted that Mill Lane has a history of flooding due to poor drainage issues and indeed, this could be exacerbated by the proposed development.</p> <p>In landscape terms, the land rises northward, with the landscape to the north of the village making a significant contribution to the distinctive character and rural setting of the village. It is considered likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The boundary of the South Downs National Park lies approximately 100m to the north. The Council consider there is scope to mitigate the impact through careful siting and design, where development could be accommodated without changing landscape character through concentrating development to the south and SW corner of the site, maintaining a buffer to the protected woodland to the west of the site and locating open space on the more elevated parts of the site. However, the diminishment of this gap places additional pressure upon the South Downs National Park without good justification. There is no reasonable requirement for Wickham settlement to expand in this direction and diminish the gap to the National Park designation. The Council has given insufficient weight to the pressure upon the National Park in this regard and the consistency of the local landscape character with that of the projected designation.</p> <p>The character of the landscape is entirely consistent with that entering the South Downs National Park Designation and thus this land forms intrinsically part of its setting. There is no fundamental change in the landscape which indicates that the site should be released. The pastoral pattern of fields, with ribbons of hedgerows and hedgerow trees and clusters of woodland is entirely consistent with this character.</p> <p>It is clear that the designation of this site for development will clearly extend Wickham far beyond any of the previous patterns of development at the northern edge of the settlement, and will appear as a finger of growth pushing out into the landscape. There are clear reasons why the extension of Wickham settlement northwards is unjustified and the Council's decision to allocate the site for development in preference to Land at Mayles Farm (WI24) is in our view unfounded.</p> <p>see PDF for further detail</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</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</i></p> | <p>Yes Form (listing policies and submitted document) Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence base) Supporting documents (Landscape Appraisal and Maps)</p> |

*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 | WK5 |
| 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/20/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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 | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr Andrew Macleod |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D/2/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | This site in my opinion is one of the more sensible options for the village as it will have the least impact the "First phase" having recently been completed with plenty of room for expansion. |
| 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, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr David Ellrich and The Milligan Trust |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/2/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The allocation of 40 dwellings on land west of Mill Lane Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. Wickham is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.</p> <p>At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.</p> <p>Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings. It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.</p> <p>This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.</p> <p>Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the north of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.</p> <p>This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming decades.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>The allocation of 40 dwellings on land west of Mill Lane Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. Wickham is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.</p> <p>At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.</p> <p>Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings. It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.</p> <p>This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.</p> <p>Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the north of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming decades.</p> <p>Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>The allocation of 40 dwellings on land west of Mill Lane Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. Wickham is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.</p> <p>At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.</p> <p>Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings.</p> <p>It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.</p> <p>This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the north of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.</p> <p>This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming decades.</p> <p>Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.</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>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</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,</i></p> | <p>No</p> |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy Greenish |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328E-U |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328E-U/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>On behalf of the members of the Wickham Society, I write to express our disappointment that an agreement reached in May 2022 with Winchester City Council (WCC) to restrict the amount of housing allocation required in the Parish of Wickham and Knowle to just the development of 200 houses north of Ravenswood in the 2020/40 Local Plan, has now been extended to include the requirement of an additional 100 houses within Wickham. With the advent of 6,000 houses to be built at Welborne within 2 miles of our village over the next 20 years, the impact of any additional housing can only be detrimental to the fabric of our community, roads and conservation areas that we cherish and are determined to protect.</p> <p>We acknowledge that with the change of central government, which is resolved to increase our housing supply, there is an inevitable consequence that will include the requirement for the additional 100 houses within our community. However, we are concerned that there has been very limited consultation with residents about where this housing should be located.</p> <p>Earlier this year, the Parish Council took the decision to refrain from putting forward a preferred option for development and thus the decision was taken by WCC for inclusion within the current edition of the local plan. We are relieved to note that the revised plan is proposing that any additional housing will not take place until at least 2030, as we are currently absorbing the impact of an additional 200 houses in the last 4 years, which is regrettably having a negative impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>However, we would like to propose that this time could be used to undertake further consultation with the local community to ensure that a considered and realistic approach is taken to ensure a robust and a well-supported options appraisal and conclusion is reached, that has solid community support.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the current process has not achieved this outcome.</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. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Form (WK5 and WK6) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy House, Chair |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/2/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This representation is made on behalf of Wickham Residents' Association (WRA) by its elected Committee. WRA has a membership of 283 adult residents of the village of Wickham. WRA's Committee's views expressed in this representation demonstrating that the Local Plan is not sound are based on the Committee's opinion of how members feel and an appreciation of the issues that the Plan raises as to its impact on and acceptability to residents. It has not conducted in the time available a formal survey of members' views. It does not therefore make unequivocal statements backed by the authority its members. In that respect it joins with the Parish Council in declaring the Plan unsound. Residents of the parish have not been directly consulted on matters affecting the parish which makes it unsound on grounds of not having been professionally prepared because it has not been objectively assessed and not justified because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives that residents may find more acceptable. It fails to meet the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>WK5/SHELAA site W102 Statement page: 461/2 14.117 "Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character through concentrating development to the south and SW corner of the site, maintaining a buffer to the protected woodland to the west of the site and locating open space on the more elevated parts of the site." Potential number of units: 40"</p> <p>Observations I. 14.117 Supporting text: "The site is located to the north of the recently completed housing development at Houghton Way and the Wickham Surgery which in turn are located to the north of Wickham Community Centre." The location is also to the north-east of the primary school and is close to its boundary. The area is already overdeveloped with significant parking and access problems owing to the nature of the facilities located there: none are easily accessible by foot, most visitors arrive by car and there is no public transport. A developer with an interest in this land may argue that the concentration of activity is a benefit: that would indeed be a benefit in a village centre, but not up a narrow country lane. There is no sense in exacerbating problems already experienced in the area and which will only worsen over time as the Surgery</p> |

is required to take a minimum of 2000 new patients from the nearby Welborne development that can only reach the Surgery by car. The school roll is also expected to rise.

ii 14.117 Supporting text. “The landscape to the north of the village makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character and rural setting of the village and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. The boundary of the South Downs National Park lies approximately 100m to the north”. The word 'likely’ is redundant in the above sentence: it is valued but now threatened by further development and the Sports Pitch site designated for the east side of the lane.

lii Policy NE 14 Rural Countryside 7.105 p 171 applies: “Traffic intrusion may adversely affect the character of the area due to numbers of trips and the type of vehicles (e.g. heavy goods vehicles). The suitability as well as the capacity of rural lanes should also be considered, as physical re-modelling of rural roads and introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances necessary for the development may have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character. Rural lanes are a particular characteristic of the district that have historic as well as landscape significance”. The plan for housing in Mill Lane WK5 relies on a new access road being created across what is greenfield to Mill Lane. The proposal further proposes to widen and reconfigure the lane to allow two-way passing, which is not possible throughout its length at the moment. Equally, to get to Mill Lane from the north requires traffic to travel on one of three narrow country lanes joining that would also need modification. The access from the south via Bridge Street is also not conducive to high volumes of traffic. It is our contention that action to re-model Mill Lane represents a contradiction of NE14 “as physical re-modelling of rural roads and introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances necessary for the development will have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character”. The intention in the Plan to create another access off Mill Lane (probably almost at the same location as the access from the housing development but on the opposite side) for the proposed sports pitches will doubly offend the policy.

iv 14.117 Supporting Text: “The boundary of the South Downs National Park lies approximately 100m to the north. However, there is scope to mitigate the impact through careful siting and design. Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character through concentrating development to the south and SW corner of the site....”. Such mitigations could be made but they only need to be made at this site. The fact that mitigations are even considered means that by their very existence the houses will change the landscape character and residents may well feel that such changes, however mitigated, may not be sufficient.

v The parish consultation in 2022 regarding sites place this one (W102) lower than either the Glebe (W103) Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space (W124). (data available from parish Council). It is fully expected by WRA that had a consultation taken place in direct relation to the Local Plan site assessments and allocations this site W102/WK5 would have been the least favoured by a considerable margin. That no in depth consultation has been conducted makes the Plan unsound.

V114.119. “Mill Lane is currently a narrow rural road with relatively low traffic volume. Pedestrian and cycle access should be established at the southern end of the site through to Houghton Way, to link into existing pedestrian facilities”. In the evidence base presented to WCC in respect SHELAA sites, the parish council in

2022 emphasised that, as result of local consultation in that year no access onto Mill lane from any housing development should be made.

vi WK 5: Access ii.

The proposals include direct, safe and lit, where appropriate, active travel links as part of a strategy that minimises car journeys from the development by providing opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport that is connected to the surrounding area; Access iv: As part of the design process a transport assessment, should consider any improvements to be provided to Mill Lane, as necessary, to accommodate increase in traffic;" Mill Lane has been noted above to be a narrow rural road with passing only possible at certain points. The rural nature of the lane should be maintained as per policy but the southern end of the lane leads to the overdeveloped Surgery and Community Centre area. The traffic survey completed on this part of the lane in conjunction with the Surgery expansion plan (20/10484/FUL) was criticised by Hampshire Highways who issued a holding objection as a result – but this objection was ignored by WCC's Planning Committee. The Local Government Ombudsman issued a rebuke to WCC for failing to consider the objection. However, the reasons for that objection still apply. It would be impossible to create safe cycle and pedestrian routes without significantly infringing Policy NE 14 by making significant alterations to the lane itself. It is also unnecessary in relation to the building of 40 houses. Inasmuch as those 40 units should be located elsewhere such disruption to and alteration of, the rural nature of the lane, against Policy NE 14, is not necessary and a cost that can and should be avoided,

xi.WK 5 Environmental. "Provide useable and accessible on-site open space in accordance with the approach set out in policy NE3". Reference to NE 3 does little to support this site allocation. NE 3 refers to the provision of open space in any development: the plan for this site claims that but in fact what it does is reduce open space. It is already open space and development will simply reduce it and the landscape benefits that NE 14 seeks to deliver.

xii.Development Strategy and Site Selection. Page 25. The table shows distinctions between the Mill Lane (W102) and other sites favouring Mill Lane on 4 objectives. This is contested inasmuch as for example 11A Objective 1 for Mill Lane (W102/WK5) is rated as likely minor positive for minimising climate change effects whereas W103/WK6 and W124/WK3 are shown to be potential minor negatives in this regard. Yet the factors used to assess the objectives are differentiated only by the number of homes planned for the sites. In other respects W124 for example has a bus route (W102 does not); WK/W103 and WK3/W124 have accessible open space immediately adjacent to them (W102 does not). The potential for adults to walk to work (Objective 2) from W102, W103 and W124 is the same if they work in Wickham but if they don't the probability of using a car to go to work is likely to be 100% from W102 but possibly less than that from W124 because it is on a bus route YET the score for W102 on Objective 2 is "likely minor positive" but for W103 and W124 it is "likely minor negative". So this measure seems badly flawed.

A thorough examination of the manner of these assessments is required as they appear flawed. It would have been expected that there should be equivalence or more favour given to W103 and W124 securing the favourable scores and it begs the question as to why they do not.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p> GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION:</p> <p>This development does not meet the soundness criteria: it is NOT JUSTIFIED relative to better alternatives; it is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED because it ignores the evidence of community opinion, has an outstanding highways objections and the comparative site selection analysis is questionable. It does not meet the test of duty by WCC to co-operate. WCC held a drop-in event at Wickham in September, but that cannot be regarded as a satisfactory consultation, and we can find no report of it in the evidence base supporting the Plan on WCC's Plan website. Quantified evidence of a large sample has not been produced. There has been no updated consultation on this site.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | This site WK5 should be removed from the Plan |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | This site is considered undesirable and has been withdrawn from the Plan |
| 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 |
| <p>Have you submitted supporting information?</p> <p><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</p> <p>Form (commenting on policies)</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| 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/18/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 40 dwellings is likely to generate up to 12 primary age pupils and 8 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Wickham Church of England Primary School, and Swanmore College. A contribution towards expansion of all phases of education may be required. |
| 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 and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Philip Greenish |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/3/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Should the additional requirement for 100 dwellings (40 at Mill Lane and 60 at Southwick Road/School Road) be confirmed, then I believe these sites are acceptable and preferable to any other sites Wickham. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| 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/24/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| 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? | 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 | WK5 |
| 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)/11/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Tim Fairchild |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32UH-U |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32UH-U/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | This development does not meet the soundness criteria: it is NOT JUSTIFIED relative to better alternatives; it is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED because it ignores the evidence of community opinion and highways objections. There has been no updated consultation on this site. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK5 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/1/WK5 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>1. Wickham and Knowle Parish Council does not agree that the Winchester City Council Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan ('the submission plan') meets the test of soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. As a result it does not satisfy the relevant requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>2. The plan is not sound because it has not been positively prepared and that policies WK5 and WK6 making site allocations in the parish of Wickham and Knowle, are not justified. The Parish Council does not consider that the submission plan provides a reasonable justification for any site allocations in Wickham over and above that made by policy KN1.</p> <p>3. If, however, it is accepted that additional site allocations are required then those allocated by the plan at WI02 Mill Lane and WI03 Southwick Road/School Road (References W102 etc relate to those given in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment) are not the best available sites for development in the parish. The Parish Council does not support these allocations.</p> <p>4. The specific defect identified in this representation can easily be remedied by a modification to the submission plan. Our first position is that policies WK5 and WK6 should not have been included from the submission plan. However, if that is not to be accepted, WK5 and WK6 should be replaced with a revised policy making the correct site allocation. The Parish Council asks the Inspector to require that one of these modifications is made. It is to be hoped that the City Council will make the necessary amendments but should in the unlikely event that the City Council refuses to do so, the plan should be found unsound.</p> <p>5. If a development allocation is required for Wickham over and above the site at Ravenswood in Knowle Village then sites WI02 and WI03 should be replaced within the plan by the allocation of WI24 Mayles Lane. For reasons we will explain, WI24 is a preferable location and more deliverable site. The City Council's reasons for choosing WI02 and WI03 in preference to WI24 are unclear. They are not 'better' sites by any objective measure. WI24 would provide both housing and community benefit which accords with the purposes of the planning system. In selecting WI02 and WI03 in preference to WI24 the City Council has not been positive, open or transparent in site selection. This is not an appropriate strategy taking into account the reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence.</p> <p>Background</p> |

6. Wickham and Knowle Parish Council represents an area which includes two settlements. One is the ancient village of Wickham which has shops, pubs and community facilities which justify it being categorised as a 'larger rural settlement' in the submission plan. The other is Knowle which is a residential development created in the last twenty years on the site of a decommissioned Victorian hospital. It has no village centre of its own and residents are reliant on Wickham and larger settlements to the south for their services and activities. Although they each have their own sense of identity and distinct qualities, the parish council believes it unreasonable for Wickham and Knowle to be treated as separate settlements for planning policy purposes.

7. In the early stages of Regulation 18 consultation on the emerging local plan (Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022) the City Council considered that a sustainable increase in Wickham's housing numbers would be met in full by the allocation of site WI18 Ravenswood on the edge of Knowle (Policy KN1 in the submission plan) which already has consent for some of the proposed development. The Parish Council supported this as a sustainable level of development for the parish as a whole. At the time the City Council also accepted that 'Wickham' meant Wickham parish and wrote to the Parish Council to confirm this.

8. During Regulation 18 consultation the City Council said:
"Sites were considered in accordance with the methodology set out in section 5 of this document. There are currently a number of sites allocated in the adopted local plan being developed. There is an opportunity at Knowle to deliver 200 homes at the Ravenswood site with significant community gains. The Council considers that given the community discussions held at that time, this is the best way to meet the identified level of development for Wickham in the emerging development strategy (ibid)."
(Our emphasis added and note that the City Council does not distinguish between Wickham and Knowle in this consultation – it rightly assumes that the two settlements represent one mutually interdependent place within the parish)

9. Later in the Regulation 18 consultation the City Council changed its stance, requiring Wickham to allocate a further 100 dwellings.

10. Paragraph 6.29 of the 2024 version of the Development Strategy and Site Selection document states:
"The Regulation 18 draft Local Plan did not include a proposed allocation at Wickham due to the availability of a site at the nearby settlement of Knowle, which was brought forward as an exception site and has since reached the point where permission can be issued once appropriate s106 agreement(s) are signed. Following consideration of the responses to the regulation 18 consultation, the Council has reconsidered and the Proposed Submission Plan contains sites adjacent to the settlement of Wickham to deliver about 100 dwellings in line with the settlement's categorisation as a Larger Rural Settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper."

11. The City Council has provided no explanation for this shift, other than to state that it was a reaction to Regulation 18 consultation response from a single unnamed source. For some reason the City Council has adopted a position inconsistent with its previous approach by drawing a distinction between Knowle and Wickham. The addition of 100 dwellings in Wickham is now justified by identifying Wickham as a Larger Rural

Settlement separate from Knowle. However, were this to be correct, Knowle should be categorized as a Smaller Rural Settlements in the 2024 Settlement Hierarchy, and should not receive an allocation at all. The City Council's position is illogical and lacks transparency.

12. This lack of justification for the inclusion of policies WK5 and WK6 could be remedied by the removal of those policies.

13. However, if the City Council is to be permitted to adopt this approach then it must ensure that it allocates the correct site(s) for development in Wickham. In August 2022 the Parish Council submitted its assessment of the five SHELAA sites within the parish, without expressing a preference between them having been told that no allocation would need to be made. Following its change of position the City Council demanded via a letter dated 10th April 2022, that the parish council identify its preferred site for approximately 100 homes by 17th May 2024.

14. The Parish Council responded to this unreasonable requirement stating:

"The Parish Council has been given inadequate time to consult with residents on the implications of this change in your policy position...Should the City Council disagree and proceed with evaluating sites for possible allocation, the Parish Council expects to be fully consulted as part of that process".

15. The Parish Council received no reply or further engagement from the City Council. The City Council selected the sites WI02 and WI03 without further consultation and the Parish Council were only made aware of this immediately prior to the publication of the submission plan. It made representations to the City Council's Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet regarding the lack of consultation and inappropriate choice of sites, but these concerns were waived aside.

16. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires that 'plans should be shaped by early proportionate and effective engagement'. The expectation should be that local communities should have the opportunity to actually shape the future of their local area. Wickham has been provided with inconsistent and incorrect information and has not enough time has been given for timely consultation with its residents. The sites selected by Winchester City Council do not reflect the views of the local community.

The City Council's chosen options – unjustified and possibly undeliverable

17. Sites WI02 and WI03 have serious shortcomings and cannot be supported.

Mill Lane WI02

18. The plans submitted by Bloor Homes require vehicular access to the site from Mill Lane. There are no alternative access options. Mill Lane is a rural, narrow country lane and there can be no certainty that the road can be widened to allow two cars to pass, or pedestrians to move safely. This raises a serious question mark over its deliverability. Any reconfiguration of Mill Lane would be contrary to Policy NE14 - Rural Character. The same applies to the roads beyond Mill Lane that feed into it as they would also need modification.

19. The site has the potential to expand further and would have further dire consequences to the rural character of Mill Lane and its surround area.

20. The site is located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone for residential planning applications, i.e. within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland.

21. It is very close to the boundary with the South Downs National Park and therefore may be subject to an objection at a later stage from the National Park Authority.

Southwick Road/School Road (WI03)

22. Residential development on WI03 would see Wickham sprawl eastwards; substantially beyond the existing boundary of the existing settlement.

23. The City Council describe this site as surrounded by residential land uses to the south, and agriculture to the north, east and west; however this is factually incorrect. There are agricultural uses to the north, south and east of the settlement.

24. Significant archaeological remains were discovered during the development of an adjoining site and this poses a significant risk to the deliverability of development on this site.

The Parish Council's preferred allocation

Mayles Lane (WI24)

The Parish Council's considers this site to be the best available alternative for the full allocation, because :

- it was supported by the greatest number of residents when the Parish Council sought public views before its response to the City Council in 2022

[Includes diagram showing result of survey in 2022 - this can be seen in full submitted representation]

Source: Wickham and Knowle Parish Council online survey

- part of the site comprises previously developed land
- development of the site would maintain the compact form of the village and avoid an obvious extension of the settlement out into the countryside
- access to the site can and must be provided via Hoads Hill (not Mayles Lane). Hoads Hill is being improved as part of the nearby Welborne development, making the access suitable with less impact
- the site is within walking distance to the shops, facilities and services and unlike WI02 or WI03 is on a local bus route which further enhances its status as a more sustainable location for development
- it offers significant potential opportunities for public open space and a connected network of greenspaces which would sit alongside the Welborne development and provide the opportunity of delivering a continuous walking connection to Knowle to the south
- by agreement with the site promoter it will be possible to include additional football pitches adjacent to the existing recreation ground, representing a clear public benefit which mitigates the impact of the development. This site for sports has significant advantages over the Mill Lane designated Sports Pitches site
- the promoter has allowed a 20 meter open space buffer between the development area and neighbouring properties
- it would maintain the open gap between Wickham and the Welborne by formally designating the land as part of a network of green spaces, forming something close to a country park for the benefit of residents

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Parish Council has reviewed all the information available before resolving to support site WI24. It is acknowledged that it is in Local Gap, but nevertheless the merits to the site are clear and therefore supported by policy NE7 of the submission plan. <p>Summary</p> <p>26. The last minute decision (and it was a last minute decision whatever they now say) of the City Council to require 100 homes to be provided in Wickham in addition to the 200 allocated at Ravenswood was indicative of poor community engagement and transparency in plan making. For the City Council to have changed its position because of one unnamed and unexplained representation is illogical and raises questions about the Regulation 18 consultation.</p> <p>27. However, if the City Council is determined to make a further allocation it must do so in a way which represents justified and purposeful plan making. The decision to allocate WI02 and WI03 does not meet these tests. The inclusion of those sites render the submission plan unsound.</p> <p>28. Modification of the submission plan by the substitution of WI24 would not only be preferable in accordance with guidance on sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework but would also ensure that the submission plan met with the wishes of the local community in this respect.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Replace polices WK5 and WK6 with a single policy which allocates the site WI24 for up to 100 dwellings in lieu. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | An appropriate policy wording which allocates WI24 and requires the preparation of a masterplan with up to 100 residential dwellings on land immediately to the south west of Mayles Lane and the entirety of the remainder of the site given over to public recreational use with stewardship arrangements to be agreed. For information, the site promoter has prepared a concept masterplan which may be considered by the examination. |
| 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> | Yes Form (WK1) Form (WK5 & WK6) |

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

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 Modifications](#) proposed to criterion v of Policy WK5 (page 463) and para. 14.119 to retain flexibility in how suitable pedestrian links may be delivered.

| Local Plan Reference or document | Policy WK6 Land at Southwick Road/School Road | |
|--|--|-----------|
| Total Number of Representations received | 18 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 10 | 1 |
| Sound | 6 | 6 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 9 | 3 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>Respondents including Wickham and Knowle Parish Council argue the decision-making process lacked adequate public consultation and transparency. Other respondents considered it a suitable option if development in Wickham is required. Some objectors considered this preferable to the other proposed allocation at WK5. Alternative development sites were proposed.</p> <p>The site promoter has confirmed the deliverability of the proposal and proposed that this proposal could come forward earlier than 2030, with a larger scheme coming forward later in the Plan period.</p> <p>One respondent pointed out the reference to Southwick Road was inaccurate and misleading. One respondent considered the site poorly related to the settlement and subject to archaeological constraints.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park Authority sought changes to ensure the setting of the SDNP is protected. Hampshire County Council advised the expected pupil yield from a development of this size. Southern Water advised they have infrastructure which crosses the site and requested an amendment to the plan to ensure this is taken into account if the site is developed.</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-3BJQ-9/1/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/7/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/36/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3278-D/4/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/5/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/16/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/5/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/38/WK6</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/4/WK6</p> | | |

BHLF-AQTS-32YC-T/1/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/3/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328E-U/2/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/4/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328C-S/2/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328A-Q/7/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/5/WK6

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/33/WK6

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- The need for this development given the nearby proposals for 6000 homes at Welborne, and the City Council's previous approach in the Regulation 18 Plan that that development in Knowle was an acceptable development strategy;
- Whether alternative sites in Wickham would be more appropriate;
- Whether the site should be expanded to increase capacity;
- Whether the policy should be amended to ensure the setting of the SDNP is protected;
- Whether archaeological value is protected;
- Whether the policy take appropriate account of waste water infrastructure;
- Lack of opportunity for consultation prior to the publication of the regulation 19 Plan.

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| 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 | Records indicate a Roman road runs through the site. While we welcome the policy provision for archaeological investigation, explicit reference should be made to the Roman road and associated settlement activity, and the approach taken. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | “14.126 The nearby site at The Glebe contained to the north west significant archaeological remains. Further archaeological evaluation of the site will be needed prior to development to ascertain the full nature of the archaeological resource within the site. Records indicate that a Roman road runs through the site and Roman settlement activity has been identified in the immediate vicinity. Should archaeological investigation indicate good survival, the site development should be informed by and sensitive to any such remains, as they could be categorised as a non-designated heritage asset and, potentially, nationally important”. |
| 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</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes) |

| | |
|---|--|
| as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable. | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carl Dixon |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/5/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The arguments put forward in the draft for the selection of this space for limited further housing are logical and compelling. |
| 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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carol Batterson |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328C-S |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328C-S/2/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Full response on website.</p> <p>At very short notice I heard from our Residents Association that we need to respond by Sunday to a citizenspace.com/planning /local plan regulation 19 re the new housing allocation for Wickham. Using the link supplied, I got onto the Website and found the appropriate page only to find that the only sites for Wickham are WK5 and WK6 and yet their favoured site is Mayles Farm, where the Parish Council would like the total allocation of 100 houses and a football pitch to be built. They are further proposing that the access would be off A32, Hoads Hill. I would strongly oppose this as only last night the road was closed after a serious accident. Not only is Hoads Hill a dangerous access point but the land itself is very sloping and rivulets of water run down every winter to collect in a large pool near Mayles Lane and is totally unsuitable for housing.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that the proposed entry to an estate of 100 houses and a football pitch from A32, Hoads Hill would be highly dangerous and that environmentally, it is an area which should not be built on as it is a wildlife corridor between farmland on one side and the river, golf course and more farmland on the other. Of the 2 plans which were on the form, Mill Lane (W5) has limited access but School Road (W6) already has access via a roundabout into an existing estate which they propose to extend. This seems to me to be the best option with as little disruption as is possible. It would be a good idea to put all 100 houses as an extension to that existing development.</p> <p>The new suggestion which we cannot comment on is to build on farmland to the South of Wickham village with an entrance off A32 Hoads Hill. I strongly object to this suggestion and cannot see why it is being considered. Firstly Hoads Hill is very busy with frequent accidents and the proposed entrance is very small. Secondly the land is very wet in winter, rivulets run down the fields to make a huge pool near Mayles Lane. Thirdly is land should be part of the strategic gap between Wickham village and Welbourne especially as there is farmland the other side of A32, then there is Mayles Farm which goes down to the River Meon with more Farmland the other side of the river. A development on that land would block that wildlife corridor which should be a major priority.</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? | |
| 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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Chris Knowles-Vollentine |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DN-G/4/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Further housing allocations to Wickham fail to take into consideration the current construction of 6000 dwellings a mere field away. Whilst in another authority the 'local need' for housing cannot possibly be argued to be not being met when 6000 dwellings are being constructed. Furthermore, WCC previously agreed that the 200 homes to be built at Ravenswood would be the allocation for Wickham and Knowle for the foreseeable future, this has been ignored before those houses have even been constructed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | No further housing allocations for Wickham |
| 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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Croudace Homes |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328A-Q |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328A-Q/7/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response.</p> <p>Policy WK6 allocates the westernmost section of the site which Croudace Homes has an interest in for 60 dwellings (indicative) which is strongly supported.</p> <p>Representation confirms the policy criteria and approach to access and environmental requirements are acceptable and notes the criteria regarding CIL and states 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> <p>Objection raised of the phasing of this site after 2030.</p> <p>Representation refers to technical reports completed and states that the aspiration is to develop the whole site for approximately 150 – 175 homes at a density appropriate to the existing built form and the surrounding area. The site could be phased so that the first 60 homes, as proposed to be allocated by Policy WK6, could come forward in the first 5 years of the plan period, with the wider site coming forward in following 5-10 years of the plan period. It is considered that the site could provide the mandatory 10%, or more, BNG on site.</p> <p>Representation outlines a range of benefits resulting from a larger development.</p> <p>6.3 It is considered that as currently drafted, the emerging Local Plan Review is not positively prepared in accordance with paragraph 35 a) of the NPPF and is therefore unlikely to assist the Government in its objective to significantly boost the supply of new homes. The draft Local Plan does not appear to have fully assessed the existing allocations to understand why they have not been delivered to date, but simply rolled them forward, and also included sites which have already been completed.</p> <p>Further, the capacity of the proposed site allocations do not appear to have taken into account the mandatory requirement for BNG and this impact on potential housing numbers.</p> <p>To assist in remedying this deficiency in the housing land supply, it is considered that the Council should allocate further sites of varying size to provide a flexible, responsive and deliverable housing land supply over the plan period.. In this respect, we would like to highlight the suitability of the wider land at Southwick Road which is suitable to come forward in the plan period and would provide a key contribution to the small-medium sites which would be able to deliver in the early years of the plan period.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The whole site which comprises the land at Southwick Road, Wickham is best placed to contribute towards meeting housing need in a “most accessible and sustainable” location, as well as supporting “the vitality and viability of communities, and [maintaining] their rural character and individual settlement identity”, as sought by Spatial Policy SP2. The allocation of the westernmost section of the site by Policy WK6 is strongly supported and it is highlighted that that wider site is also a sustainable site that will meet Wickham’s current and future housing need as well as potentially contributing to the wider unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>In accordance with the definition of ‘deliverable’ within the NPPF (2023), the land at Southwick Road is available for development now, it is a suitable and sustainable location for future residential development and it is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years following its allocation.</p> <p>In the light of the above and the details provided in these representations, it is requested that the Council review their allocated sites together with their housing requirement and look to allocate additional small and medium sites, such as the additional land at Southwick Road to meet Winchester’s housing need over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>Croudace Homes support the allocation of the land at Southwick Road site for approximately 60 homes whilst confirming the wider site is also available for further homes to meet Winchester’s housing need and welcome the opportunity to continue working with the Council, community and other stakeholders to deliver a high quality sustainable development in which people aspire to live in the early years of the plan period.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</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</i></p> | <p>Yes Form (referring to letter) Letter (commenting on policies)</p> |

*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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Macra Ltd |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328W-D/5/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The designation of at Southwick Road/School Road (WI03) for housing development would see Wickham settlement sprawl eastwards; substantially beyond the existing extent of the settlement.</p> <p>The Council describe this site as surrounded by residential land uses to the south, and agriculture to the north, east and west; however this is factually incorrect. There is residential development to the east and west however there are agricultural uses to the north and south. The site is positioned alongside the recent strategic housing allocation WK3 – Glebe Housing Allocation and open space, which was designated within the Winchester Local Plan Part 2 (2017).</p> <p>It is abundantly clear in reading the proposed strategic site from an aerial perspective, that the site will fundamentally project out into the landscape as a finger of development, which does not relate to the existing settlement boundary of Wickham.</p> <p>The Council consider the site to not be prominent from public viewpoints and well concealed within the wider landscape due to topography and trees, however, fundamentally, the designation of the site will extent the sprawl of the settlement eastwards out into an unrestricted open pastoral landscape with no nearby built context to relate to. The designation of this site could lead to further unrestricted sprawl and is contrary to the nucleated settlement pattern of Wickham, pushing development further away from services and facilities in the core of the settlement.</p> <p>The neighbouring site at The Glebe (WK3) contained significant archaeological remains. There is no evidence to demonstrate that this site is also not subject to significant archaeological interest and indeed it is unclear what constraints this may impose on its ability to be brought forwards for housing development in a manner which would not push development to the periphery of the site where it would be preferable to located open space to ensure a soft edge is preserved to Wickham.</p> <p>There is little rationale again to push development out into the pastoral landscape where there are no advantages for local connectivity or the delivery of significant public infrastructure to mitigate for the sprawl of the urban area.</p> <p>Once again, it is clear that the designation of this site for development will clearly extend Wickham far beyond the previous patterns of development at the eastern edge of the settlement, and will appear as a finger of growth pushing out into the landscape. There are clear reasons why the extension of Wickham settlement</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>further eastwards is unjustified and the Council's decision to allocate the site for development in preference to Land at Mayles Farm (WI24) is also in our view unfounded.</p> <p>Both of these sites will see the existing settlement of Wickham sprawl out into the open countryside, and indeed will deliver sites which for distinct reasons are considered to be fundamentally less suitable than Land at Mayles Farm, Wickham (WI24).</p> <p>see PDF for further detail</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</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</p> <p>Form (listing policies and submitted document)</p> <p>Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence base)</p> <p>Supporting documents (Landscape Appraisal and Maps)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| 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/36/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr Andrew Macleod |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D/4/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | This proposal is another good choice as it would effectively be an extension of a previously completed development with superstructure in place. |
| 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, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr David Ellrich and The Milligan Trust |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/5/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Paragraphs 14.22, 14.124 and 14.125 all reference 'The Glebe'. Whilst local people may well know where the Glebe lies it is not named on any plan. This would be a useful addition.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.124 refers to vehicular access via Grindall Field which is a road on the recently completed development to the east of the allocation. Grindall Field has access to the roundabout at the junction of School Road and Hoads Hill. Reference to the site being at School Road is understandable. It is unclear why there is any reference to Southwick Road to which the site has no direct connection. This should be omitted.</p> <p>Policy WK6</p> <p>The allocation of 60 dwellings to the south of Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.</p> <p>A figure of 100 dwellings is suitable for Wickham which is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'.</p> <p>At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle village. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.</p> <p>Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings.</p> <p>It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.</p> <p>This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the North of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.</p> <p>This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is discreetly situated and is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming years.</p> <p>Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Paragraphs 14.22, 14.124 and 14.125 all reference 'The Glebe'. Whilst local people may well know where the Glebe lies it is not named on any plan. This would be a useful addition.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.124 refers to vehicular access via Grindall Field which is a road on the recently completed development to the east of the allocation. Grindall Field has access to the roundabout at the junction of School Road and Hoads Hill. Reference to the site being at School Road is understandable. It is unclear why there is any reference to Southwick Road to which the site has no direct connection. This should be omitted.</p> <p>Policy WK6</p> <p>The allocation of 60 dwellings to the south of Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.</p> <p>A figure of 100 dwellings is suitable for Wickham which is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'.</p> |

At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle village. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.

Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings.

It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.

This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.

Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the North of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.

This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is discreetly situated and is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming years.

Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.

Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.

In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.

What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?

Paragraphs 14.22, 14.124 and 14.125 all reference 'The Glebe'. Whilst local people may well know where the Glebe lies it is not named on any plan. This would be a useful addition.

Paragraph 14.124 refers to vehicular access via Grindall Field which is a road on the recently completed development to the east of the allocation. Grindall Field has access to the roundabout at the junction of School Road and Hoads Hill. Reference to the site being at School Road is understandable. It is unclear why there is any reference to Southwick Road to which the site has no direct connection. This should be omitted.

Policy WK6

The allocation of 60 dwellings to the south of Wickham is supported in principle. The decision of the Council to allocate a further 100 dwellings to Wickham village will enable the settlement to slowly expand. It has the shops, services and connectivity to provide a sustainable base for new development. Furthermore, additional development will assist the viability and vitality of the settlement.

A figure of 100 dwellings is suitable for Wickham which is classed as a 'Larger Rural Settlement'.

At the Regulation 18 Stage (the previous consultation) the only housing allocation for Wickham was the 200 dwellings proposed at Ravenswood, near Knowle village. This development was not really 'in' Wickham although it was within the Parish of Wickham, at its southern edge.

Objections made at Regulation 18 stage, especially by those who were promoting land for development in Wickham, indicated that the proposed allocation was inadequate. The village required an allocation of housing and should not rely on 200 dwellings at Knowle which is a much smaller settlement and lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Council gave consideration to these objections and decided that an Inspector could find the plan to be 'unsound' if there was not adequate housing provision in the village. Accordingly, the Council proposed to the Parish Council to allocate more land to accommodate a further 100 dwellings.

It is noted that following consultation with the Parish Council objection has been raised to the principle of a further allocation. The Parish Council was invited to indicate its preferred sites. Although it provided a list of Strategic Land Availability Assessment sites it provided no indication of its preferences.

This representation supports the Council in its decision to allocate more development, but it is considered that there should have been greater consultation on the selection of the preferred sites.

Other land was promoted for development through the submission of sites to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This includes land to the North of Castle Farm Lane under SHELAA reference W121. This comprises 16.986ha currently in use for grazing. In the SHELAA 2023 it was deemed as 'deliverable/developable'.

This land north of Castle Farm Lane has the advantage of being proximate to the village. It is discreetly situated and is well screened from the wider area. In conjunction with other land north of Castle Lane this could make a valuable contribution to the village. It offers the opportunity for gradual small-scale expansion of the village over the coming years.

Following the publication of the draft changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging requirement for additional housing provision in most districts, including Winchester, the Council reviewed its

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>position. The Government consultation indicated that the additional housing requirement would not apply where a new Local Plan had been submitted for examination before the publication of the amended NPPF (plus one month). Given the advanced stage of work of the new Local Plan, and the significant delay and cost if the Plan were not promptly submitted, the Council decided to press ahead quickly with the Regulation 19 Consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to the level of increase in future housing requirements for Winchester District the Council will be obliged to commence work on a new plan under the emerging new system at the earliest opportunity. The new plan will have to address the shortfall in housing need. This will mean reviewing the allocations in the various urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>In the light of this situation the further expansion of Wickham village to contribute to the additional housing requirement will need to be considered. The land north of Castle Farm Lane could address this future need and is well placed for the discreet expansion of the village.</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>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</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>No</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy Greenish |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328E-U |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328E-U/2/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>On behalf of the members of the Wickham Society, I write to express our disappointment that an agreement reached in May 2022 with Winchester City Council (WCC) to restrict the amount of housing allocation required in the Parish of Wickham and Knowle to just the development of 200 houses north of Ravenswood in the 2020/40 Local Plan, has now been extended to include the requirement of an additional 100 houses within Wickham. With the advent of 6,000 houses to be built at Welborne within 2 miles of our village over the next 20 years, the impact of any additional housing can only be detrimental to the fabric of our community, roads and conservation areas that we cherish and are determined to protect.</p> <p>We acknowledge that with the change of central government, which is resolved to increase our housing supply, there is an inevitable consequence that will include the requirement for the additional 100 houses within our community. However, we are concerned that there has been very limited consultation with residents about where this housing should be located.</p> <p>Earlier this year, the Parish Council took the decision to refrain from putting forward a preferred option for development and thus the decision was taken by WCC for inclusion within the current edition of the local plan. We are relieved to note that the revised plan is proposing that any additional housing will not take place until at least 2030, as we are currently absorbing the impact of an additional 200 houses in the last 4 years, which is regrettably having a negative impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>However, we would like to propose that this time could be used to undertake further consultation with the local community to ensure that a considered and realistic approach is taken to ensure a robust and a well-supported options appraisal and conclusion is reached, that has solid community support.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the current process has not achieved this outcome.</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. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Form (WK5 and WK6) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mrs Wendy House, Chair |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328T-A/4/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This representation is made on behalf of Wickham Residents' Association (WRA) by its elected Committee. WRA has a membership of 283 adult residents of the village of Wickham. WRA's Committee's views expressed in this representation demonstrating that the Local Plan is not sound are based on the Committee's opinion of how members feel and an appreciation of the issues that the Plan raises as to its impact on and acceptability to residents. It has not conducted in the time available a formal survey of members' views. It does not therefore make unequivocal statements backed by the authority its members. In that respect it joins with the Parish Council in declaring the Plan unsound. Residents of the parish have not been directly consulted on matters affecting the parish which makes it unsound on grounds of not having been professionally prepared because it has not been objectively assessed and not justified because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives that residents may find more acceptable. It fails to meet the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>WK6/SHELAA SITE REFERENCE W103 14.122 (p 465) Supporting Text. "The site lies to the east of the recently developed site at The Glebe. The site is not prominent from public viewpoints and well concealed within the wider landscape due to topography and trees." Indicative allocation 60 homes Observations i. This site is larger than the recently developed site west of it , Wykeham Vale (which comprises 82 dwellings) and should therefore be capable of hosting all the 100 homes that WCC in April 2024 informed the parish council would be required. The site has been assessed as having a potential housing capacity of 131 units (ref: Report to Wickham Parish Council Full Council 28th July 2022). Assuming this is the case, the site has sufficient capacity to meet the whole Plan requirement for homes in Wickham parish, this removing the need for the unacceptable site at Mill Lane (WK5) to be included. ii. 14.124: "Motor vehicle access to the site W103 site would need to be gained via Grindall Field. Development proposals will need to demonstrate that this access is able to serve the additional development or provide sufficient improvements. Proposals will need to ensure there are appropriate walking and cycling links through The Glebe, and on to Wickham village centre and beyond." This will be essential. These</p> |

infrastructure modifications should have been completed as part of the Wykeham Vale development but were not. The developer this time MUST provide these safe routes. At the same time steps must be taken to re-model the roundabout at the bottom of Hoads Hill. Already it is proving poorly equipped to manage traffic volumes. SpeedWatch data gathered by WRA's accredited team demonstrates that traffic speeds in School Road (A32 north of the Hoads Hill roundabout) demonstrate a high level of speeding. The pedestrian crossing at the roundabout is informal and precarious, traffic travelling south only looking to the right and not to pedestrians crossing from the left. As traffic volumes using the roundabout increase with traffic from Welborne and the proposed development at WK6 these concerns will multiply in significance.

iii. 14.126: "The nearby site at The Glebe contained to the north west significant archaeological remains. Further archaeological evaluation of the site will be needed prior to development to ascertain the full nature of the archaeological resource within the site." These considerations will need extensive investigation and management before any development can take place and may impact the nature of the development. If alternative sites offer fewer encumbrances, it might be better to leave the site as open space and be treated in any future Plan as an opportunity for heritage and ecological management in the same way as the site to the west above Wykeham Vale is being used.

iv. The site is greenfield site and does nothing towards meeting the policy principle of "brownfield first" – ref page ii of the Plan: Foreword by Cllrs Martin Todd and Jackie Porter). Consideration to any site with the potential for brownfield development should at least be considered. There are few brownfield sites in Wickham but those that may be available should at least be considered.

v. In summary WK6:

- a) Is greenfield with special issues (archaeology)
- b) Offers no brownfield gain
- c) has no public transport
- d) offers no open space or sports amenities adjacent to it or elsewhere
- e) will increase traffic volumes directly onto the tight roundabout at the entrance to Grindall Field.

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION

This development does not meet the soundness criteria: it is NOT JUSTIFIED as the evidence base for its selection is not up to date and in prior consultations it was not the most preferred choice of residents.

It does not meet the need to consider reasonable alternatives.

It does not meet the test of duty by WCC to co-operate.

It is possible that WCC held a drop-in event at Wickham in September, but we cannot verify that and can find no report of it in the evidence base supporting the Plan on WCC's Plan website and quantified evidence of a large sample has not been produced.

There has been no updated consultation on this site.

It is preferred to Mill Lane to contain the whole requirement if other alternatives that might be considered because they offer greater benefits to the parish.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>The Plan needs fundamental change to be considered SOUND. Drop WK 5 and WK6. place WK3 as the sole site to be developed for 100 homes.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>“Following consideration of resident input and further examination of the evidence base, WK3 better fits WCC policies and brings greater community benefits and so is the chosen site for development, but not to be completed before 2030”</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)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| 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/33/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 60 dwellings is likely to generate up to 18 primary age pupils and 13 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Wickham Church of England Primary School, and Swanmore College. A contribution towards expansion of all phases of education may be required. |
| 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 and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Philip Greenish |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/7/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Should the additional requirement for 100 dwellings (40 at Mill Lane and 60 at Southwick Road/School Road) be confirmed, then I believe these sites are acceptable and preferable to any other sites Wickham. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Roger Cole |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BJQ-9 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BJQ-9/1/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Having attended the presentation and studied the maps pertaining to this proposed development I agree with the siting as access to village facilities (shops, primary school etc.) can be easily achieved by pedestrians . The visual and and environmental impact of the site has been well considered. My comments apply equally to the proposed site at Mill Lane (WK5). |
| 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, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| 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/38/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Policy WK6 LAND AT SOUTHWICK ROAD/SCHOOL ROAD</p> <p>We have made an initial assessment of this site and 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, we propose the following additional criterion for Policy WK6: Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing underground infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>We propose the following additional criterion for Policy WK6: Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing underground infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing underground infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. |
| 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</i> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)</p> |

*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 | WK6 |
| 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)/16/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Tracy McKay |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32YC-T |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32YC-T/1/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The Wickham Residents Association suggested I go onto the winchester.citizenspace.com website and comment on the proposed development sites for our village.</p> <p>Having tried to do this I am not entirely convinced it is meant for the residents of Wickham; and one of the sites, Mayles Farm, is not even listed as it was submitted very late in the day.</p> <p>However, if I may, I should like to take this opportunity to say that my recommendation would be the Croudace development between Southwick Road and School Road.</p> <p>I believe this area can accommodate all 100 houses needed for Wickham, and as an extension to the recent development, it would hopefully keep disruption to a minimum. The access is safe and already in place, as are the utility services.</p> <p>However I would suggest that there should be a Pelican crossing at the church end of School Road, and perhaps Croudace could pay for this</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? | |
| 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 | WK6 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3281-7 - Wickham and Knowle Parish Council/3/WK6 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>1. Wickham and Knowle Parish Council does not agree that the Winchester City Council Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan ('the submission plan') meets the test of soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. As a result it does not satisfy the relevant requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>2. The plan is not sound because it has not been positively prepared and that policies WK5 and WK6 making site allocations in the parish of Wickham and Knowle, are not justified. The Parish Council does not consider that the submission plan provides a reasonable justification for any site allocations in Wickham over and above that made by policy KN1.</p> <p>3. If, however, it is accepted that additional site allocations are required then those allocated by the plan at WI02 Mill Lane and WI03 Southwick Road/School Road (References W102 etc relate to those given in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment) are not the best available sites for development in the parish. The Parish Council does not support these allocations.</p> <p>4. The specific defect identified in this representation can easily be remedied by a modification to the submission plan. Our first position is that policies WK5 and WK6 should not have been included from the submission plan. However, if that is not to be accepted, WK5 and WK6 should be replaced with a revised policy making the correct site allocation. The Parish Council asks the Inspector to require that one of these modifications is made. It is to be hoped that the City Council will make the necessary amendments but should in the unlikely event that the City Council refuses to do so, the plan should be found unsound.</p> <p>5. If a development allocation is required for Wickham over and above the site at Ravenswood in Knowle Village then sites WI02 and WI03 should be replaced within the plan by the allocation of WI24 Mayles Lane. For reasons we will explain, WI24 is a preferable location and more deliverable site. The City Council's reasons for choosing WI02 and WI03 in preference to WI24 are unclear. They are not 'better' sites by any objective measure. WI24 would provide both housing and community benefit which accords with the purposes of the planning system. In selecting WI02 and WI03 in preference to WI24 the City Council has not been positive, open or transparent in site selection. This is not an appropriate strategy taking into account the reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence.</p> <p>Background</p> |

6. Wickham and Knowle Parish Council represents an area which includes two settlements. One is the ancient village of Wickham which has shops, pubs and community facilities which justify it being categorised as a 'larger rural settlement' in the submission plan. The other is Knowle which is a residential development created in the last twenty years on the site of a decommissioned Victorian hospital. It has no village centre of its own and residents are reliant on Wickham and larger settlements to the south for their services and activities. Although they each have their own sense of identity and distinct qualities, the parish council believes it unreasonable for Wickham and Knowle to be treated as separate settlements for planning policy purposes.

7. In the early stages of Regulation 18 consultation on the emerging local plan (Development Strategy and Site Selection 2022) the City Council considered that a sustainable increase in Wickham's housing numbers would be met in full by the allocation of site WI18 Ravenswood on the edge of Knowle (Policy KN1 in the submission plan) which already has consent for some of the proposed development. The Parish Council supported this as a sustainable level of development for the parish as a whole. At the time the City Council also accepted that 'Wickham' meant Wickham parish and wrote to the Parish Council to confirm this.

8. During Regulation 18 consultation the City Council said:
"Sites were considered in accordance with the methodology set out in section 5 of this document. There are currently a number of sites allocated in the adopted local plan being developed. There is an opportunity at Knowle to deliver 200 homes at the Ravenswood site with significant community gains. The Council considers that given the community discussions held at that time, this is the best way to meet the identified level of development for Wickham in the emerging development strategy (ibid)."
(Our emphasis added and note that the City Council does not distinguish between Wickham and Knowle in this consultation – it rightly assumes that the two settlements represent one mutually interdependent place within the parish)

9. Later in the Regulation 18 consultation the City Council changed its stance, requiring Wickham to allocate a further 100 dwellings.

10. Paragraph 6.29 of the 2024 version of the Development Strategy and Site Selection document states:
"The Regulation 18 draft Local Plan did not include a proposed allocation at Wickham due to the availability of a site at the nearby settlement of Knowle, which was brought forward as an exception site and has since reached the point where permission can be issued once appropriate s106 agreement(s) are signed. Following consideration of the responses to the regulation 18 consultation, the Council has reconsidered and the Proposed Submission Plan contains sites adjacent to the settlement of Wickham to deliver about 100 dwellings in line with the settlement's categorisation as a Larger Rural Settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper."

11. The City Council has provided no explanation for this shift, other than to state that it was a reaction to Regulation 18 consultation response from a single unnamed source. For some reason the City Council has adopted a position inconsistent with its previous approach by drawing a distinction between Knowle and Wickham. The addition of 100 dwellings in Wickham is now justified by identifying Wickham as a Larger Rural

Settlement separate from Knowle. However, were this to be correct, Knowle should be categorized as a Smaller Rural Settlements in the 2024 Settlement Hierarchy, and should not receive an allocation at all. The City Council's position is illogical and lacks transparency.

12. This lack of justification for the inclusion of policies WK5 and WK6 could be remedied by the removal of those policies.

13. However, if the City Council is to be permitted to adopt this approach then it must ensure that it allocates the correct site(s) for development in Wickham. In August 2022 the Parish Council submitted its assessment of the five SHELAA sites within the parish, without expressing a preference between them having been told that no allocation would need to be made. Following its change of position the City Council demanded via a letter dated 10th April 2022, that the parish council identify its preferred site for approximately 100 homes by 17th May 2024.

14. The Parish Council responded to this unreasonable requirement stating:

"The Parish Council has been given inadequate time to consult with residents on the implications of this change in your policy position...Should the City Council disagree and proceed with evaluating sites for possible allocation, the Parish Council expects to be fully consulted as part of that process".

15. The Parish Council received no reply or further engagement from the City Council. The City Council selected the sites WI02 and WI03 without further consultation and the Parish Council were only made aware of this immediately prior to the publication of the submission plan. It made representations to the City Council's Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet regarding the lack of consultation and inappropriate choice of sites, but these concerns were waived aside.

16. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires that 'plans should be shaped by early proportionate and effective engagement'. The expectation should be that local communities should have the opportunity to actually shape the future of their local area. Wickham has been provided with inconsistent and incorrect information and has not enough time has been given for timely consultation with its residents. The sites selected by Winchester City Council do not reflect the views of the local community.

The City Council's chosen options – unjustified and possibly undeliverable

17. Sites WI02 and WI03 have serious shortcomings and cannot be supported.

Mill Lane WI02

18. The plans submitted by Bloor Homes require vehicular access to the site from Mill Lane. There are no alternative access options. Mill Lane is a rural, narrow country lane and there can be no certainty that the road can be widened to allow two cars to pass, or pedestrians to move safely. This raises a serious question mark over its deliverability. Any reconfiguration of Mill Lane would be contrary to Policy NE14 - Rural Character. The same applies to the roads beyond Mill Lane that feed into it as they would also need modification.

19. The site has the potential to expand further and would have further dire consequences to the rural character of Mill Lane and its surround area.

20. The site is located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone for residential planning applications, i.e. within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland.

21. It is very close to the boundary with the South Downs National Park and therefore may be subject to an objection at a later stage from the National Park Authority.

Southwick Road/School Road (WI03)

22. Residential development on WI03 would see Wickham sprawl eastwards; substantially beyond the existing boundary of the existing settlement.

23. The City Council describe this site as surrounded by residential land uses to the south, and agriculture to the north, east and west; however this is factually incorrect. There are agricultural uses to the north, south and east of the settlement.

24. Significant archaeological remains were discovered during the development of an adjoining site and this poses a significant risk to the deliverability of development on this site.

The Parish Council's preferred allocation
Mayles Lane (WI24)

25. The Parish Council's considers this site to be the best available alternative for the full allocation, because:

- it was supported by the greatest number of residents when the Parish Council sought public views before its response to the City Council in 2022

[Includes diagram showing result of survey in 2022 - this can be seen in full submitted representation]
Source: Wickham and Knowle Parish Council online survey

- part of the site comprises previously developed land
- development of the site would maintain the compact form of the village and avoid an obvious extension of the settlement out into the countryside
- access to the site can and must be provided via Hoads Hill (not Mayles Lane). Hoads Hill is being improved as part of the nearby Welborne development, making the access suitable with less impact
- the site is within walking distance to the shops, facilities and services and unlike WI02 or WI03 is on a local bus route which further enhances its status as a more sustainable location for development
- it offers significant potential opportunities for public open space and a connected network of greenspaces which would sit alongside the Welborne development and provide the opportunity of delivering a continuous walking connection to Knowle to the south
- by agreement with the site promoter it will be possible to include additional football pitches adjacent to the existing recreation ground, representing a clear public benefit which mitigates the impact of the development.

This site for sports has significant advantages over the Mill Lane designated Sports Pitches site

- the promoter has allowed a 20 meter open space buffer between the development area and neighbouring properties
- it would maintain the open gap between Wickham and the Welborne by formally designating the land as part of a network of green spaces, forming something close to a country park for the benefit of residents

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council has reviewed all the information available before resolving to support site WI24. It is acknowledged that it is in Local Gap, but nevertheless the merits to the site are clear and therefore supported by policy NE7 of the submission plan. <p>Summary</p> <p>26. The last minute decision (and it was a last minute decision whatever they now say) of the City Council to require 100 homes to be provided in Wickham in addition to the 200 allocated at Ravenswood was indicative of poor community engagement and transparency in plan making. For the City Council to have changed its position because of one unnamed and unexplained representation is illogical and raises questions about the Regulation 18 consultation.</p> <p>27. However, if the City Council is determined to make a further allocation it must do so in a way which represents justified and purposeful plan making. The decision to allocate WI02 and WI03 does not meet these tests. The inclusion of those sites render the submission plan unsound.</p> <p>28. Modification of the submission plan by the substitution of WI24 would not only be preferable in accordance with guidance on sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework but would also ensure that the submission plan met with the wishes of the local community in this respect.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Replace polices WK5 and WK6 with a single policy which allocates the site WI24 for up to 100 dwellings in lieu.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>An appropriate policy wording which allocates WI24 and requires the preparation of a masterplan with up to 100 residential dwellings on land immediately to the south west of Mayles Lane and the entirety of the remainder of the site given over to public recreational use with stewardship arrangements to be agreed. For information, the site promoter has prepared a concept masterplan which may be considered by the examination.</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</i></p> | <p>Yes Form (WK1) Form (WK5 & WK6)</p> |

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

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed modification](#) to Local Plan proposed to rename site Land at School Road, to clarify the location of the proposed development.

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

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to Policy WK6 criterion vi. to highlight the need to protect the setting of the National Park.

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to Policy WK6 to add new criterion to ensure the development makes suitable provision for access to existing waste water infrastructure.

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to paragraph 14.126 of the Plan in response comments received from Historic England to recognise the potential archaeological considerations and set out how they are to be addressed

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| Local Plan Reference or document | Policy KN1 Ravenswood | |
| Total Number of Representations received | 10 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 8 | 0 |
| Sound | 7 | 1 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 8 | 0 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>Some respondents considered the site preferable to alternatives. Two considered this should development should be the last to be considered in the gap. One questioned the deliverability of the site, given the time since a planning application was submitted. Hampshire County Council provided an estimate of pupil yields and stated a contribution towards expansion of all phases of education may be required.</p> <p>The site promoter confirmed delivery of the site, but sought amendments to the plan criteria concerning education contributions, managing water infrastructure and access.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/5/KN1 ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/28/KN1 ANON-AQTS-3278-D/3/KN1 ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/4/KN1 ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/3/KN1 ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/35/KN1 ANON-AQTS-32TD-P - Homes England/1/KN1 ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/32/KN1 BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council/6/KN1 BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/25/KN1</p> | | |
| <p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to address potential impact on European Sites; and • The approach to waste water and water supply. | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| 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-8/35/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>A planning application was submitted for 200 homes at Ravenswood on 29 June 2018 (18/01612/OUT). Whilst the application was considered in a delegated report in March 2019, a decision still has still not been issued, despite the application being submitted over 6 years ago. The Section 106 remains unsigned despite discussion appearing to have commenced in 2018. It is noted that since the Regulation 18 consultation two documents relating to nutrient mitigation have been submitted in January 2024.</p> <p>Whilst Bloor Homes acknowledges the resolution to grant on this unallocated site, there are significant question marks about the delivery of the site given the lack of resolution of the S106 over a considerable period of time.</p> <p>Bloor Homes is concerned that this proposed allocation would potentially fail to meet some of the emerging policies within this consultation, given the passage of time since the outline planning application was submitted.</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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) 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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Ravenswood site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>A planning application was submitted for 200 homes at Ravenswood on 29 June 2018 (18/01612/OUT). Whilst the application was considered in a delegated report in March 2019, a decision still has still not been issued, despite the application being submitted over 6 years ago. The Section 106 remains unsigned despite discussion appearing to have commenced in 2018. It is noted that since the Regulation 18 consultation two documents relating to nutrient mitigation have been submitted in January 2024.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Whilst Bloor Homes acknowledges the resolution to grant on this unallocated site, there are significant question marks about the delivery of the site given the lack of resolution of the S106 over a considerable period of time.</p> <p>Bloor Homes is concerned that this proposed allocation would potentially fail to meet some of the emerging policies within this consultation, given the passage of time since the outline planning application was submitted.</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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) 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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Ravenswood site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>A planning application was submitted for 200 homes at Ravenswood on 29 June 2018 (18/01612/OUT). Whilst the application was considered in a delegated report in March 2019, a decision still has still not been issued, despite the application being submitted over 6 years ago. The Section 106 remains unsigned despite discussion appearing to have commenced in 2018. It is noted that since the Regulation 18 consultation two documents relating to nutrient mitigation have been submitted in January 2024.</p> <p>Whilst Bloor Homes acknowledges the resolution to grant on this unallocated site, there are significant question marks about the delivery of the site given the lack of resolution of the S106 over a considerable period of time.</p> <p>Bloor Homes is concerned that this proposed allocation would potentially fail to meet some of the emerging policies within this consultation, given the passage of time since the outline planning application was submitted.</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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) 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 Ravenswood site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1066-1068) in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the Ravenswood site and can provide 40% affordable housing.</p> |
| <p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Carl Dixon |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32CU-P/4/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | I have always been concerned that such a large development on this flank of Wickham and Knowle is directly eating into a vital settlement gap which presently seperates this historic area from the looming development of Welborne. If the new estate is to be approved, then it must absolutely be the last such development of this important rural area. |
| 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> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Fareham Borough Council |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3266-A - Fareham Borough Council/6/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Full response on website Policy KN1 – Ravenswood The Council is supportive of the policy requirements accompanying this allocation. It is important that the site ties in to the existing strategy for the locality in terms of links with Knowle, but also safeguarding the areas of greenspace identified in policy WK3 to create the buffers around the new development at Welborne, particularly the impacts at Dashwood.</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? | |
| 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) |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Homes England |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TD-P - Homes England |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TD-P - Homes England/1/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | See attached representations sent via email as there is no ability to upload files to this portal. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | See attached representations sent via email as there is no ability to upload files to this portal. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | See attached representations sent via email as there is no ability to upload files to this portal. |
| 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 policy) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| 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/28/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| 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 | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr Andrew Macleod |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3278-D/3/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | As there seems to be some urgency to fill the current shortfall in housing quota, I cant understand why this development still has not started. Although it is to the south of the settlement gap. It would have a lesser impact on Wickham village than say infilling the last green space currently occupied by the rural aspect of Mayles farm. |
| 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, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr David Ellrich and The Milligan Trust |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BX6-V/3/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | I am not responding to this section but I am unable to move either backward or to submission without completing this section. This website response form is very poor and not user friendly. It is very time consuming |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | none |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | none |
| 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 | KN1 |
| 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/25/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 200 dwellings is likely to generate up to 60 primary age pupils and 42 secondary. The site is served by Wickham Primary School and Swanmore College. A contribution towards expansion of all phases of education may be required. |
| 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 and evidence base) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Philip Greenish |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B6N-J/5/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Para 14.137 states: "the planning application and associated technical evidence, has demonstrated that development of this site will secure a much larger part of the Gap to be safeguarded for the longer term, and in that context the loss of this part of the gap is acceptable". That being the case, it is imperative that no further development is allowed anywhere within the Settlement Gap. It should be made unequivocally clear to developers who own land in the remaining gap that they will not be granted approval to develop the land under any circumstances. |
| 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> | No |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | KN1 |
| 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/32/KN1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Therefore, the wording below is no longer applicable.</p> <p>14.141</p> <p>Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with development.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>The wording below is no longer applicable.</p> <p>14.141</p> <p>Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with development.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>Remove:</p> <p>14.141 Engagement with Southern Water will be required in order to coordinate emerging water supply pipeline project proposals with development.</p> |
| 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? | <p>Yes</p> <p>Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)</p> |

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.

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to Local Plan Policy KN1 (page 472) to add new criterion to address potential impacts of development on European sites.

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to Local Plan Policy KN1 (page 472) to provide flexibility with how connections to waste water and water supply are delivered.

[Proposed modification](#) proposed to delete para. 14.141 following update from Southern Water that their proposed water supply pipeline will not go through the site