

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

Sutton Scotney

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 SU01 Land at Brightlands | |
| Total Number of Representations received | 39 | |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 28 | 9 |
| Sound | 3 | 34 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 14 | 23 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>Respondents raised concerns regarding infrastructure and local services capacity, which makes up 66% of the issues raised. The respondents stated that the existing sewage system is already overstretched, leading to reliance on tankers and they said they had limited confidence in Southern Water’s ability to resolve these issues. The respondents said the proposed development at Brightlands threatens to worsen the situation, as many properties are not connected to the mains sewer.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and safety were also raised by respondents as major worries due to inadequate roads and unsafe pedestrian paths, especially across the busy A30. Respondents also said that healthcare services are under pressure, with long GP waiting times posing a challenge as population growth looms. Environmental and health impacts form 63% of concerns, with increased flood risk and noise pollution from the A34 being key issues raised, alongside potential harm to groundwater management and local wildlife.</p> <p>Access and connectivity account for 61% of the issues raised, due to respondents saying that unsafe pedestrian access due to a major road which acts a barrier. Respondents said they were dissatisfied with the consultation process accounting for 45% of issues, stating that better community engagement and clearer communication is needed.</p> <p>Overall, the respondents said there is a necessity of addressing infrastructure, environmental, community engagement, and access issues before proceeding with any further developments in Sutton Scotney. Some respondents said they preferred the site south of Wonston Road because of location and better integration with the village. Another respondent said they favoured Brightlands over the land south of Wonston Road because of flooding concerns and the history of flooding on the land south of Wonston Road.</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-3B9K-J/1/SU01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BDS-5/1/SU01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BDX-A/1/SU01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BFV-A/1/SU01</p> | | |

ANON-AQTS-3BFX-C/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BE3-6/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BQG-6/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BRE-5/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3B5Y-V/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3B5Q-M/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3B5S-P/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BTM-F/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BPW-N/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BXV-V/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BP3-H/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BXG-D/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/31/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BXH-E/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BP6-M - Wonston Parish Council/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/36/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32T7-9/10/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32F3-Q/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BQ7-P/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/7/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32TX-A/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-323C-M/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-323T-5/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32U1-4/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3225-5/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3226-6/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3BE4-7/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32MT-Y/2/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32Z1-9/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-3229-9/1/SU01

ANON-AQTS-32T6-8/1/SU01

BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/6/SU01

BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/18/SU01

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/29/SU01

Post Regulation 19 Actions

Proposed Change agreed with Historic England in relation to paragraph 14.183 (in relation to potential archaeological finds)

Proposed Change agreed with Southern Water in relation to policy criterion xvii (relating to wastewater infrastructure)

Proposed Change agreed with Southern Water in relation to a new criterion xix relating sewerage infrastructure

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Responses expressed concerns about infrastructure and service limitations, including overstretched sewer systems, road capacity, and healthcare.
Environmental and health concerns include heightened flood risks, utility shortages, pollution risks to the River Dever, traffic and noise issues from the A34;
- Concerns about access to the site and the A30 is seen as a barrier that poses safety risks, especially for pedestrians, due to limited pathways and crossings;
- Respondents said they would have liked more consultation and community engagement in the process of selecting sites;
- Responses included concerns about the development's impact on the historical and natural environment including flood prevention, and potential biodiversity and noise pollution;
- Some responses mentioned the archaeological significance, potentially housing Roman artefacts and ask for careful examination;
- Comments about transparency and consistency in policy implementation from Regulation 18 to Regulation 19 stage have been raised;
- Responses have called for further consultation and site assessments to address these concerns;
- Concerns were raised about the viability testing of the sites, the Parish council stated that the site hasn't been tested for 50-60 and only for 120, whereas the other sites in Sutton Scotney had been viability tested for 50-60;
- Some respondents stated that the land at Brightlands wouldn't naturally integrate with the village of Sutton Scotney and that other sites are more suitable. The site suggested as an alternative to Brightlands is Land South of Wonston Road;
- Flooding was also another key issue for many respondents and that new development wouldn't help to improve this issue; and
- One respondent was supportive of the land at Brightlands over the site south of Wonston Road due to the risk of flooding and history of flooding on the site.

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| 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 | While we support the policy approach, it would be prudent to consider the possibility that remains of national importance may be uncovered. Set in that context, we note reference in supporting text to “issues” may include the potential for Scheduling, as the Council may be aware. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Andrew Cowen |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5S-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5S-P/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Lack of Consultation</p> <p>Regulation 18 asked the community to consult on a different strategy for Sutton Scotney with no policy for a housing allocation. Regulation 19 has come in a very different format. This has led to insufficient consultation with the Parish, local community and key stakeholders in assessing options for allocations in Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>Technical: Regulation 13 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment requires necessary supporting evidence to be subject to effective consultation. It should allow for as many interested parties as possible to provide feedback and give a considered response. Neither the committee or the residents of Sutton Scotney have been able to do this prior to Reg 19. The only feedback prior to this was via a questionnaire with limited detail of potential sites.</p> <p>Regulation 19 has allowed for time for the community and committee members to be consulted with detail and make a more informed response to the Consultation. Two events have been held in the Parish Hall that have attracted a significant amount of the local community to review the details of the proposed allocation (Brightlands) as well an alternative site (Land South of Wonston Road).</p> <p>Subsequently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the Scrutiny Committee there was commitment by WCC councillors that Regulation 19 could effect change if it is wanted and justified. • Feedback to the Parish committee has shown an overwhelming level of support for the alternative site 'Land South of Wonston Road.' • Given Reg 18 differed from Reg 19 it is of extra importance that the Inspector consider these comments. <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment Report (IIAR)</p> <p>Regulation 12 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations requires likely significant effects of the draft Reg 19 Plan, including draft allocations, to be evaluated as well as reasonable alternatives. However The Wonston Parish Site Assessment does not provide a fair assessment of both the draft allocated site and</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>other sites assessed on a level playing field. It only scores the draft allocated site with mitigation and consequently, it does not provide a fair or appropriate assessment of reasonable alternatives. This, again, is in breach of SEA Regulations and therefore unsound.</p> <p>The scoring of the draft allocation is flawed too. It does not reflect the noise impacts of the A34 on future development. Neither does it adequately reflect the implications of the A30 as a barrier to integration, cohesion, safety, health and wellbeing and minimising car travel. These are all key strands of the Local Plan. The IIA directs also that 'The potential negative effects identified by the IIA of residential site options could be avoided by selecting sites outside of air and noise pollution hotspots.'. This further underlines the need for equivalent site assessment.</p> <p>Brightlands Viability</p> <p>Policy SU01 seeks an allocation of 50-60 dwellings in Sutton Scotney. The Local Plan has identified a significant number of concerns with the Brightlands to include archaeology, noise pollution, road safety and drainage. These lead to concerns over the site's viability at 50-60. There is documentation in the public domain that shows the developers of Brightlands working on the basis of 120 dwellings. This would conflict with the policy of 50-60.</p> <p>Land South of Wonston Road has submitted a viability report via Regulation 18 submissions to demonstrate the site is viable and deliverable for between 50-60 dwellings.</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</i></p> | <p>No</p> |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | angela lewis |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-323T-5 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-323T-5/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Proposed Brightlands development does not comply with NPPF Paras 12, 14 and 16.</p> <p>12: Design policy has not been developed with the local community. Wates, the developer with an option on this land has submitted a design almost identical to its designs on its previous developments without apparent consultation with the local community. No Wates representative was present at a local meeting arranged to present and discuss its plans. There are no apparent tree lined streets on the plan.</p> <p>14: Brightlands is in an area of flood risk in a village with no mains drainage, already requiring 24hr tanker sewage collection. The developer has not considered cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding and has made no effort in mitigation. Its plan will add to flood and sewage leak risk.</p> <p>16: Plans do not set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Plans (one size fits all) for the new development do not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Some interest and discussion between the developer and the local community at the very least - leading to plans making some positive contribution to the local environment and also taking account of the limiting factors in the surrounding area.</p> <p>More individually designed houses and sensitive building layout, tree lined roads, road safety compliance, flood risk mitigation</p> |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Catherine Landale |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-323C-M |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-323C-M/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There has been a lack of consultation regarding the proposals put forward as part of Regulation 19 which are in a very different format to its predecessor (regulation 18). This has led to insufficient consultation with the local community in assessing different options for housing allocation in Sutton Scotney. Given the differences between Regulation 18 and 19 with regard to the housing allocation in Sutton Scotney, it is of extra importance that the Inspector consider the views and comments of the local community and fully consider alternative sites which could accommodate the proposed allocation of 50-60 houses.</p> <p>Regulation 12 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations requires potential effects of the draft regulation 19 plan to be evaluated as well as reasonable alternatives. The draft plan does not make any reference to any other potential sites let alone provide any fair or appropriate evaluation of such sites. This is in breach of the relevant regulations and is therefore unsound.</p> <p>The draft local plan has identified a number of significant concerns in relation to the Brightlands site - including noise pollution, access to the existing village (across the A30) and drainage. In particular drainage is a major concern given the constant flow of tankers in and out of the village to take sewerage away and the recent history of flooding in the village. These concerns give rise to significant concerns about the viability of the site - there are documents in the public domain that indicate that the potential developer is working on the basis of 120 dwellings on the site. This is double the number allocated and in direct conflict with the stated allocation of between 50-60 dwellings.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | The Inspector needs to fully consider the views and comments of all stakeholders in the local community and properly evaluate all alternative sites which could accommodate the proposed allocation of 50-60 houses as a cohesive addition to the existing village. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | CLAIRE SAVAGE |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32Z1-9 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32Z1-9/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There has been a severe lack of consultation and this consultation has not been inclusive. Many of our residents are elderly, have additional needs and neurodiverse. The details published and process are complicated and people need time to digest and understand what is being proposed.</p> <p>Under Regulation 18, the community was invited to consult on a strategy for Sutton Scotney that did not include any housing allocation policy. However, the format of Regulation 19 has been significantly different, resulting in inadequate consultation with the Parish, local residents, and key stakeholders on potential housing allocations in Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>In term of the Technical Details: Regulation 13 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment mandates that necessary supporting evidence be made available for effective consultation, allowing as many interested parties as possible to provide feedback and offer a thoughtful response. Prior to Regulation 19, neither the committee nor the residents of Sutton Scotney were afforded the opportunity for meaningful input. The only feedback mechanism was a questionnaire with limited information on potential development sites.</p> <p>This is not representative of the village given that many of the villagers are elderly and not digitally savvy, plugged into the internet or able to participate in online questionnaires. This is not inclusive of the community. However, Regulation 19 has provided more time for detailed consultation with the community and committee members, enabling them to make more informed responses. Only two consultation events were held at the Parish Hall and again with limited time for the community to understand and respond.</p> <p>Given the significant differences between Regulations 18 and 19, it is crucial that the Inspector carefully considers these comments.</p> <p>I attended both events and the outcome published supported the smaller development and not Brightlands. Having read the plan for the whole of Winchester - it talks about the need for new developments to have strong public transport links and infrastructure such as broadband fibre networks. We have neither of these. For the last five years there has been a project to get fiber in the village. This has not happened. I have personally had to sign up to satellite broadband - via starlink as a result of the lack of broadband for work purposes. Not everyone can afford this.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>The public transport is limited, with no public transport in the evenings, on Sundays and one hour during peak times. How will a development attracting well over a hundred more people be supported by this infrastructure?</p> <p>Regulation 12 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations requires an evaluation of the likely significant effects of the draft Regulation 19 Plan, including the draft site allocations, alongside reasonable alternatives. However, the Wonston Parish Site Assessment does not provide a fair or impartial comparison between the draft allocated site and other potential sites. It evaluates the allocated site with mitigation measures, which leads to an unbalanced and inappropriate assessment of reasonable alternatives. This approach fails to comply with SEA Regulations, making the process unsound.</p> <p>In addition to these concerns, the scoring of the draft allocation is problematic. It overlooks the noise impacts of the nearby A34 on future development and does not adequately consider the A30 as a barrier that affects integration, community cohesion, safety, health, wellbeing, and efforts to reduce car travel—all of which are crucial elements of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment also highlights that the negative effects of residential site options could be mitigated by selecting sites outside of areas affected by air and noise pollution. This further emphasizes the need for an equivalent assessment of all potential sites, ensuring a fair comparison.</p> <p>Policy SU01 aims to allocate 50-60 dwellings in Sutton Scotney. However, the Local Plan has flagged several concerns about the viability of the Brightlands site, including issues related to archaeology, noise pollution, road safety, and drainage. These factors raise questions about the site's capacity to accommodate 50-60 dwellings. Publicly available documents also reveal that the developers of Brightlands are considering plans for 120 dwellings, which contradicts the policy's target.</p> <p>On the other hand, Land South of Wonston Road has submitted a viability report as part of the Regulation 18 process, demonstrating that the site is both viable and deliverable for 50-60 dwellings, in line with the proposed allocation.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>More consultation with community ensuring inclusivity and not those just digitally savvy and online A proper environmental impact of both sites Ensure that all proposed sites have been considered and not just Brightlands Reassessment of the evidence for regulation 19 on the site assessment Confirmation as to why proposed allocation putting forward a scheme for 120 when the policy requires 50-60 ? this needs to be revisited and confirmed to the community.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>Unfortunately, I do not feel skilled or experienced enough to do this.</p> |
| <p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p> | |
| <p>If no, please explain</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Cynthia Eve Scott Morgan |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BE3-6 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BE3-6/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The addition of up to 120 houses at Brightlands create a separate area of development which is not connected to the existing village and will not integrate with the rural community. In addition the development can only be detrimental to the already overstretched facilities in the village, in particular the survey, transport and drainage. The land is currently good quality agricultural land which will be lost for ever. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | David Howe Price |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5Y-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5Y-V/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Site is likely not viable. Waites have only assessed the site for 120 properties - at the level of 60 properties the problems of the site are likely to make it uneconomic. By site problems I mean potential Archeological remains, Noise abatement from A34 and Sutton Scotney services, and issues with flooding management as well as the noted foul drainage concerns.</p> <p>Not Justified - lack of consultation means no comparison of alternate sites in the Parish has been performed, unless it has been done so without informing the village population. Better sites likely exist. Brightlands site was added to Reg 18 plans just 8 days before plans were published with no consultation with village representatives and no comparative studies.</p> <p>Lack of viable sewerage - the Village has major sewerage problems in the base case with daily sewerage tankering. Although Southern Water have plans in place to resolve this, Southern Water has not been a trusted partner in resolving sewarege problems. In the discussion of the plans to resolve tankering, Southern Water told villagers that capacity would exist following the resolution for those with private sewerage systems to be able to connect (at their own cost), to the new system. However, that statement was subsequently retracted with villagers being told capacity for this would not be possible until 2027. Now, with the potential Brightlands development, it seems these new homes will be added to the mains sewerage before any capacity is made available for existing homes to connect. There is no confidence in the village that anything Southern Water says can be trusted.</p> <p>Viability of access to the village. Brightlands site is the other side of the A30 to all village facilities (Village hall, Pub, Dever Stores, Gratton Trust playing fields). Safe access will be expensive - a simple road crossing of the A30, which has fast moving traffic, will not be viable so a pedestrian bridge would be needed.</p> <p>Viability of services. The Gratton Surgery is already overloaded with no plan to expand capacity. Additional families in the village will apply further pressure to already stretched capabilities.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | A proper comparative study of alternatives, coupled with full consultation with local residents. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Denise Crane |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFV-A |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFV-A/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There has been no consultation with local residents on this proposal to date, although I understand a 'one-off' date has been set for 25 September at the Victoria Hall. This is simply not acceptable and smacks of a 'done deal'.</p> <p>The assessed need for dwellings in Sutton Scotney in this 2020-2040 plan is 60, so the big question is why the developer of the site at Brightlands is proposing double this number (120 dwellings) and this is seriously being considered?</p> <p>The site at Brightlands is currently agricultural and protects the north of Sutton Scotney from experiencing flooding. The village itself has suffered flooding on numerous occasions since we moved here in 2001 and surface water run-off from a new development will likely cause serious issues for existing residents going forward, particularly from double the quantity of dwellings actually required.</p> <p>There are currently significant problems with handling sewage within the village, with residents and roads suffering from constant tanker visits to the treatment plants. It is true that our beautiful fields have been dug up to enable the laying of a new pipeline by Southern Water to take sewage (including that from any new development) away to Harestock. However, I would question whether the issue in its entirety will be resolved by 2025 and also why existing local residents, none of whom are connected to mains draining, will be forced to fund their own connections, even if this is technically feasible? To allocate more housing before a known and huge issue has even been resolved does not make logical sense.</p> <p>Then we come to the subject of existing infrastructure, including roads, bus routes, GP services and schools, and the provision of sufficient upgrades to these to accommodate any new developments, such as that being proposed at Brightlands. Sutton Scotney has already seen significant development via the new dwellings at Taylors Yard and Old Station Drive. During neither of these developments were upgrades made to any of the critical infrastructure mentioned above. The village and existing local residents surely cannot again be left to cope with lack of local school places (at all ages), impossibility of accessing GP appointments, significant wear and tear on rural roads (particularly as heavy traffic is often re-routed through the village during frequent periods of disruption on the A34) and lots more traffic 'thundering' through the village considerably above the 30 mph speed limit.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Potentially at least 240 more cars (120 dwellings x 2 cars) through an already busy village, particularly the main Oxford Road, will do nothing to improve air quality, CO2 emissions and pedestrian safety. In a village where we have been unable to secure any form of proper pedestrian crossing, this is dangerous and downright irresponsible. At busy periods, there will be lots of children walking to and waiting for school buses within the village and more traffic will do nothing to improve safety. Providing safe and secure pedestrian access to the site will therefore be a nigh impossible challenge, particularly as existing residents are unable to even cross the road.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Any proposed development will shape the future of Sutton Scotney and the one at Brightlands is not a cohesive and logical extension to our beautiful village. Little, if any, account appears to have been taken of the impact on the local area and community and there seem to be no plans for any upgrades to existing infrastructure.</p> <p>In a world where environmental benefits and 'sustainability' have had to become prime considerations, developments such as the one proposed at Brightlands have no place.</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>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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Denise Martin |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3226-6 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3226-6/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There are a number of points on which I do not think the proposals in the Local Plan are sound. In particular, the test of living well and connectivity would be seriously hampered by the proposed development being on the opposite side of the major road, the A30 towards Salisbury, and thereby would be cut off from the village. This is a busy major road which already sees excess speed through the village, the development would encourage more cars, more speed, a great danger of more accidents and more noise and pollution.</p> <p>Another very important point is the already over subscribed Doctor's Surgery in the village. It can presently take 5 weeks to gain a doctor's appointment. An ageing population, with all the potential age-related illnesses that can ensue, will be greatly disadvantaged by this proposed development causing the complete overwhelming of the surgery.</p> <p>This proposal would surely hinder all aspects of biodiversity and habitat of many species. I fundamentally disagree with the proposal to allocate the land for this development.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Timely consultation with local people. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | I have no suggestions here. I do not consider myself to be sufficiently knowledgeable in Planning matters or planning jargon. I am merely an interested and concerned inhabitant of this village |
| 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? | 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Dilys Williams |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T6-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T6-8/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The proposed site at Brightlands is not a sound choice because in many respects it does not address fundamental objectives of the Winchester District local plan.</p> <p>Firstly the choice of Brightlands does not appear to address the objective in 3.6 (ii) f prioritising brownfield sites in that this site is use for agricultural use and therefore by developing on a rural site natural environment will be lost. Secondly it does not address objective 3.6 (vi on page 20 as regards climate change and reducing carbon emissions.; as noted in SP2 vi the plan seeks to promote “the use of public transport, walking and cycling, integrate ...homes, jobs, services to reduce car use”. This is where the selection of Brightlands poses a fundamental flaw:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village of Sutton Scotney adjacent to the Brightlands site has little employment, no schools, no entertainment venues. Therefore any new residents and their children will need to travel to school/work/leisure activities. The policy for SU01 says the proposals include a strategy to minimise car journeys by providing opportunities fir walking cycling and public transport. <p>BUT Sutton Scotney only has one bus an hour to Winchester (and no return bus after 7 pm in the evening and no buses on Sundays). There is no public transport connecting with Micheldever Station the nearest station; furthermore it is unfeasible to walk or cycle to this station along fast-moving roads which have no footpath or cycle-path and are unlit. The timing of buses to connect to early morning trains from Winchester is poor. All of which means that residents of the new site will be obliged to use cars.</p> <p>Furthermore the village has become congested in the centre having doubled in size in the last 35 years there having been no changes in the road structure and very likely now no available space to do so; an additional 60 houses would add to the problems.</p> <p>Accordingly the use of Brightlands fails to achieve the objective in SP2 (iii) because a development in this location will not minimise the need to use private cars to travel. Accordingly it will adversely affect Winchester’s plans to be carbon neutral by 2030.</p> <p>In addition a development at Brightlands fails to address the objective of “living well” (page 21 of the local plan) due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with ground water and potential surface water run-off (not addressing SP2 (v0 • The lack of sewerage* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of general infrastructure in the village location (no mains gas, poor broadband, low water pressure) • Lack of services most notably with a GP surgery already suffering from capacity issues due to the doubling in size of the village in 35 years. <p>*Paragraph 14.178 says that the foul drainage situation is to be resolved by southern Water by 2025 but with only 2 months to go tanks are still being emptied by lorry and no solutions have been put forward for many residents who remain unconnected to mains drainage. It is hard to see how a new development would allow this to be resolved.</p> <p>The Brightlands proposal also fails to properly address SP3 as in fact this is development on a rural location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution in the area due to the adjacency with the A34 • The potential to increase light pollution in a rural area • The number of additional cars from such a development (perhaps as many as 120 vehicles without taking account of delivery vehicles) would pose issues with what is already a busy road on the outskirts of the village given that it was designed as a by-pass and for many years it was known as Bypass road. • Issues with creating access on a small roundabout on Stockbridge Road East <p>The policy for the site says in SU01 at vi and viii that a pedestrian crossing will link the site to the village and safe pedestrian access will be provided. This raises a number of points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is outside the village boundary and therefore it will be difficult to make it part of the community • The A30 creates a specific barrier which will impede inclusivity • The A30 is a fast road (a Bypass road – see above) and pedestrian crossings in such a location will cause traffic issues and tailbacks which the bypass was designed to avoid and therefore would be a regressive step • A pedestrian crossing would cause tailbacks to the access roundabout and be detrimental to the junction with the main road to the village. |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>The land at Brightlands should not be included in the allocation.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>Delete SU01</p> |
| <p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p> | |
| <p>If no, please explain</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Doreen Marsh |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXH-E |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXH-E/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | The Plan calls for 60 dwellings on Bright lands site yet the consultation in September 2024 called for 120 dwellings on Brightlands site. The consultation should match the Local Plan and clearly it doesn't. If the Council now want to change the Plan to 120, a revised Sustainability Impact Assessment should be carried out. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Change to 120 dwellings and revised Sustainability Impact Assessment being carried out. If this isn't possible on Brightlands an alternative site opposite Victoria Hall to be considered which will provide 60 dwellings. |
| 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 Email (commenting on policy) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Douglas Neal CEng BEng (Hons) MCIBSE MIET |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXG-D |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXG-D/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The required sewerage for the properties connected is around 35l/s (I have calculations to substantiate), this will maximise the new pipe that is supposedly to be installed (at 170mm ID). The development indicates a further 60 houses on top of the 60 proposed, the sewerage will not cope with the additional 60 houses, so the premise is based on poor science.</p> <p>The surface water run off, for removing 60,000 tonnes of absorptive top soil will require baffling of circa 1 acre, this is not allowed for in the development, two small ponds of circa 0.05 acres have been shown. This will flood my already flooded house to the north end of the site below the site level, and as you can imagine I would be able to easily demonstrate, with physics and mathematics that this could have been predicted. Southern Water have given no assurances, specifically they state no surface water can be added. Mathematics and Physics I am afraid stand up in a court of law better than speculation and assurances. The recently installed flood relief to Sutton Scotney is right next to the development, will be disturbed by the development and is at capacity: as my house and the petrol station still get substantial ponding (I have many recent photographs), even in light rain. Southern Water have stated they have no capacity for additional surface water.</p> <p>I have done these calculations relatively quickly and easily, therefore one could surmise that if the developer, who has employed a firm like mine but larger, has not addressed these issues, they are hiding them. Moreover their report actually states Southern Water have given assurances and attached a letter that directly contradicts this statement saying there is only 1.08 l/s drainage allowable, when 35l/s is required. The village, especially this area, gets regular blackouts and brownouts. Although the pole transformer has been replaced, this has only spaced out the incidents not cured them. There is insufficient power for this development without bringing in 350kVA at High Voltage. Again I have done these calculations quickly and easily, and these are a fundamental part of a stage 2 report which the developer has omitted, either deliberately or oversight.</p> <p>The proposed road junction is at best a liability and worst an accident trap, I have spoken to clients who work for the highways agency and they were unable to offer an opinion as they did not know where to start. In other words, too bad to even comment, blind spots on the exit from a hill, too large a traversable area without a full roundabout, damage to the flood relief, no account of large retaining wall from old railway.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Finally, the village itself sits in valley, it has already had flood relief which is just that, relief not cure. All sites considered will substantially raise the surface water level and the flood relief. According to the report, the relief works were the best that could be made. Indicating that there is no potential for more.</p> <p>This means the site will (from maths and physics) cause flooding, I challenged the chief planning officer and presented the calculations (proof) and was told he had been given assurances, when I pointed out that Southern Water has specifically stated no surface water, he restated he had been given assurances even though I showed him the page of the report with the letter saying the opposite. The chief planning officer has been made aware, and now, so have you, officially.</p> <p>The land to the south of Wonston Road, it appears has not even been considered, yet this is away from the main area of flooding, abuts a large amount of farm land (meaning surface water relief will be far less expensive), is more sympathetic to the expansion of the village, whereas the Brightlands site expands beyond the natural village boundary and was previously outside the local plan development area.</p> <p>The surgery is at capacity and is indicating that it will close to new patients before the new development, there are no further local surgeries within 5 miles not run by the same practice. This has not been considered by the planners.</p> <p>Finally, the central government had allocated the barracks at Barton Stacey to house several hundred asylum seekers, but this was never followed through due to the main road and lack of amenities. This land bank is available, is not in a flood zone, is a brown field site, already has infrastructure, and has not been considered. There are also several other land banks that would suit larger and more cost effective developments, thus meaning more affordable housing, and these have not been considered either.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>The majority of residents in Sutton Scotney do not favour Brightlands.</p> <p>Sutton Scotney has already received four recent developments including a good allocation of social housing, Station Drive, Taylors Yard, Saddlers Close, Harding Close. Why are now more required when the village has already had substantial recent allocation</p> <p>Do not use the Brightlands site, consider other land banks.</p> <p>Why has only Brightlands been considered.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>Sutton Scotney has already received sufficient additional housing in recent times. Due to the flood risk it should not be considered for more.</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>No</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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Eryl Holt |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP3-H |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP3-H/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.185 Southern Waters reputation is famously in doubt and I personally have little faith in their finishing the works in the allotted time or to a reasonable standard</p> <p>14.186 This area is NOT served by more than one GP surgery. The existing surgery is overwhelmed already with patients experiencing unacceptably long times to receive an appointment. We need another or bigger surgery as it is without further housing.</p> <p>Sutton Scotney is a village. It does not have the infrastructure to cope with another 60-120 dwellings. Social housing has proved disastrous mainly because to access supermarkets, cinemas, gym, station, dentist, you have to have access to a car which is expensive and bad for the environment. So 120+ new cars makes little sense. There is extremely limited employment opportunities in the Village. Most residents either work from home or commute. Most residents live here because they enjoy living in a small village. The proposal will create a small town. There is plenty of opportunity for housing in the as yet undeveloped parts of Barton Farm where residents are close to shopping centres and transport. There is absolutely no NEED to build in Sutton Scotney especially when so many developments remain unsold/unlived in.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | I believe the text is inaccessible to the average adult in Sutton Scotney and to answer fully requires far more expertise than it is reasonable to expect from most people who nevertheless wish to share their views. The text is obstructive and should be simplified or revised to enable folk to make their valid opinions known. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Simplification. More time to answer. Also there is no requirement for additional housing in Sutton Scotney. Unless you are a developer of course! |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | George Whalley |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/6/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Land at Brightlands - Site Constraints</p> <p>2.99 Sutton Scotney has significant constraints in the capacity of the local waste-water network which has resulted in daily tankering to dispose of wastewater. In response to the Regulation 18 consultation the Parish Council and Ward Members have expressed their strong concern regarding an allocation in Sutton Scotney due to sewerage capacity issues.</p> <p>2.100 It is understood that Southern Water have commenced the construction of a new pipeline between Sutton Scotney and South Wonston which would link to the Harestock Road Waste-Water Treatment Plant in Littleton. However, it is uncertain whether the pipeline will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed allocation. Furthermore, there is uncertainty regarding the delivery of further infrastructure waste-water infrastructure improvements that are required in South Wonston to support the development.</p> <p>2.101 The Regulation 19 SA identifies that the site is within an area of high archaeological potential, and it is likely that archaeological remains will be encountered. Records also show that a Roman building of some status was reported at or near this location. Therefore, the site may not be deliverable in relation to archaeological sensitivity.</p> <p>2.102 In relation to noise the majority of the site is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are above 50 dB or the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are above 55 dB. Therefore, it is uncertain if the site is entirely deliverable when appropriate noise buffers are applied.</p> <p>2.103 Therefore, in relation to site constraints regarding wastewater infrastructure, noise and archaeology there is a lack of clear evidence that the site is deliverable, and it should be removed from the draft Local Plan or its capacity reduced to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>2.104 The proposed allocation at Sutton Scotney is not justified or effective and should be</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>removed from the Local Plan. The proposed allocation is not consistent with the settlement hierarchy and lacks key services to support growth. The site is also highly constrained and deliverability during the Plan period is uncertain. Bishops Waltham is a more sustainable location to accommodate a higher level of growth. Land at Mill Chase is a suitable, available and achievable site option on the settlement edge of Bishops Waltham that should be allocated in place of the Land at Brightlands allocation.</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 Form (referring to letter) Supporting information (commenting on policies and proposed site)</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Hathor Property |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T7-9 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32T7-9/10/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Policy SU1 : Brightlands My client has significant reservations about draft allocation at Policy SU1. As highlighted above, the evidence base to support the allocation relative to my client's land interests is fundamentally flawed. The relevant extracts of the SHELAA, IIRA, DSSS and the details within the SSSI all contain inconsistencies and errors that, had they been appropriately addressed, would very likely have led to a different conclusion being reached about the preferred site. There are also inconsistencies with stated capacity of Policy SU1 itself and whether, taking into account mitigation necessary to address constraints, it is deliverable. Policy SU1 identifies an indicative capacity of 50-60 dwellings within a site area of 5.28 hectares as identified on the accompanying plan. This is consistent with the Policy H3, the Market Towns and Rural Areas strategy and table at 14.7 which identifies a range of 40-60 for Sutton Scotney to contribute toward meeting housing requirements. However, both the SHELAA and DSSS refer to a higher capacity of 95 dwellings. Though the site has been promoted through the SHELAA, no formal representations have been submitted on behalf the landowner commenting on the allocation. However, it is understood that following more recent engagement with the Parish Council that at 50-60 dwellings, as set out within Policy SU1, the development is not viable, and that around 120 dwellings are required . If the required policy capacity renders any residential scheme unviable, it cannot be considered sound. This may well be a reflection of the significant mitigation required to address constraints that are in addition to those that might normally be expected :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provision of access from the existing roundabout onto the A30 (Stockbridge Road East) would need upgrading to accommodate a fourth arm (as confirmed by HCC highways in Appendix 3 of the DSSS; • the need to include a new pedestrian crossing to be located at the A30 linking the site to the village (as confirmed in the Policy); • archaeological assessment and investigations will be required to assess the sites archaeological interest in advance of any design proposals (as confirmed in the Policy); • completion of a noise assessment and provide appropriate mitigation to prevent excessive disturbance to the residential development from the nearby service station and major roads (as confirmed by the Policy); and • ensuring that the amenity of the two existing detached dwellings is suitably safeguarded. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>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 Letter (commenting on policies and proposed site)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Helen Mary Solomons |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQG-6 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQG-6/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.185 Southern Water sewerage pipeline. Why should a proposed development be given access to the pipeline when it cannot cope with existing properties AND many houses already in the village cannot gain access to it.</p> <p>Southern Water do not have a good record in problems solving with present capacity.</p> <p>14.182. Travel links non existent. A30 access for transport and pedestrians</p> <p>14.184 ground water flooding risk would be increased.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Sort out Southern Water.</p> <p>Look at flood alleviation schemes.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | No new housing until Southern Water improve sewerage removal from the village. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Iain Curry |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3229-9 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3229-9/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There has been no consultation with the village. Regulation 19 has been the first opportunity for residents to consider site allocations . There have been two meetings in the village and at both there was a preference for the land south of the Wonston Road rather than the land at Brightlands. There is a concern over the WCC's evidence base and the viability of the proposal at Brightlands .</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>I understand that the developers for the Brightlands site say that there needs to be 120 houses as opposed to the 60. Therefore this site is not financially viable, whereas the alternative site is viable for the 60 houses. A proper investigation is necessary regarding the noise levels for the Brightlands as it is located adjacent to the A34. Full investigation should have been made with regard to road safety and drainage. This is the wrong side of the A30 road to the main settlement</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | There is a breach of SEA Regulations as the assessment does not show a reasonable and fair comparison with the other site put forward in the village. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | John Holt |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXV-V |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXV-V/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | I am unsure whether this is legally compliant but I feel, it has been offered to residents with far too little lead up time for such a complex and important issue, its worded in far too complex a way and therefore does not comply with a duty to cooperate |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | More time. Clearer language. More consultation with residents. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | More time. Clearer language. More consultation with residents. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | John Mark Tiplady |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3225-5 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3225-5/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Congratulations! You have made completion of this as difficult as possible. I am not a NIMBY, welcome development when sensible. However, to consider more housing in a village with history of flooding, limited sewage (my development has incredibly expensive treatment plant) without connecting existing properties to mains sewage is irresponsible |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Judith Anne Polak |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TW-9 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/7/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The allocation is for 60 homes yet the promoting developer has told me verbally that the site is not financially viable at this level and will need to include at least 120 houses. WCC have not asked the developer to produce a viability report for 60 homes, yet they have done this for an alternative site in the village. This alternative site is preferred by a majority of people canvassed in a recent poll organised by Wonston Parish Council. As no allocation was made at the Reg 18 stage I was not given the opportunity to comment on this allocation and have not been able to exercise my democratic right of reply. This development is totally out of proportion for a village of circa 450 households an increase of almost 27% with no improvements to infrastructure. Sutton Scotney suffers from poor sewerage as there is no main drainage. A new pipe is due to be installed by Southern Water but this currently has no capacity before 2035 beyond relieving those already connected to either Saddler Close or Gratton Close treatment works who currently endure 24/7 tankering of sewage. WCC have entered into an agreement with Southern Water for any new development but this does not help other residents who have to put up with the stench of foul drainage all the time. How can it be right that new developments have priority over this relief pipe before those in the village who would like to join it?</p> <p>The proposed access to this new development is from the existing roundabout. The site lines for any car bicycle or pedestrian are impossible without the removal of ancient hedgerows and even worse for anyone in a wheelchair at a lower level. This is a dangerous stretch of road frequently used by heavy goods vehicles accessing the nearby petrol station to save money on fuel. Whenever the A34 is closed as it is at present for road repairs, traffic is diverted through the village to this roundabout.</p> <p>Removal of this ancient hedgerow will impact bats, dormice and slow worms live on this site. There are valuable roman remains on the site itself.</p> <p>Sutton Scotney is low lying in the Dever valley and suffers with flooding, many homes have pumps to alleviate this risk, working 24/7. Much of the village is in EA designated flood zones. Any development on Brightlands will reduce the permeability of the field and have a massive impact on flood protections for the village. Currently groundwater is carried via pipework under Oxford Road to Bogmoor Sump and then under the road adjacent to the roundabout where new access is planned. Any work in this area will endanger the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>flood defences. The additional groundwater run off from the site will flow into Bogmoor sump by gravity alone and in heavy rainfall may cause Bogmoor sump to back up causing flooding along Oxford Road.</p> <p>Any policy suggesting development on this site is unsound made worse by the fact that a viable alternative at Dairy Field has been overlooked by WCC despite the fact that local people have confirmed their preference for Dairy Meadow in a recent poll undertaken by Wonston Parish Council - undertaken because no formal consultation was provided by WCC because this site was allocated at very short notice. WCC had a copy of Wates vision for the site (including for 120 houses) in August 2022 but did not share this with anyone (including I understand the Parish Council). It was not included at the Reg 18 stage when people could have commented. WCC have failed in their duty to consult. They have expected the developer for Dairy meadow to prepare a viability study for 55-60 houses but have not asked the Brightlands developer to do the same. The two developers are not being treated equally.</p> <p>The doctors surgery is over subscribed already and is considering closing its list to new patients. If this happens any new households will be forced to join a surgery in Winchester or Andover which can only be access by car.</p> <p>Sutton Scotney is not averse to new development indeed we have had 8 new small estates added since 1980s, but these are all small developments most built in keeping with a village environment and none larger than 30 homes further illustrating that 120 homes promoted by Wates is out of proportion. A smaller in keeping development of 55-60 is large enough and Dairy Field is a far better site. Brightlands is separated from the village by a busy road and is adjacent to the A34 which is noisy and polluting. the Wates vision of the site has placed higher density lower cost housing closer to the A34 - the less attractive areas limited for those who cannot afford more.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the allocation of houses on Brightlands and believe that the SU01 policy is wholly unsound, this allocation is unjustified as it does not take account of any reasonable alternative site and fails on a number of policies upon which I have commented in earlier sections of this document.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Remove Brightlands and replace it with Dairy Field</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>No</p> |
|---|-----------|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Kevin Maunder |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ7-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ7-P/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There has been a lack of proper public consultation prior to this site being included in Reg 19. It hadn't been included in Reg 18. One meeting at short notice after it was included has been held with the public. No other options/alternative sites have properly been considered by planning officers or the public being given a chance to comment on these. There has been no viability study as regards this site. I consider that 50-60 properties is very unlikely to be economically viable to the developer (Wates) due to the constraints that will be imposed around noise, flood relief and natural habitat. It would not be viable for them to include affordable housing. I doubt it would still be viable at 120 homes but this number what has been suggested in information given to the Parish Council to share with residents. The village regularly suffers from power outages. Have the costs of installation of additional electric to cover EV + broadband usage been considered. Access to and from site on is unsound in policy SU01. Have previously asked for a suitable crossing but was too dangerous according to Hampshire County Council. Access would appear to be in contrary to Policy NE1. No safe link to Main Sutton Scotney is contrary to Policies SP2 and SP3. The site has no connectivity as opposed to Policy D1</p> <p>The access to the roundabout is appalling and would require increased visibility only achieved by cutting back hedgerows. There is very limited visibility if crossing the road on a 40 mph limit only reduced from 50 30 metres from roundabout.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | A total review of the plan. Consideration of any other sites. Public consultation. Take into account what residents want. Risk to public crossing roads. Village flooding |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Leonie Measures |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32U1-4 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32U1-4/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I live to the north of the proposed development at Brightlands and our horse paddock shares an adjoining hedged boundary for approximately 75m to the eastern side of the proposed northern boundary. The horse is neutral as regards any development in the adjacent field however would request that the existing hedge line is maintained (Northern boundary is strangely absent from Policy SU01 XV).</p> <p>I do not have a background in housing, planning or land development and feel quite overwhelmed by the sheer amount of background reading I have had to undertake to attempt to reach an informed opinion on the local plan as it may affect Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>The village needs an increase in housing to support both locals requiring affordable housing to stay in the area and to attract newcomers in order to maintain the village vibrancy and local economy. I support the principle of appropriate, sustainable, affordable housing that is sensitive to the existing rural village of Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>I feel it is essential that any development reflects the needs and concerns of the local community. Unfortunately, the consultation process surrounding this housing allocation has been insufficient. Many residents feel uninformed and excluded from discussions that directly impact their lives and the character of our community. The last minute allocation of the Brightlands site has avoided the level of community engagement and scrutiny due to it being presented at the regulation 19 stage and having been previously excluded at the regulation 18 stage of the draft local plan. It is apparent that studies/investigations/surveys which may have been beneficial prior to land allocation are largely absent and replaced by a "To Do" list of requirements listed in the table at P495 SU01 Policy post site allocation. Deciding what can be made to be viable after allocation of land does not appear fair to other site promoters. On the surface, as a resident, this appears to be presented as a "fait accompli" or "done deal" presented too late in the process.</p> <p>I am aware that 2 sites were initially seen as viable but following comparison by the city council a preference for SU01 (WO10 Brightlands) over WO11 (The dairy Meadows). From reading the site selection and background of both I am not entirely sure this was a fair process as scoring is very subjective in places (identifying that one development might be glimpsed from a village hall car park?) a view is subjective and sensitive development should not be seen as a negative if the development is fitting. The Dairy meadows proposed development would have little effect on rising downlands to the south if undertaken sympathetically.</p> |

Some of the scoring and assessments have been identified by the dairy meadows potential developer to be unfair and in breach of guidelines around scoring and assessment.

I feel as though there is one National developer (Wates) promoting one site (WO11 Brightlands), a smaller developer (Pennybar) promoting another site (WO11 The Dairy Meadows), The City Council needing to tick housing allocation boxes to achieve housing targets, a parish Council not wanting any housing until infrastructure is in place and residents stuck in the middle trying to form an opinion without the benefit of land development knowledge. I have filled this in without the benefit of a legal or planning department and so I can only assume there will be glaring inaccuracies and overwhelming displays of ignorance for which I apologise. I believe there has been a breakdown in trust and communication at City Council and parish council level. As minutes of meetings between parish and city council have, bizarrely, not been taken, it is difficult to ascertain how this has happened. It is however clear that it is the residents of Wonston parish who have been disenfranchised by lack of representation and of meaningful community engagement in the decision-making process due to the last minute allocation made at the regulation 19 stage.

As no building will be considered until 2030 at the earliest I am confused by the last minute rush to allocate a site. I can only conclude the last minute allocation this is as a result of pressure on Winchester City Council to meet an arbitrary target or from pressure from the proposed developers Wates.

I am somewhat confused as to the housing allocation numbers. Initially it was 50 -60 dwelling requirement and then when Sutton Scotney was excluded from reg18 a windfall allowance of 20 dwellings was made. At regulation 19 stage the housing allowance has a requirement of 80 dwellings Reading the SU01 Brightlands developers promotional literature for the site it is clear that they will be seeking an allocation of 120 dwellings to make the proposal "viable". I am perplexed by Winchester City Councils decision to allocate a site which the developers wish to build 120 houses when the policy indicates a requirement of only 50-60. This discrepancy suggests a lack of alignment with community expectations and planning guidelines. Housing density at 120 homes could potentially lead to an increase in population of 3 times the housing number, conservatively of 360 people. The resulting burden and potential detrimental impact this could cause on the underlying fraying infrastructure (Health, Education, Transport etc is worrying). I note in the developer's promotional literature that Naomi House Childrens Hospice is promoted as an attractive feature in the list of facilities which Sutton Scotney offers. This is at best an underlying ignorance of the local area and at worse a callous promotion of a service that no parent could ever wish to have need of.

The Brightlands site has been identified as lying within an area where the noise levels are objectively high, it is somewhat perplexing that this site has been chosen prior to a assessment of the potential noise levels and what, if anything, can have meaningful mitigation on this. My home is situated at approximately the same distance from the a34 as the western end of the proposed site. I have double glazing, fencing, trees and hedging yet still find myself needing the dulcet tones on radio 4 on constantly during the day to compete with

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>the river of background traffic noise. I try to avoid opening windows or doors. When outside of my house, I am always aware of the background traffic noise, I do try, unsuccessfully, to think of it as a nearby waterfall. Given the known and emerging evidence base of the harmful effects of high levels of traffic noise on health it seems odd that this has been chosen over a quieter and arguably healthier site . Numerous studies have shown that prolonged exposure to high levels of traffic noise can lead to serious health issues, including sleep disturbances, elevated stress levels, and cardiovascular problems including stroke and heart attack. The health and well-being of our community should be a top priority. I believe this area needs to be given greater importance in the discussion of the 2 different sites.</p> <p>As has been evidenced, Sutton Scotney has both issues with sewerage/ waste water and ground water. It is ambitious claim for Southern Water to claim that sewage issues will be resolved by March20125, they have been claiming imminent resolution since 2018. Southern Water has lost implied trust of many of the residents and a statement of common ground with the council is no reassurance as to its resolution.</p> <p>The Village pumping station is overwhelmed with waste since the southbound A34 service station linked in to it in effect creating the waste of an additional village with the mobile traffic population. The village has experienced overflows of human waste and continual pumping via tankers during the day over a number of years. Although there are plans in place with Southern Water creating a new pipe line it is disappointing that this will not have additional capacity for existing residents of the village who have experienced failures with package sewage plants and likewise need to rely on continual pumping to tankers. It seems immensely unfair that failed sewage systems that Winchester city council have previously signed off as appropriate at the planning stage cannot be served by a new village pipeline yet there will be capacity for potential new residents.</p> <p>Owning adjoining land to Brightlands I am concerned that there will be less capacity for groundwater to soak through the land once it is built over with non porous materials. The eastern end of the field already becomes water logged during times of heavy rain. I believe my land will become a literal soakaway to compensate and as a result will become unusable. Brightlands site is within flood zone 2 and 3 and not merely adjacent to these high risk areas as stated.</p> <p>Policy SU01 xi,xii,xiii. Although these paragraphs undertake to assess ground water and flood risks I feel that these are assessments which are needed to e undertake prior to allocation of the land. I am concerned as to whether there will be recompense should mitigation measures prove inadequate and as to who would remain liable should this situation occur.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>I would like to see more scrutiny and assessment of both proposed sites, The Dairy Meadows and Brightlands prior to site allocation.</p> <p>I believe they are both equally bad developments but with the potential to be improved. Further assessments of flood risk and ground conditions, ground water and noise of both sites should be undertaken before mitigation and post proposed mitigation at the relevant developers expense and let the people of Sutton Scotney make a democratic and informed decision. Building on either site would not take place until 2030 (policy SU01 ii)so there is time.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Margaret Sandford and Alistair Black |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BE4-7 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BE4-7/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Housing allocations: land at Brightlands SHELAA site reference SU01</p> <p>I am contesting the above allocation on the basis that it is not</p> <p>a) Justified as an appropriate strategy taking into account reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence</p> <p>b) It is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in meeting:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Economic objectives II. Social objectives III. Environmental objectives <p>a) Not justified</p> <p>At Regulation 18 stage four potential SHELAA sites were put forward for the Parish of Wonston. These included SU01, Brightlands and WO11, Dairy Meadow/land South of Wonston Lane. Winchester City Council (WCC) rejected all sites. There was no public consultation with the residents of the Parish.</p> <p>The late inclusion of a site in Regulation 19 meant a hurried consultation exercise was undertaken by Wonston Parish Council (WPC) at which residents were asked to select between the two proposed site SU01 and WO11. At this time there was very little detail on either site but both were put forward as developing 50-60 homes. The outcome of this consultation was an absolute preference, by the local community, for WO11 and not SU01. A further meeting was held at which WCC presented a fait accompli outlining the proposal for 50—60 homes on SU01. At this meeting there was no evidence of the fully worked up draft proposal by the developer which WCC had been negotiating with and had had since 2022. The developer's proposal is clear that they are aiming to build 120 homes on the site, not 50-60 as promulgated by WCC.</p> <p>Having read the proposal I argue that the SU01 is 'unsound' as :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer's view is that the site is not viable without fully developing it at 120 houses. • There has been no assessment of possible alternative site/s especially WO11. • Even 60 new homes in one location will impact the rural nature of this village. And in my view is 'not proportionate'. 120 homes would be totally disproportionate and alter, in a negative way the rural nature of the village. <p>b). I also believe the site is not 'justified' as it does not meet the overarching objectives of the NPPF</p> |

(i) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure

Sutton Scotney is a rural community. Its economy is mainly agriculture with very limited opportunities for employment. Most of the working community has to travel to the conurbations of Winchester, Andover, Basingstoke, Southampton or London. The transport infrastructure consists of an hourly bus service between Winchester and Andover Mondays to Fridays. There is no very early morning or late evening service. The service is bi-hourly on a Saturday with no service on a Sunday. Therefore most people use private cars to travel to their place of work or the train stations at Winchester or Micheldever. I fail to see how adding new homes in Sutton Scotney will meet the stated objective above. It will, however significantly add to carbon emissions as there will be a significant increase in private car use for journeys to work and school.

(ii) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being;

and (96.a)promote social interaction - including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages.

Looking at the maps showing the development of SU01, it can be seen that the site will be isolated from the village of Sutton Scotney by the A30. Furthermore, on the opposite side of the site is the A34. This site will in effect be an 'island'. The A30 is a busy road carrying heavy agricultural machinery as well as traffic travelling to and from Stockbridge, Salisbury and Romsey. The road from the west is built on a Roman Road – straight and long. Vehicles travel at speed, enter the top of Stockbridge Road West at speed until they meet the roundabout .There is no footpath on Stockbridge Road West and I cannot see how a continuous footpath could be created without the removal of the existing significant hedgerow. Nor could a footpath be built on Stockbridge Road East as there is the old railway bridge abutment and the open ditch into which surface water flows from the Bogmoor Sump.(see below). There are no cycle routes and all cyclists have to share the narrow country roads. I believe the proposed site of SUO1 would not facilitate community cohesion at all – quite the reverse. This is in contrast to site WO11 which would nestle into the village making a coherent whole. It would also provide easy access to all village facilitates without navigating a major road.

(iii) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

I make the following comments:-

SUO1 is agricultural land and is currently used for growing seed crop. Removing valuable agriculture when food security is becoming ever more necessary, is very short sighted.

To provide safety measures for road users and pedestrians will require the removal of significant hedge rows leading to a loss of biodiversity

The site will be impacted by high noise levels from the A303 and particularly the A34 even with mitigation

The site is believed to have historical remains from the Roman era

120 homes will add an estimated 180-200 more vehicles - not conducive to low carbo emissions

Mitigating and adapting to climate change

The village is subject to ground water flooding. This is mitigated by an underground culvert running south to north under the length of Oxford Road which takes surface drainage off the road and the water flowing from the winterbourne south of the village. It emerges at what is known as Bogmoor Sump. This is just off the roundabout, which will take the new access road to SUO1 site. Seven pipes turn left taking the water under the A30 merging into an open ditch on Stockbridge Road East. It goes underground at the railway embankment, resurfacing as an open ditch just before the garage forecourt. Back underground, a single pipe turns right then sharp left continuing under the grassed area of the garage forecourt which then progresses to the left to enter the open ditch on the opposite side of Bullington Lane.

There are two associated problems. 1. The 'fall' of this network of pipes and ditches is extremely shallow. 2. As well as the 7 pipes, Bogmoor Sump has a single large overflow pipe which runs in a straight-line alongside the A30 until opposite the garage where it swings left joining the pipe described above. In the event of excessive rainfall when the overflow pipe is working 'turbulence' is created by the meeting of the water from the two pipes and water flows back into the village and not onwards to the River Dever. With the very wet weather experienced this year, the lower lying properties in the village have already been pumping out for some months.

I have provided this detail as it is necessary to understand the complexity of the system and its close location to the site SUO1 which if developed will add to the water run-off.

There is no mention in SU01 of protecting or enhancing the flood management system which aims to protect current residents. It is therefore my lay person's view that SUO1 is not sound or appropriate strategy and does not meet the NPPF.

There are also issues of 'sewerage'. Although there are plans to accommodate any new developments into the forthcoming 'mains pipeline' there are mixed and confusing messages from Southern Water as to whether there will be sufficient capacity to meet new development. Current residents, all of whom are reliant on cess pits/septic tanks would have to self-fund costs associated with joining up to the mains sewerage system if capacity was available.

It should also be noted that the pressurised pipeline will pump the sewerage via South Wonston to the main treatment plant at Harestock. In the last few weeks we approached the waste disposal firm to have our septic tank emptied we were told we would have to wait as Harestock (where the tankers discharge) had no capacity to receive tankers.

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| 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/31/SU01 |
| 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 | SU01 |
| 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/29/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | A development of 60 dwellings is likely to generate up to 18 primary age pupils and 13 secondary age pupils. The site is served by South Wonston Primary School and Henry Beaufort Secondary. It is likely that these could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards the expansion of secondary 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Phil Dowson |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B9K-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B9K-J/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | The inclusion of Brightlands is flawed vs a clearly much better option at Dairy Meadow in Sutton Scotney. Brightlands is north of the A30, a natural northern boundary of Sutton Scotney. Any Brightlands development would be impossible to integrate with Sutton Scotney. There are also implications regarding an increased flood risk if Brightlands were to be developed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Replace Brightlands with Dairy Meadow |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Do not feel qualified to answer this technical question. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Rachel Dye |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BDS-5 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BDS-5/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | 14.179 - the land is outside the village boundary. It looks to me as if this site is not a natural, organic phase of village development. The Pennybar site south is Wonston Road looks a more logical area for growth. The Brightland site looks like a topographical bolt-on, which in reality would lead to the estate looking as if it had no natural relationship to the village . |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | I feel that the land south of Wonston Road is a more natural growth site. The development could have a chance of looking integrated with the village rather than just set down in the edge of it. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Rachel Dye |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BDX-A |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BDX-A/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | 14.149- this site is outside the village boundary. The development is not on a site of natural organic growth for the village. It will appear in reality to be a bolt on with little relationship to the village. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | The site south of Wonston Road is a better potential site for development. Houses here would be more integrated with the existing village, rather than appearing to be sited on the edge of the village , with no apparent relationship to it. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Change the site to south of Wonston Road. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Richard Cowen |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5Q-M |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5Q-M/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | I have been involved in this community for over 50 years. This proposed allocation appears deeply flawed and unwanted. Leaping the A30 when other better sites are available and deliverable feels like poor planning. It is clear also that both the proposed allocation and alternative sites have not been assessed on the same terms. Given the lack of community consultation on site assessment at Regulation 18 I think it is important closer scrutiny is required of a potential allocation in Sutton Scotney. Land South of Wonston Road clearly integrates better into the village and can offer existing residents more in the way of access to onsite benefits. It is hard to imagine that anyone will visit the Brightlands site which feels like a separate settlement. I am aware of two community consultation events that have taken place over the course of Regulation 19 in which the majority of those who attended share my view. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | In light of assessment failures by WCC and support from the community for Land South of Wonston Road I would encourage an allocation for Land South of Wonston Road over Brightlands. The site is a better place for development and is demonstrably viable at a policy aligned 50-60 dwellings. I cannot see how 120 dwellings at Brightlands is policy compliant and understand there are question marks over its viability at 50-60 |
| 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</i> | No |

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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Robert Benedict Middleton |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32F3-Q |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32F3-Q/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>In outline, there was a clear lack of consultation on site assessment for Sutton Scotney. Sites have not been assessed on the same basis and alternative sites have been overlooked. The evidence base for site assessment in Regulation 19 is flawed. There are question marks over the viability of the proposed allocation. Why is the proposed allocation putting forward a scheme for 120 when the policy requires 50-60 Following two community meetings there is a strong preference for the alternative site, Land South of Wonston Road, which is viable for 50-60 dwellings. More detailed comment as follows:</p> <p>Lack of Consultation</p> <p>Regulation 18 asked the community to consult on a different strategy for Sutton Scotney with no policy for a housing allocation. Regulation 19 has come in a very different format. This has led to insufficient consultation with the Parish, local community and key stakeholders in assessing options for allocations in Sutton Scotney.</p> <p>Technical: Regulation 13 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment requires necessary supporting evidence to be subject to effective consultation. It should allow for as many interested parties as possible to provide feedback and give a considered response. Neither the committee or the residents of Sutton Scotney have been able to do this prior to Reg 19. The only feedback prior to this was via a questionnaire with limited detail of potential sites.</p> <p>Regulation 19 has allowed for time for the community and committee members to be consulted with detail and make a more informed response to the Consultation. Two events have been held in the Parish Hall that have attracted a significant amount of the local community to review the details of the proposed allocation (Brightlands) as well an alternative site (Land South of Wonston Road).</p> <p>Subsequently:</p> <p>At the Scrutiny Committee there was commitment by WCC councillors that Regulation 19 could effect change if it is wanted and justified. Feedback to the Parish committee has shown an overwhelming level of support for the alternative site 'Land South of Wonston Road.' Given Reg 18 differed from Reg 19 it is of extra importance that the Inspector consider these comments.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment Report (IIAR)</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Regulation 12 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations requires likely significant effects of the draft Reg 19 Plan, including draft allocations, to be evaluated as well as reasonable alternatives. However The Wonston Parish Site Assessment does not provide a fair assessment of both the draft allocated site and other sites assessed on a level playing field. It only scores the draft allocated site with mitigation and consequently, it does not provide a fair or appropriate assessment of reasonable alternatives. This, again, is in breach of SEA Regulations and therefore unsound. The scoring of the draft allocation is flawed too. It does not reflect the noise impacts of the A34 on future development. Neither does it adequately reflect the implications of the A30 as a barrier to integration, cohesion, safety, health and wellbeing and minimising car travel. These are all key strands of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The IIA directs also that 'The potential negative effects identified by the IIA of residential site options could be avoided by selecting sites outside of air and noise pollution hotspots.'. This further underlines the need for equivalent site assessment.</p> <p>Brightlands Viability Policy SU01 seeks an allocation of 50-60 dwellings in Sutton Scotney. The Local Plan has identified a significant number of concerns with the Brightlands to include archaeology, noise pollution, road safety and drainage. These lead to concerns over the site's viability at 50-60. There is documentation in the public domain that shows the developers of Brightlands working on the basis of 120 dwellings. This would conflict with the policy of 50-60. Land South of Wonston Road has submitted a viability report via Regulation 18 submissions to demonstrate the site is viable and deliverable for between 50-60 dwellings.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>There needs to be meaningful consultation with residents in the community, based on full details relating to each of the two proposed sites, Brightlands and Land South of Wonston Road. The Brightlands site is an important store of groundwater, which, if developed, and particularly at the scale of the proposed 120 rather than 50-60 dwellings the policy requires, would have significant impact on the area's flood resilience. This will only become more important as climate change leads to increased frequency and severity of flooding events. There is already insufficient sewage capacity within the village and the addition of a further 120 dwellings, without very significant improvements being made first to the sewage treatment and disposal options, will compound the already existing problems which mean over dependence on tankering of sewage. Southern Water pledges to upgrade the village facilities have not been met, with numerous delays and all deadlines they have set previously for scope and timings of improvements have been missed and/or downgraded. Why should villagers have any confidence that a new set of pledges to upgrade the systems won't simply be missed or downgraded as on all previous occasions?</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> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Robert Parker |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BTM-F |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BTM-F/1/SU01 |
| 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>For full response please see Appendix C</p> <p>I am one of 5 residents living at the centre of SU01 Brightlands. The first time we knew about the proposed development of Brightlands was when the Regulation 19 Local Plan was published on 19th July 2024</p> <p>For</p> <p>The land is available. The land is relatively flat. The land will accommodate up to 120 dwellings</p> <p>Against</p> <p>The land is separated from the rest of the village by the A30 trunk road. Road safety issues are involved in vehicles exiting the site and pedestrians and cyclists crossing the A30. The site is 'landlocked'. There is no way out or off site without crossing the A30. The PROW on the western edge goes nowhere. Development will create a village of two halves. Community cohesion and social inclusion will be compromised by the A30</p> <p>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land Loss of biodiversity and habitat. Noise pollution Air pollution</p> <p>Increased carbon emissions due to motor vehicle ownership on site Increased risk of contributing to village flooding.</p> <p>Why was Brightlands chosen at the last minute for inclusion in the Local Plan? Dealing with the site itself (SHELAA Reference SU01 Page 493) if looking at the map on the right 'Wider Context' it immediately becomes obvious how large the site is compared to the whole village. If developed, it will increase the size of the village by about 25% - out of all proportion to the size of the existing village. The indicative number of homes is given at 50-60 but, of course, this site would take 120 homes. Residents know that the indicative number of homes at 50-60 is just Phase 1 of a bigger plan as the evidence of intent for a much greater number has become obvious since the Parish Council acquired a document from Carter Jonas on behalf of Wates Construction. There is a total confusion of numbers in various documents actually in the Local plan documentation.</p> <p>Development Strategy & Site Selection Page (up to an additional 120 dwellings)</p> <p>This point was raised at the Full Council Extraordinary Meeting held on 28th August 2024 officers clearly stated that up to 140 homes (yet another figure) would be 'out of character for the area'. I refer to a document not in the evidence base but which the LPA have had in their possession since December 2022 in response to Regulation 18 consultations and which they have withheld from residents and the Parish Council right up to</p> |

present time. We were only aware of its existence on 2nd September 2024 when Carter Jonas supplied it to the Parish Council as a result of the Council requesting their attendance at a public meeting in Sutton Scotney on 4th September. They supplied the report in lieu of attending. It is entitled 'Response on Behalf of Wates Developments Ltd'. I will attach a copy of this report as Appendix A.

Page 13 paragraph 5.8 (50-60 limiting, 100 dwellings or greater have greater potential to deliver Affordable Housing)

Page 16 paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3 (120 homes in both)

The LPA may argue that it is not relevant as it was part of the Regulation 18 consultation and does not form part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan but it actually does, as parts of this document have been 'copied and pasted' into the Regulation 19 Local Plan which I feel makes it relevant. An example follows:

Describing the two residential properties as being 'at the centre of the site but outside of the site boundary' rather glosses over the difficulties which both residents and developers will experience. The considerable impact on existing homes has not been considered neither have the occupiers ever been consulted by owners, land agents, planners or developers.

The situation with the owners of the two properties is extremely serious in as much as we both have right of way over the driveway down to the A30 and are jointly responsible for the maintenance of 75% of the driveway, but we don't own it. This can clearly be seen on the site plan. Our properties will be 'islands' connected to the 'mainland' at the pleasure of the developer. He may use the drive as he wishes including using it for moving heavy machinery and construction traffic on and off the site whilst we remain responsible for its maintenance and repair. We will be at the mercy of the developer for vehicle access and the uninterrupted supply of our essential services such as water, electricity, broadband and septic tank soakaways which cross over and under the fields from different directions.

When I challenged the lack of Regulation 18 public consultation for Brightlands at the Cabinet Committee meeting of Winchester City Council on 19th August 2024 the Strategic Planning Manager stated that the law did not require land allocations to be published at that stage and that the Regulation 19 public consultation complied with the law. Whilst this may be true, it begs the question why all other land allocations were published in the Regulation 18 Draft Report inviting responses from the public when residents of Sutton Scotney had no such opportunity. At no stage have residents on Brightlands or the wider village ever been consulted pre-Regulation 19 which makes a mockery of the 'Your Place, Your Plan' title of this Plan.

I now deal with various aspects of Policy SU01

Access iv. / v.

This will require the removal of the whole hedgerow from the roundabout west at least as far as the driveway to the existing properties. The existing grass verge will need to be hard landscaped to stop grass and vegetation growing 2 to 3 feet high as happens now otherwise visibility will be zero. Removal of approximately 100m x 4m of established hedgerow will impact biodiversity and habitat. The close proximity to the roundabout of underground pipes forming part of the Bogmoor Sump drainage system also needs to be considered. This fairly primitive drainage system is crucial to preventing flooding.

This roundabout is at the lowest point in the village (193ft above sea level) and the new road from any development will be straight into a 2/3 Flood Zone.

The cost of construction has been rated High (SHELAA High Level Transport Review WO10) and the accident rate low. This is because few vehicles exit the current site access and only three people have regularly crossed the A30 on foot to and from Brightlands in the past 30 years.

Access vi.

The siting of a pedestrian crossing will be crucial as this is a 40 mph trunk road on a slight curve with a small 'indent' in the road just after the access road to the southbound A34 services.

Then there is the type of traffic and speed to consider. Whilst the A30 does not carry the volume of traffic carried by the A34 or A303 it is an 'agricultural corridor' stretching from Micheldever Station to the east to Stockbridge and beyond in the west. The road carries a considerable volume of oversized agricultural vehicles and equipment. The type of pedestrian crossing will be key to safe crossing of this 'A' road. A fairly recently installed crossing of the same road near the Texaco filling station has a central refuge. It is at a wider part of the road but the refuge is barely wide enough to safely protect a parent pushing a buggy or a person on a disability scooter. Traffic passes uncomfortably close on either side. The A30 adjacent to Brightlands is less wide and the road may require widening to install a crossing.

Zebra crossings and pedestrian controlled crossings such as Pelican, Toucan and Puffin all require flashing lights of various types and colours and in the case of the latter crossings also audible signals. These types of crossing may not be appropriate in a village setting due to light pollution and noise.

Vii.

If residents need to cross a trunk road 4 times and a village 'high street' (Oxford Road) twice just to get from home to the Post Office and back they will take a car. A footpath cannot be constructed to the Post Office on the north side of Stockbridge Road East as there is insufficient width between the old railway abutment and the A30. So they will drive. Evidence – I've never seen my neighbours walk to the village in over 20 years. Use of the Post Office is increasing both as a banking hub and for the large number of returns of online orders.

There are no cycle paths to connect to and very little space to construct any through the village. Footpaths outside Oxford Road are narrow and often reduced in width by vegetation.

Sadly, the LPA placed reliance on the 'Wates' report as this PROW was cut in two in 1981 when the A34 bypassed Sutton Scotney. Prior to this the footpath connected Sutton Scotney with Barton Stacey. Now the footpath is impassable for its whole length and doesn't go anywhere leaving the Brightlands site totally landlocked without access to anywhere without crossing the A30.

Whatever is done will never be able to prevent development on Brightlands creating a village of 'two halves'. No one from the existing village will have reason to cross the A30 to Brightlands. Open space might just be an attraction but why cross a trunk road when excellent open space is already available at The Gratton without crossing a trunk road?

SP2 Spatial Strategy

Homes, jobs, services and facilities

Employment

Many people now work from home either as employees of larger companies or engaged in running small businesses. There is little local employment of note. A few low paid jobs exist at the A34 services, Sutton Manor Nursing Home and Norton Park Hotel but most people travel to London, Winchester, Basingstoke, Andover or Southampton for work. These journeys require use of a motor vehicle at least as far as railway stations at Winchester and Micheldever. Public transport is of no use whatsoever to shift workers who require early and late buses.

Shopping

Services and facilities, such as they are, are centred on Sutton Scotney. There are none at Norton, Hunton or Stoke Charity and only the Wonston Arms at Wonston itself. Sutton Scotney has the excellent Dever Stores, a Spar shop in the Texaco garage and the Coach and Horses pub.

Neither village shop is suitable for a large weekly/monthly family shop. It would be impossible to stock sufficient goods to cope with demand. Neither shop is large enough to stock more than a limited range of fresh fruit and vegetables and no fresh meat or fish. The Dever Stores is not suitable for wheelchair access since the aisles are too narrow and the Spar shop at the Texaco garage has a ramp but no automatically opening doors. The latter shop is also too expensive for residents on low incomes. Taking one example a single pint of milk is 29p more expensive than the Dever Stores. Multiply this across a small basket of shopping and the difference is considerable. It is a convenience store but mainly for the convenience of passing motorists.

This means that a motor vehicle is essential to reach major supermarket chain stores at Winchester, Andover or Basingstoke contributing to air pollution and carbon emissions.

Healthcare

SU01

This allocation falls within an area which is served by one or more GP practices. The NHS Integrated Care Board has advised that the relevant practices are working from surgeries which fall below relevant NHS space standards for the number of people on the current practice patient list.

GP services are available at The Gratton Surgery in Sutton Scotney only. This surgery also takes patients from South Wonston, local rural villages and as far away as large new developments at Picket Twenty Andover and Barton Farm Winchester which can lead to long delays in routine appointments. Routine appointments are currently a 5 week wait and blood tests, if available, are 6 weeks. Patients drive considerable distances to visit the surgery. These journeys all contribute to increasing carbon emissions.

Reg 19 IIA Non Technical Summary page 49

IIA objective 5: To support community cohesion and safety in the district.

Our current community networks in Sutton Scotney work well due to the relatively compact nature of the village. Walking within the village is common and interactions between residents take place daily. Vulnerable residents are looked after and welfare checks are frequent. This relieves pressure on services such as the

NHS and Social and Mental Health services. My concern is that no one from the south of the A30 will have any reason to go across to Brightlands which will result in Brightlands residents feeling isolated. This will particularly affect residents with mental health issues.

Infrastructure

Education

There is no school within the Parish. There is an over subscribed Primary School at South Wonston and Secondary Schools in Winchester, Stockbridge and Whitchurch. Buses run to Winchester but there is no bus service to Stockbridge or Whitchurch.

There is, however, excellent nursery and pre-school provision with Busy Bees based in Sutton Scotney.

Communications

Sutton Scotney has its own Telephone Exchange and has access to Fibre to the Cabinet (FTTC) broadband at download speeds of up to 76Mbps. BT have no current time frame for introducing Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) to this area. This impacts greatly on the ability of residents and local businesses to operate efficiently and effectively. It most certainly is not gigabit broadband.

Community facilities

We are fortunate to have the excellent Victoria Hall in Sutton Scotney which caters for many and varied community activities and private bookings. The hall is a registered charity and is run by a committee of trustees.

We also enjoy the open space at The Gratton recreation ground which is looked after by The Gratton Trust.

There are no organised activities such as a youth club for young people.

Public Utilities

There is no mains drainage for the majority of the Parish. We are not on the gas grid. Therefore, we rely on electricity, oil, LPG or wood for home energy requirements. Our electricity supply is currently barely adequate with frequent 'micro power cuts' which last for a few seconds but are enough to crash computers and require clocks and timers to be reset. Any new development will require all electric homes with EV charging points.

Lack of local infrastructure

Even though every parish/town council complains about the lack of local infrastructure in respect of adding to their population it cannot, and should not, simply be ignored. The availability of GP and Dentist appointments, school places, public transport, supermarkets, shops and employment are all of importance to every community and we should not make life even harder for people when the aims of a greener future are to give residents a healthier less stressful lifestyle. Rural villages do not adapt to 20 minute neighbourhoods.

CN1 Mitigating and adapting to Climate Change

See Also comments Policy T1. An infrequent bus service not suited to shift workers or residents wishing to avail themselves in the evenings of facilities in Winchester mean that private car use is essential.

More homes requiring more deliveries from online shopping will mean ever more delivery vans entering the village on a daily basis. Patients visiting the Gratton Surgery drive their cars from considerable distances to

attend appointments. All of this traffic comes from outside the village and increases CO2 and air and noise pollution.

D7 Development Standards

Pollution (excluding noise)

Development which generates pollution or is sensitive to it, and accords with the Development Plan, will only be permitted where it achieves an acceptable standard of environmental quality and avoids unacceptable impacts on health or quality of life.

Although there is no readily available data available it can be anticipated that Sutton Scotney suffers from high levels of airborne pollution due to their proximity to the high volumes of traffic on the A34, A303 and A30. Air pollution is the biggest environmental threat to health in the UK, with between 29,000 and 43,000 deaths a year being attributed to long-term exposure. (UK Health Security Agency 2022).

Ignoring this issue will have a very negative impact on the health of new residents.

Noise

Development which generates noise pollution or is sensitive to it will only be permitted where it accords with the Development Plan and does not have an unacceptable impact on human health or quality of life.

The majority of the site is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are above 50 dB or the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are above 55 dB. Due to the proximity of the site to the services and major roads a noise assessment will be required in accordance with policy D7.

The close proximity of three trunk roads (A34/A303/A30) means a high level of traffic noise for at least 18 hours a day. It continues to a lesser extent at night but, with windows open on hot summer nights, it does interfere with a good night's sleep. Often, the A30 is used as a night time detour when roadworks necessitate closure of the A303 between Micheldever Station and Andover and Bullington Lane and Oxford Road as a detour when the A34 is closed. Similarly when either the A303 or A34 are closed by road traffic incidents (regularly) then the village is the detour route.

T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel

Public transport

We have a bus service serving Sutton Scotney to and from Winchester and Andover. Two routes have recently amalgamated so the village now shares a bus with Andover. Without the requirement for students to travel to secondary schools it is highly likely that our bus service would not exist. Public transport is of no use whatsoever to shift workers who require early and late buses. Monday to Friday the service is generally hourly, but less frequent on Saturdays and with no service at all on Sundays and Bank holidays.

At best, the bus service can be described as adequate for the demand which is essentially from students and senior citizens.

Hampshire County Council are the public transport authority but appear to have no money to subsidise bus services. Winchester District Council have no responsibility to ensure an efficient public transport service

leaving provision to a commercial decision by bus operator Stagecoach. If demand is not sustained then the bus service will cease.

Walking and Cycling

Walking in Sutton Scotney is reasonably safe and easy as there are footpaths on Oxford Road and on Stockbridge Road West (south side). Vegetation along the latter is often a problem in late summer requiring detours onto the verges.

Since the Post Office moved from the Dever Stores in Oxford Road to the Texaco Garage on Bullington Lane there is a real hazard in crossing the north end of Oxford Road near the Water Treatment Plant due to fast moving traffic coming off the A30. There is no crossing point or proper footpath and Hampshire County Council refused to create a proper footpath through the trees on the north east corner of Oxford Road as to do so would indicate that it was an approved place to cross the road when, in fact, it was too dangerous. Copy of email dated 20th April 2021 from Hampshire Highways attached as Appendix B. Paragraph 3 applies.

I fail to see how any developer can meaningfully link in to the existing pavement/footpath system other than providing the means to cross the A30 and additionally across Oxford road to complete the journey to the Post Office. There is no cycle network to connect with.

T4 Access to New Developments

An additional crossing will be required on Oxford Road south of the roundabout and within the 30mph limit to serve the Post Office, Winchester bus stop and the school bus pick up. (This is not mentioned in SU01).

This poses problems as vehicles park the whole length of the east side of Oxford Road. Clearly a crossing between parked cars is not safe. Therefore, a parking ban will be required for an appropriate distance requiring yellow lines in a conservation area and depriving existing residents of parking spaces.

NE1 Protecting and enhancing Biodiversity and the Natural Environment in the District
Ecological Buffer Zones (2023 SHELAA report)

WO10 Brightlands

Within 200m of Priority Habitats

Within 200m of Protected Species Records

Within 100m of moving water

Within 1km of SSSI

Loss of agricultural land

Reg 19 IIA Non Technical Summary page 18

Although the District has very little of the highest grades of agricultural land, its large areas of Grade 3 agricultural land are a significant asset to the District, and new development and climate change put pressure on the availability and productivity of such soils.

SU01 is currently given over to agriculture. It is Grade 3 Agricultural Land and is particularly productive with high quality arable crops being used for seed production. It would be short-sighted indeed if we sacrificed good productive land for housing when there are alternative, more suitably sized sites remaining.

NE6 Flooding, Flood risk and the Water Environment
SU01

The village of Sutton Scotney has experienced high levels of groundwater flooding and infiltration drainage issues. Due to historic flooding events, it is advised to engage early with the Lead Flood Authority. Additionally, engagement with the Environment Agency is encouraged because of the site's proximity to flood zones 2 and 3. Given the historical presence of silt in the area, as part of the design process, it will need to be demonstrated how this issue is dealt with during construction and post occupation. As there can be high levels of groundwater which have the potential to restrict drainage outfalls for a considerable period, surcharging will need to be considered with appropriate SuDS / land uses considered to manage flood risk in a groundwater flood event scenario. In order to be able to manage groundwater flood risk, the use of open space and SUDS should be considered to create a buffer between the site and the main road to the south. The inclusion of the above paragraph recognises the considerable risk of developing Brightlands in relation to flooding. The land at Brightlands acts as a huge sponge protecting the village from flooding from the north and west. I have figures relating to rainfall absorbency and potential for flooding from surface water runoff. See Appendix C

Development is a big risk in relation to flooding.

NE14 Rural Character

Sutton Scotney village population has doubled in size since 1998. There have been significant new developments in Saddlers Close, Sutton Park Road, Pigeon House Yard, Pigeon House Field, Taylors Yard, Station Drive, Buddlesgate and Harding Close. There has been so much development that the area inside the settlement boundary is now full. The previous biggest development was 30 homes. Adding 60 - 120 new homes to the village is out of all proportion to the existing village size and will irreversibly alter the rural character of Sutton Scotney.

NE16 Nutrient Neutrality Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas

Reg 19 IIA Non Technical Summary page 19

Pollution from surface water runoff from both agricultural and urban areas can occur during extreme weather events which are more likely to occur with climate change. Increased levels of nitrogen and phosphorus input to rivers in Winchester District from agricultural sources or from wastewater from existing housing and other development are adversely affecting water quality in some of those rivers, including the River Itchen SSSI and SAC.

This fails to recognise similar issues affecting the SSSI of the River Dever and River Test from development on Brightlands. See NE17. Also, sewage from new development at Brightlands will be treated at Harestock and discharged into the River Itchen. In effect Brightlands will be discharging into both SSSI's in the district. Not something to be lightly overlooked.

NE17 Rivers and Their Settings

Chalk streams are a rare and valuable habitat. Etc...

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>The cleanliness of surface water runoff from any Brightlands development is crucial to the protection of this world renowned rare and valuable habitat since the River Dever feeds directly into the Test.</p> <p>Winchester District Local Plan</p> <p>Sadly, in the case of Sutton Scotney, the LPA totally failed us in this respect. Whilst they may be correct in law that land allocations are not required at Regulation 18 stage, how does this sit with regard to the more than 3,000 public responses at Regulation 18 from other towns and parishes, of which more than 800 related to land allocations? Representations at Regulation 19 cannot really define the shape of anything; at best pointing out obvious errors and failings.</p> <p>If procedures can be a reason for failing a soundness test then, in the case of SU01, this policy should fail. Sutton Scotney was not included at Regulation 18 and residents were not consulted in accordance with the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. It cannot be right that 99% of the residents of the Winchester District have a comprehensive say in the Plan but 1% at Sutton Scotney do not.</p> <p>The Policy SU01 should also fail in soundness as all proportionate evidence has not been considered and there has been a clear failure to fairly examine other reasonable alternatives, particularly land allocation WO11 (2023 SHELAA report) land south of Wonston Road and for residents to be given a choice. On 4th September 2024 the Parish Council held a public meeting in Sutton Scotney where the overwhelming choice of site was for WO11. (See Wonston Parish Council response) When most village facilities are east of Oxford Road (Post Office, Dever Stores, GP Surgery, Victoria Hall, Winchester bus stop, School bus pick up and drop off stops, Gratton Recreation Ground) it makes little sense to make new residents cross the A30 and Oxford Road to access them when living at WO11 would mean crossing just one minor road.</p> <p>The decision to select SU01 over WO11 is also flawed regarding the number of homes to be built. Why lose hectares of agricultural land for 60 homes when there is another site WO11 half that size and better suited to village inclusion? The total confusion of new home numbers mentioned earlier is indicative of the rushed and muddled inclusion of SU01.</p> <p>Policy SU01 should also fail as it is unlikely to be deliverable based on 50–60 homes and building 100-120 homes to achieve profitability will be out of all proportion to the size of the existing village and the reported aims of the LPA.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Both SHELAA sites in Sutton Scotney (SU01 and WO11) should be examined equally and the Parish Council and local residents should be properly consulted. Fully costed plans for 50-60 homes on both SU01 Brightlands and WO11 Land south on Wonston Road should be made available as costs for developing the sites taking into account the listed constraints could be very different.</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> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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) Supporting Document 1 (copy of Wates Development Regulation 18 response) Supporting Document 2 (Letter from Hampshire Highways to Wonston PC) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| 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/36/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>INTERMEDIATE RURAL SETTLEMENTS SUTTON SCOTNEY</p> <p>Southern Water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for Sutton Scotney. We recognise the council's concern regarding 'foul drainage issues' in Sutton Scotney. Please note that foul sewer networks can be vulnerable to blockages or to being overwhelmed during storm periods, and so it is not possible to state that all drainage issues can be resolved through the delivery of capital schemes. However, a scheme is underway that will provide a more resilient wastewater network in Sutton Scotney. This scheme is due to be completed by March 2025. A further scheme on the wastewater network in Harestock is planned for the next water industry Financial Plan period of 2025 – 2030. The sewer network in Harestock will receive flows from Sutton Scotney and so this second scheme will supplement the upgrades delivered in the first scheme. Therefore, we recommend amendments to the wording in the paragraph below, or for our proposed wording to be set out as a separate paragraph.</p> <p>Current Wording 14.178 Sutton Scotney is within the group of 'intermediate' settlements, with an aim to identify new sites for 50-60 dwellings. There are currently foul drainage issues but these are due to be resolved by Southern Water in March 2025. It is expected that there is capacity for the development of about 80 dwellings in Sutton Scotney, which can be achieved as follows:</p> <p>Recommendation 14.178 Sutton Scotney is within the group of 'intermediate' settlements, with an aim to identify new sites for 50-60 dwellings. Southern Water are currently delivering a project to upgrade their wastewater treatment sites located at Saddlers Close & Gratton Close. These sites require upgrades to ensure that they are compliant with new environmental standards and to prevent pollution spills. The project is due for completion in March 2025. A second project is required to upgrade the 'receiving' sewer network in the Harestock sewer catchment, which will be delivered as a business priority early in the next water industry Financial Plan period of 2025 – 2030. These schemes, once completed, will be sufficient to allow the sewer catchments serving</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Sutton Scotney to meet the growth needs projected in the local plan and any new drainage connections from existing properties.</p> <p>Policy SU01 LAND AT BRIGHTLANDS</p> <p>Southern Water are currently delivering a project to upgrade the wastewater treatment sites located at Saddlers Close & Gratton Close. These sites require upgrades to ensure that they are compliant with new environmental standards and to prevent pollution spills. The project is due for completion in March 2025. A second project is required to upgrade the 'receiving' sewer network in the Harestock sewer catchment, which will be delivered as a business priority early in the next water industry Financial Plan period of 2025 – 2030. These schemes, once completed, will be sufficient to allow the sewer catchments serving Sutton Scotney to meet the growth needs projected in the local plan and any new drainage connections from existing properties.</p> <p>We also 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 amendments to the criterion below for Policy SU01:</p> <p>Current wording</p> <p>xvii. Occupation of development will be phased to align with and drain to the new sewerage pipeline between Sutton Scotney and South Wonston, the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider. Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes;</p> <p>Proposed amended wording</p> <p>xvii. Occupation of development will be phased to align with delivery of Wastewater Infrastructure upgrades at Sutton Scotney and at Harestock in consultation with the service provider. Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes;</p> <p>Note that there is limited existing sewerage infrastructure in Sutton Scotney, and therefore new sewers may need to be laid 'off site' to drain wastewater from the new development to a practical point of connection and to serve new drainage connections from existing properties.</p> <p>As such we propose the following new criterion for Policy SU01.</p> <p>New and improved sewerage infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the plan</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>We are proposing the following modifications.</p> <p>14.178</p> <p>Sutton Scotney is within the group of 'intermediate' settlements, with an aim to identify new sites for 50-60 dwellings. Southern Water are currently delivering a project to upgrade their wastewater treatment sites</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>located at Saddlers Close & Gratton Close. These sites require upgrades to ensure that they are compliant with new environmental standards and to prevent pollution spills. The project is due for completion in March 2025. A second project is required to upgrade the 'receiving' sewer network in the Harestock sewer catchment, which will be delivered as a business priority early in the next water industry Financial Plan period of 2025 – 2030. These schemes, once completed, will be sufficient to allow the sewer catchments serving Sutton Scotney to meet the growth needs projected in the local plan and any new drainage connections from existing properties.</p> <p>xvii. Occupation of development will be phased to align with delivery of Wastewater Infrastructure upgrades at Sutton Scotney and at Harestock in consultation with the service provider. Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes;</p> <p>New and improved sewerage infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the plan</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>14.178 Sutton Scotney is within the group of 'intermediate' settlements, with an aim to identify new sites for 50-60 dwellings. Southern Water are currently delivering a project to upgrade their wastewater treatment sites located at Saddlers Close & Grat</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>Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Susan Lane |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPW-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPW-N/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The addition of 60 homes to Sutton Scotney would give a population increase percentage of some 10%. Local services are already stretched with the GP surgery having a waiting time of 5 weeks to obtain an appointment. Bus services have been reduced further this week (Oct 1) and local roads are already crowded. Employment opportunities will be almost entirely outside the village meaning that new residents will be forced to use cars. School children will travel to South Wonston and Winchester. However, if forced to accept this new allocation of houses I consider that Brightlands is the preferable site despite its major drawback lying north of the A30. My reasons for opposing the alternative site on Dairy Meadow lie largely on the risk of flooding. I have lived opposite the site for nearly 50 years, was twice flooded when living in Witts Cottage, and the property was flooded for a third time after I had moved to my present house next door. The Victoria Hall car park was badly flooded in 2014 and the Hall itself was in danger of the water overtopping the floor by just one inch. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Foul drainage: Greater certainty about Southern Water's plans to install a new pipe line to Harestock and one that would allow access from this site. A30 pedestrian road crossing: A more adequate road crossing would be needed than the one provided for access to the Garage and Post Office. This allows one or two people to cross but one can imagine groups of children needing to cross at any time to reach the school bus for example. Finance to enhance the Gratton Surgery: An already struggling service would need support to care for this population increase |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Foul drainage: A guarantee and dateline from Southern Water to install adequate foul drainafge from the Brightlands site. Pedestrian raod crossing: A safe and adequate road crossing over the A30 to be installed. Gratton Surgery: Legal provision required t |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Susan Neilson |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BRE-5 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BRE-5/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Residents of the village have not been sufficiently notified of any proposed development. There is reference to 'mains drainage' which the village DOES NOT have and many residents have frequent issues with their private drainage arrangements. There is talk of connecting into the pipeline between Sutton Scotney and South Wonston - this is not possible as the pipeline is pressurised (reference - Southern Water). The only connection would be into the Saddlers Close plant and current residents have been advised that they cannot be connected into this as Southern Water state it is now at maximum capacity. I strongly object that any new housing should get priority with regard to drainage connections over current residents that have been experiencing issues for many years. With the unprecedented high volumes of rain over the past few years, cesspits and septic tanks have required frequent emptying. There is risk of contaminating land when waste collection companies cannot attend in a timely manner as they are unable to dispose of loads when sewage farm depots close when full. This has happened to us on numerous occasions in the past few years. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Further consultation with residents Assurance that number of properties built is limited to 60 (as per plan) Assurance that Southern Water will connect existing homes to mains drainage as a priority |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Tessa Robertson |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MT-Y |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MT-Y/2/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>We are concerned at the confusion surrounding this site allocation, which is new since the Regulation 18 draft. Although the City Council has confirmed verbally to the Dever Society that the maximum number of dwellings on the Brightlands site will be 60, the developer has told the parish council and the media that the development would have to be 100-120 dwellings to be financially viable. There is therefore concern in the community that the development would inevitably increase to this size. This would not be acceptable to the Dever Society, as a development of this size would overwhelm the village and community and would infringe the Council's own spatial housing distribution in Policy H3.</p> <p>To clarify these concerns, we urge the Council to confirm that the final number of homes on this site will be no more than 60.</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</i> | No |

*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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Tom Evison |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFX-C |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFX-C/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | The additional of SU01 came late having not been previously considered at Regulation 18. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | SU01 needs removing at this time and reconsidering before further inclusion. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | No suggested text. |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Veronica Oldfield |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TX-A |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32TX-A/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The Brightlands site has several very serious issues that must be addressed before any development can be permitted. At present these issues make the policy unsound in my opinion.</p> <p>Issue 1 relates to Paragraph 14.184 Also The National Planning Policy Framework - Planning and Flood Risk Paragraph 165 states: "Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere."</p> <p>The site of the proposed Brightlands development and nearby Oxford Road have been subject to serious flooding and the proposed Brightlands development would increase the flood risk for the village.</p> <p>Issue 2 relates to Paragraph 14.182 Also to The National Planning Policy Framework - Promoting Sustainable Transport Paragraphs 108 - 117 The considerable traffic coming out of the proposed development will be mostly using Oxford Road - in order to reach Winchester centre, Winchester Station, schools and sixth form colleges in the Winchester and South Wonston areas. Movement will be concentrated at certain times of the day. Oxford Road is narrow and is further narrowed by parking. The extra movement of vehicles will undoubtedly cause long queues along Oxford Road polluting the area and making the transport system unsustainable. This would not be good for the health of those journeying from the proposed development nor for those living in the village. It would also detrimentally affect the business of the local shop which relies on passing traffic and on local parking on Oxford Road.</p> <p>Issue 3 relates to Paragraphs 14.178 and 14.185 also to The National Planning Policy Framework - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment The beautiful River Dever runs very near the site of the proposed Brightlands development. Very serious foul drainage problems have been a constant in the area right beside the proposed development and based on the very protracted issues with Southern Water over this, it cannot be assumed that Southern Water would accommodate the extra foul drainage requirements that the proposed development would bring. This could be disastrous for the River Dever and for pollution in the area generally. Completion of works to</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>accommodate the extra foul drainage demands would need be secured before any development could be started so that Southern Water could not fail to deliver.</p> <p>Issue 4 relates to Paragraphs 14.186 and 14.187</p> <p>Both the health of those residing in the new homes and those already in the village must be a top priority consideration. The health of all in the village would be very seriously affected if there is not a planning condition that proportionate extra primary healthcare must be provided in the area. The Gratton Surgery cannot absorb the extra patients.</p> <p>To sum up, the development of the rural Brightlands site has serious issues over flooding, sustainable transport, foul drainage and primary healthcare provision.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Strong enforceable planning conditions would be needed for the flooding and healthcare issues. Sustainable transport through Oxford Road is a very difficult issue. Southern Water should be held to making provision to accommodate the foul drainage from the proposed Brightlands development before planning is approved. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Strong enforceable planning conditions would be needed for the flooding and healthcare issues. Sustainable transport through Oxford Road is a very difficult issue. Southern Water should be held to making provision to accommodate the foul drainage from the |
| 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 | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Wates Developments Ltd. ('Wates') |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3286-C |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/18/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Full response on website Sutton Scotney</p> <p>9.1 Wates reads paragraph 14.178 of the Local Plan with some disappointment: Sutton Scotney is within the group of 'intermediate' settlements, with an aim to identify new sites for 50-60 dwellings. There are currently foul drainage issues but these are due to be resolved by Southern Water in March 2025. It is expected that there is capacity for the development of about 80 dwellings in Sutton Scotney</p> <p>9.2 First, sites of 50-60 seem to be quite limiting on settlements the size – and with the level of services and facilities – of Sutton Scotney. Sites of around 100-120 dwellings have greater potential to deliver Affordable Housing, and other community benefits because the viability of development at this scale is likely to be much greater. Moreover, with the potential shortfall in the housing target that is identified in these submissions, seeking some more houses at "intermediate settlements" might become necessary.</p> <p>9.3 Second, it is suggested that development of Land at Brightlands can also assist in the improvement of foul drainage - albeit these issues are to be resolved by Southern Water in early 2025. The scale of the site, and potential development, has the scope to include a solution to sewerage issues and Wates continues to work with its consultants and other relevant authorities in progressing matters.</p> <p>9.4 At the very least, the figure for a settlement should be described as a minimum. In this way it would be in conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, and with the Framework, which seeks to boost significantly the supply of new homes.</p> <p>9.5 Given that the plan period is proposed to last for 20 years – and even if the plan is reviewed in this time – it is still somewhat draconian, and not justified, to effectively place a moratorium on development at Sutton Scotney based on a technical issue where solutions can be found.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries</p> <p>9.6 Wates' opinion is that settlement boundaries are an arbitrary and blunt instrument, which do not have regard to the contribution that some open spaces within settlements make to the character and appearance of those settlements. In terms of impact on amenity and the local landscape it might be preferable to locate new homes in edge of village locations which technically, might sit outside the</p> |

arbitrary boundaries. It is therefore suggested that the philosophy and operation of settlement boundaries is carefully considered in the Council's final drafting exercises before the Local Plan is published to ensure that they are still generally fit for purpose. Wates submits that the Councils will need to reflect on the operation of settlement boundaries and how they comply with the Planning Practice Guidance as follows:

"The nature of rural housing needs can be reflected in the spatial strategy set out in relevant policies, including in the housing requirement figures for any designated rural areas. A wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness."

Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 67-009-20190722

Legally compliant Yes

Positively prepared Yes

Sound No

Justified Yes

Compliant with the duty to cooperate Yes

Effective No

Compliant with national policy Yes

Wates strongly supports this proposed allocation in the Local Plan. The relevant parts of the draft policy are considered below.

9.8 Land at Brightlands, Sutton Scotney as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for about 50-60 dwellings and an area of informal open space. Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific requirements:

Please refer to the table of changes shown separately on the Local Plan website.

The draft policy sets out the threshold for development as 50 to 60 dwellings on the site. However, the technical works undertaken to support the emerging Master Plan, clearly establishes that the site can accommodate up to 120 dwellings. Furthermore, the SHELAA published in 2023, identifies the capacity of the site to accommodate 95 dwellings.

9.10 Paragraph 123 of the Framework directs planning policies to promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. The same provisions are included the Council's in proposed Policy D6. Limiting the quantum of development to simply 60 dwellings on the site appears to be in direct conflict with this provision of the Framework, and the Council's own plan. Wates' is of the opinion that housing development should be provided at a target responding to the site and its context, at up to 120 dwellings. Not allocating the site in a way which makes best use of its capacity, risks the Council needing to find more greenfield sites in the rural parts of the plan area to meet the identified need.

Vision document is shown separately on the Local Plan website.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Please refer to the table of changes shown separately on the Local Plan website. The proposed policy must allow for greater quantum of development on the site and the threshold for development should be increased to at least 120 dwellings to allow for efficient use of land and viability of the scheme. 9.12 As detailed above, criterion (ii) proposing the development to be phased during the latter part of the Plan period is in against the provisions of the Framework and the Government's ambition to boost housing supply. 9.13 As evidenced in the Drainage Note prepared by Ramboll, Southern Water has confirmed that proposed development can be accommodated prior to any upgrades. Thus, Criterion (xvii) is considered unnecessary and should be omitted.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | |
| <p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p> | |
| <p>If no, please explain</p> | |
| <p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p> | <p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p> |
| <p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p> | <p>Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | SU01 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Wonston Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP6-M - Wonston Parish Council |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP6-M - Wonston Parish Council/1/SU01 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Policy SU01 states that the land at Brightlands is allocated for 'about 50-60 dwellings'. The developers report supplied to Winchester City Council (Appendix 1) states that 'the site is being promoted as a single opportunity' and refers to 120 homes throughout. Page 11 of the report states 'sites of 50-60 seem to be quite limiting'. On 20th September 2024 the developer wrote to the Parish Council (Appendix 2) and continued to refer to 120 homes.</p> <p>In respect of the alternative SHELAA site in Sutton Scotney (WO11), considered in the WCC Sutton Scotney Site Selection Report , the developer was asked to provide a viability report based on 50-60 dwellings, but the developer of the Brightlands site was not asked to do this. Indeed, their letter of 20th September 2024 (Appendix 2) confirms that they were only made aware of the site's inclusion in the Regulation 19 on 19th August 2024. Their proposals are based on 120 homes. The Brightlands site has many constraints, more than any of the other Market Town and Rural development allocation sites in the Regulation 19, making it an expensive site to develop.</p> <p>The Parish Council consider Policy SU01 to be unsound as the site, unlike site WO11, has not been shown to be viable at 50-60 dwellings. The policy is not effective as it is not deliverable and also not justified as it is not an 'appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence'.</p> <p>The Parish Council consider the access proposals in Policy SU01 to be unsound. They do not meet the 'justified' test as an appropriate strategy as they are based on errors, a lack of understanding of the site and undue reliance on the proposals of the developer which do not appear to have been verified or challenged. The developer states on page 5 of their report (Appendix 1) 'Pre-application discussions with the Local Highway Authority, Hampshire County Council has provided positive feedback in relation to the site from a highways and transportation perspective.</p> <p>In 2021 Hampshire Highways refused a request from the Parish Council to surface an informal path from the Brightlands site due to safety concerns for pedestrians (Appendix 3). More recently the Parish Council have been liaising with Hampshire Highways on a scheme to install features to lower speeds and improve pedestrian safety on the approach to Oxford Road from the roundabout noted in Policy SU01. The Hampshire Highways officer designing these features has confirmed that he has been unable to find any evidence of pre-</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>application advice having been provided in respect of any proposed development at Brightlands or connection to the roundabout (Appendix 4).</p> <p>Appendix 5 demonstrates the issues in respect of accessing the Brightlands site at the existing roundabout. Contrary to Policy NE1 it would require considerable hedgerow removal and, contrary to Policy NE4, the railway bridge prevents there being room for a pavement or safe access across the A30. Any new development could not therefore have a safe pedestrian link to Sutton Scotney, contrary to Policy SU01 and contradicts Policies SP2 and SP3 as, without safe pedestrian routes, car use will be encouraged. Contrary to Policy D1 there would be no 'connectivity to the surrounding area'. Contrary to Policy T4 there would not be appropriate crossings or safe access from the site.</p> <p>Point viii in Policy SU01 appears to have been lifted directly from the developer's report. The PROW on Brightlands land has led nowhere since being cut-off following the opening of the A34 in 1981.</p> <p>Policy SU01 does not reference Policy NE6 in respect of safeguarding designated structures and features that are required for current and future flood management.</p> <p>Site SU01 is in flood zone 1, the proposed access at the roundabout is in flood zones 2 and 3 and is adjacent to the Bogmoor Sump. The sump and a network of pipes which run under the roundabout are crucial to the movement of water and to seeking to prevent flooding in a high risk area as shown in the Bogmoor Sump Flood Map (Appendix 6) and the home flood report provided by a nearby resident (Appendix 7). Any alteration to the roundabout would need to safeguard the sump and pipe network.</p> <p>SU01 is not considered a sound or appropriate strategy as it does not seek to safeguard structures crucial to flood management.</p> <p>The Brightlands site has been included in the Regulation 19 following a Statement of Common Ground between WCC and Southern Water in respect of a pressurised pipeline being constructed to alleviate some of the severe sewage issues in Sutton Scotney which currently has no mains drainage.</p> <p>For over five years three developments in the village have relied on waste being removed by tankers. During this time Southern Water have failed to meet any of their own deadlines and what has been achieved has fallen significantly short of the promises and assurances made to residents. The Policy SU01 is not considered sound and deliverable unless amended to clearly state that no development (of any type) can commence until the Southern Water pipeline is fully functioning and has proven capacity for all current residents of Sutton Scotney and any additional new dwellings.</p> |
| <p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p> | <p>Viability - the developer should have been asked (as the developer of site WO11 was) to produce a viability report based on 50-60 dwellings.</p> <p>Access and flood management - alternative vehicle access for the site could be investigated but there is no safe pedestrian access to Sutton Scotney from the site.</p> <p>Sewerage - as above, there should be a delay in any development until the pipeline is fully operational and evidence is provided to show that it has capacity for all existing and proposed new dwellings in the village.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 Supporting document 1 (copy of Wates Development Regulation 18 response) Supporting document 2 (Letter from Wates Development to Wonston Parish Council re:Land at Brightlands) Supporting document 3 (Letter to Parish Council from Hampshire Highways) Supporting document 4 (Email re: pre-application) Supporting document 5 (photographs of site with comments) Supporting document 6 (Flooding map) Supporting document 7 (Groundsure - flooding information) Supporting document 8 (Copy of Parish Council questionnaire) Supporting document 9 (Reponses to PC questionnaire) |

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification](#) agreed with Historic England in relation to paragraph 14.183 (in relation to potential archaeological finds)

[Proposed Modification](#) agreed with Southern Water in relation to policy criterion xvii (relating to wastewater infrastructure)

[Proposed Modification](#) agreed with Southern Water in relation to a new criterion xix relating sewerage infrastructure