

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

### South Wonston Allocations

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.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy SW01 Land at West Hill Road North	
Total Number of Representations received	23	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Legally Compliant	5	14
Sound	0	19
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	4	15
<p><b>Summary of Representations</b></p> <p>A number of pressing concerns were raised in relation to proposed developments in South Wonston. A clear focus is on infrastructure and service limitations, with roads like Alresford Drove criticized for being too narrow and unsafe for increased traffic, alongside insufficient public transport and deficient healthcare services. The local primary school is also described as nearing capacity, while employment and utility shortfalls exacerbate the strain on services.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concerns over unsuitability of allocating this site for development due to inadequate infrastructure, threatening sustainability and environmental impact as the site is a sensitive greenfield location, affecting local biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>Traffic and road safety issues were raised as key issues, with narrow roads and insufficient public transport leading to increased reliance on cars, posing potential safety risks, especially around the primary school.</p> <p>Environmental concerns stress the harm to biodiversity and landscape, questioning development compatibility with sustainability frameworks.</p> <p>Lastly, there are strong calls for improved public consultation and planning transparency, with critics citing inadequate community engagement and legal compliance in decision-making processes.</p>		
<p><b>Representation Numbers</b> (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BNN-A/1/SW01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BYE-C/1/SW01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B8D-A/1/SW01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BW6-U/1/SW01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B47-S/1/SW01</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B4M-F/1/SW01</p> <p><b>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/8/SW01</b></p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B83-S/1/SW01</p> <p><b>ANON-AQTS-3B55-R - South Wonston Parish Council/1/SW01</b></p>		

ANON-AQTS-329F-W/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-329Y-G/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32UT-7/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32NH-M/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32ZZ-J/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32DP-J/2/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-3B5P-K/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32HS-S/1/SW01  
ANON-AQTS-32H3-S/1/SW01  
BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/1/SW01  
BHLF-AQTS-326K-Y/1/SW01  
BHLF-AQTS-32Y9-G/1/SW01  
BHLF-AQTS-32YS-A/1/SW01  
BHLF-AQTS-32YV-D/1/SW01

**Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation**

- Compatibility with sustainable development goals;
- Strain on local services such as - school, public transport and healthcare service limitations, lack of employment and utility shortfalls;
- Traffic and safety issues; and
- Local biodiversity and landscape impacts of development.

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Ann Jocelyn Peal
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B55-R - South Wonston Parish Council
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B55-R - South Wonston Parish Council/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>Winchester City Council failed to carry out their own methodology (WDLP2 Settlement Boundary Review 2014 p6) regarding settlement boundary adjustment. There was no prior consultation, contrary to the Statement of Community Involvement required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2005 and NPPF 2023 16 c. The access to the extension is via the front driveway of 1, Canterbury Cottages (Maps p465), inappropriate in planning terms. The site allocation has a number of drawbacks. It is a greenfield site, outside the settlement boundary and in the countryside (NPPF 124c). SW05 (SHELAA), a brownfield site, was rejected. The Alresford Drove crossroads (14.171 SW01 iii) hosts peak hour traffic heading to school, factory, and a second village exit on narrow rural roads (NPPF 115). Local information indicates the presence of bat commuting corridors on West Hill Rd North and Alresford Drove. Species include the endangered serotine bat. There is no reference to biodiversity in policy or preamble (Batural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, NPPF 180 a and d, 185b, 186a and 188). The quality of the site's soils (1,2 and 3) demonstrate a better use for food production, preferably as Parish Council Allotments or Community Orchard, both long-held aspirations (NPPF 180 a and b, 181, 124 b and Note 62 p52). Development would have a significant impact on the landscape, rural character and views (14.171) (NPPF 180 a and b and View 2, GDG 2 South Wonston Village Design Statement 2014). The supporting text and requirements refer to infrastructure issues: mains drainage (14.175 SW01 x) and the inadequacy of the Gratton Surgery in neighbouring Sutton Scotney (14.176). Septic tanks feature in the site's vicinity. An upgrade to the receiving sewer network must be completed before 2030 to serve a new development. If it is not, the developer will have to choose between septic tanks or the nearest location to stressed and occasionally overflowing mains drainage (SW01 x). Developers' contributions are expected for infrastructure needed to make SW01 acceptable in planning terms (SW01 xii), to the surgery and to secondary education (14.174) in particular. Will contributions plus other associated costs make the site viable and deliverable? SW01 ii refers to applications for all or part of the site. The whole site is not for sale. Owners of the eastern portion are undecided. Would it be viable to only deliver part of the site with the requirements unchanged? If not, Regulation 19 SPR (p27) regarding the permission of development in accord with the site</p>

	<p>allocations could not be fulfilled. In the above respects, South Wonston Parish Council finds Policy SW01 neither sound, justified, effective nor compliant.</p>
<p><b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b></p>	<p>A brief explanation of the reason for selecting SW01 and what consideration was given to the nearest , a slightly more detailed description of the impact on highway safety and the road network, a new requirement to protect and enhance the site's undesignated biodiversity by having the developer commission a professional survey to show likely effects of development, identify mitigation measures and opportunities for biodiversity gain, a short piece on the site's quality soils and previous use, and an explanation of why that use will not continue despite the possibility of an alternative to housing, a detailed reference to View 2, GDG 2, South Wonston Village Design Statement 2014 and an expanded item about mitigation for the impact of development on the landscape and rural character. With regard to the settlement boundary adjustment, the nature of the access might usefully be included and a note to the effect that Winchester City Council will consult South Wonston Parish Council on the proposed adjustment, the Parish Council will invite the affected householders to its own consultation and conduct an assessment to identify future development needs. Whether the current adjustment remains will depend on the outcome of the consultations and assessment.</p>
<p><b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b></p>	<p>Addition to the Supporting Text: "SW01 was included in the Allocations because, although the site was rated visually sensitive, it offered an opportunity to deliver houses and a cycle access to the village centre. The nearest brownfield site was not considered sustainably located in relation to the settlement".</p> <p>Addition to the Supporting Text: "The chief highway issues are the hazardous Alresford Drove/West Hill Rd North crossroads, where recent signage and lining have improved visibility but much is dependent on traffic behaviour, the peak hour traffic into the village or out to the exit on to Old Stoke Rd, large agricultural vehicles, school buses and occasional overweight lorries on very narrow or not much wider rural roads and danger to frequent pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders"</p> <p>Requirement iii: "Mitigation will include a safe access onto West Hill Rd North with visibility splays at a safe distance from Alresford Drove, and a footpath and cycleway on West Hill Rd North, a minor rural road".</p> <p>A new Requirement after vi: "The site's undesignated biodiversity and protected species will be protected and enhanced by having the developer commission a professional survey to show likely effects of development, identify mitigation measures and opportunities for biodiversity gain".</p> <p>Supporting Text: "The site was previously in agricultural use, latterly for grazing. Soils in the Grades 1,2 and 3 are present, indicating a viable alternative use for small scale food production, but the land is now destined for more profitable use to meet current housing targets".</p> <p>Requirement vii: "...wider views to the north, specifically View 2, Looking towards South Wonston Farm, GDG 2 South Wonston's downland setting and panoramic views should not be harmed by development that would be inappropriate or intrusive to the important views shown on Map No.5, South Wonston Village Design Statement 2014".</p> <p>Supporting Text: "The impact of development on the local landscape, rural character and identified important view must be mitigated by appropriate measures such as minimising visual intrusion and careful selection of</p>

	<p>materials, and design solutions to problems of scale and massing to be considered at the planning application stage".</p> <p>Settlement Boundary Adjustment: "The only available access to the Land adjacent to Chaucer Close and the rear gardens of 63-69 Wrights Way is through the front driveway of 1, Canterbury Cottages and the two parking spaces between the previously proposed Plots B and C (21/02504/FUL, refused)".</p> <p>"Winchester City Council will consult South Wonston Parish Council on the proposed adjustment, the Parish Council will invite the affected householders to its own consultation and conduct an assessment to identify future development needs. Whether the current adjustment remains will depend on the outcome of the consultations and assessment".</p>
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>  <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>

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Anna Brown
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32H3-S
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32H3-S/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The NPPF states that rural area housing has to meet demonstrable need and have sufficient facilities - South Wonston does not and this new development will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>This development is in completely the wrong place. Alresford Drove is an unadopted road - single carriage way with passing places. The end of the site joins onto a blind and narrow junction - having an additional 80 cars trying to exit there is too dangerous.</p> <p>This site falls outside the village development boundary, puts cars onto a dangerous road, and there is insufficient infrastructure in the village to support it. There are limited opportunities for employment, there is no medical facility or pub, and there is very limited public transport. The village already has problems with water supply and sewerage and this development will make that worse. There is also poor or non-existent mobile phone and internet coverage at that end of the village. It is an unneeded development in possibly the worse place to build in the village. There is already hundreds of houses at Barton Farm, with more proposed for Sir John Moore Barracks - why would a further 40 here, in a village that cannot sustain it, help the situation.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	Ensure they have correctly understood the road situation and how dangerous the sharp bend there is.
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session

<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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>
---	-----------



<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Barbara Scriven
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BYE-C
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BYE-C/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	Yes
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	The infrastructure at South Wonston could not sustain the amount of development planned. There is one main road in & out ie. Downs Road. The alternative entry & exit to S W is Alresford drove & this is a single track at its junction with Westhill Road North . South Wonston has no doctor's surgery. The nearest surgery is Sutton Scotney which has to be reached by car. The bus service is one per hour.
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	The quantity of houses could be reduced, thereby reducing the number of car journeys which will use Downs Road
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Beechcroft Land Ltd
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32NH-M
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32NH-M/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	Yes
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>This representation provides support for this allocation, however, makes the case that a higher quantum of development can be achieved at the site. This representation also objects to the late phasing of the proposed development and includes reasons as to why the development of the subject site should be brought forward for immediate release.</p> <p>This allocation is fully supported at the site as it offers an opportunity for South Wonston to grow in a logical manner (providing a logical rounding-off of the built-up area) which is consistent with the existing settlement pattern of the village. In addition to this, development in this location will inherently support local services and facilities, particularly as it borders the existing built form and is in close walking distance to existing services and facilities. The subject site sits towards the northwest of the village of South Wonston adjoining the village's settlement boundary. Whilst outside the existing settlement boundary, it is evident that this location is sustainable for residential development and offers a logical rounding off to the village with existing development on 3 of its 4 boundaries.</p> <p>Please see accompanying representation for full details.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	<p>7.5 The site is allocated for "about 40 dwellings" in policy SW01, it is considered that this policy should be amended to read "a minimum of 40 dwellings" to better align with policy D6 (which itself could be strengthened) and NPPF guidance, particularly at paragraph 128.</p> <p>There is an evidenced unmet need for new homes in South Wonston with national planning policy clear that to support the government's objective to significantly boost the supply of new homes it is important that a sufficient and variety of land can come forward and is developed without unnecessary delay. The site has been demonstrated to be deliverable in the short term and it is therefore considered that the rationale to delay any permission on site until 2030 is flawed and the imposed phasing should be removed.</p> <p>Please see accompanying representation for full details.</p>
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	<p>"a minimum of 40 dwellings" and removal of the imposed phasing of the site after 2030.</p> <p>SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO THE QUANTUM OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED IN POLICY SW01</p> <p>5.1 Despite the general support for the allocation of the site for residential development, this representation seeks an amendment to the quantum of units proposed in policy SW01.</p>

	<p>5.2 Policy D6 is also relevant in this instance, as relates to density and making the best use of land, it states that:</p> <p>In order to ensure that development land within existing settlements is used most effectively, the local planning authority will prioritise development of previously developed land, and expect higher densities where appropriate on sites which have good access to facilities and public transport, particularly within the urban areas. The development potential of all sites should be optimised, consistent with the need to promote the delivery of high quality, well designed places. The primary determinant of the acceptability of a scheme will be how well the design responds to the general character and local distinctiveness of the area in which it is located.</p> <p>[Own Emphasis]</p> <p>5.3 In this vein it is also considered that this policy can be further strengthened to better accord with the aims of the NPPF in making the most efficient use of land, below.</p> <p>5.4 In terms of higher densities being appropriate on sites which have good access to facilities and public transport it has been demonstrated above that the site is located within walking distance of the high scoring daily facilities within South Wonston, and equally to public transport opportunities. The site is sustainably located and as per provisions of policy D6 warrants the optimisation of its development potential.</p> <p>5.5 NPPF Chapter 11 is focussed on making an effective use of land, with paragraph 128 clear that decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:</p> <p>a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it</p> <p>5.6 In terms of paragraph 128 of the framework the following chapter demonstrates the need for the development in South Wonston and the lack of other suitable sites to accommodate it. Adding further weight to the notion that there should be an allowance for density of development at this site should be increased where possible.</p> <p>5.7 At a density of 30dph the site, which is free of constraint, is capable of delivering 54 dwellings, whilst also providing the requisite amount of open space, landscaping and access points.</p> <p>5.8 The site is allocated for “about 40 dwellings” in policy SW01, it is considered that this policy should be amended to read “a minimum of 40 dwellings” to better align with policy D6 (which itself could be strengthened) and NPPF guidance, particularly at paragraph 128.</p>
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>	Yes <a href="#">Letter (commenting on policy - includes tables)</a>

*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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	David Baldwin
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-329F-W
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-329F-W/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The settlement boundary adjustment is legally unsound, in that due process was not involved. The Parish Council should have been consulted, and by extension the residents of South Wonston, This lack of due consultation runs counter to the Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The lack of consultation and response to objections has meant that the views of the residents of South Wonston have been consistently ignored. Errors, such as the claim that there is a health care centre in South Wonston, have only been corrected after Reg 18 and 19 were finalised.. Responses were often left blank, or were completed at the last minute, not according to the legal schedule. At the meeting in August, questions that had been submitted in writing, because the timing of the meeting, a Bank Holiday, made it impossible for many to attend, were not read out, as promised, and were thus not considered by members. My question received a written response which did not address the points made in an acceptable fashion. The whole process has been rushed through and the council has not been in legal compliance with the consultation requirements in the SCI.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	It is too late to make modifications as errors and objectors' views have been consistently ignored and Reg 18 and 19 have already been finalised, despite the shortcomings of the consultation process.
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	<p>The development of SW01 is not viable. The impact assessment has been incorrect: South Wonston should be classed a Small Rural Settlement and thus not suitable for further housing development. This conclusion is based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no doctors surgery in the settlement.</li> <li>2. There are no employment possibilities in the community, thus necessitating more car use.</li> <li>3. The bus service, although recently improved, is poor and does not encourage residents to leave their cars in the drive,</li> <li>4. There is no drainage in the north end of the village and no indication in the policy as to how this will be addressed. There is also no indication in the policy as to how the ground water and the aquifer will be protected</li> <li>5, There is no superfast broadband.</li> </ol>

	<p>6. There has been no clarity about the way access onto West Hill Road North will be planned. Highways say they want a footpath the length of the site, but there is no room for this, if hedgerows are not completely cleared, which runs counter to the HCC's policy to retain trees and hedgerows. The positioning of the proposed development is extremely dangerous. The road is very narrow, there is a blind ninety degree turn into Alresford Drove on the corner of the proposed site. Traffic is already heavy, 40 more houses will increase the density of traffic and the danger to all considerably.</p> <p>7. The allocation was rejected for affordable housing in 2017 by WCC on grounds which included physical separation form the village, highway and biodiversity concerns. These considerations still apply. The site was declared as sensitive and should be protected from development.</p> <p>8. The policy claims that views will be retained - it is completely unclear what views are meant - to the north over countryside, but these views will be blocked by new housing, or of the village from the north? The road has been consistently wrongly named Grindelwald which is just another inaccuracy that show how flawed the whole policy is.</p> <p>9. Emissions from cars in the village are already at a very high level. 80 more cars will just make this worse.</p> <p>10. South Wonston is officially deficient in open spaces. It is not clear what new open spaces will be created by the development, but it is unlikely they will be an advantage to the community as a whole. More people adds to the pressure on already deficient open space.</p> <p>11. Pressure on the school, and the doctors surgery in Sutton Scotney, will increase unacceptably with the arrival of new housing. No indication has been made as to how this will be dealt with.</p> <p>With all these considerations it is clear that this development is not viable or deliverable.</p>
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>  <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>

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	George Whalley
<b>Personal reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V
<b>Full reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>Policy SW01 – Land at West Hill Road North, South Wonston</p> <p>2.105 We object to the proposed allocation of Land at West Hill Road, South Wonston for 40 dwellings, which is not justified or consistent with the settlement hierarchy and the sustainability of the settlement in relation to available key facilities. There are reasonable alternative site options in the Market Town of Bishops Waltham which are more sustainable to accommodate a higher proportion of growth.</p> <p>2.106 South Wonston is defined in the Local Plan settlement hierarchy as an ‘intermediate rural settlement’ which sits below the more sustainable ‘Market Towns’ and ‘Larger Rural Settlements’ in the Policy H3 Settlement Hierarchy. Consistent with national policy and the settlement hierarchy, it is more sustainable to direct a higher level of growth (than currently identified in the local plan) to Bishops Waltham.</p> <p>2.107 A Settlement Hierarchy assessment<sup>14</sup> has been by the Council which provides an upto- date assessment of settlements in the District to determine their place in the settlement hierarchy and to inform the Local Plan spatial strategy. Bishops Waltham scores highly in the Council’s assessment of daily facilities and services with only the settlement of Winchester City scoring higher. A comparative assessment of key services and facilities between Bishops Waltham, South Wonston and Sutton Scotney is set out in Appendix 3 of these representations.</p> <p>2.108 South Wonston is not a sustainable location to accommodate this level of growth and lacks an appropriate range of key facilities. The settlement lacks a regular public transport service, health facilities and employment opportunities.</p> <p>2.109 Bishops Waltham is a sustainable Market Town appropriate to accommodate a higher level of growth than currently identified in the Local Plan. The settlement has a regular public transport service, Post Office, full range of healthcare facilities, a range of convenience and other retail, pre-school and primary school, excellent community facilities and a range of employment opportunities.</p> <p>Land at West Hill Road North – Site Constraints</p> <p>2.110 The Council’s Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper 15 includes an appraisal of Land at West Hill Road North. The assessment identifies that site is in a prominent location and visible over a wider area in viewpoints to the north, including the Drove public right of way, Stainers Lane, Wonston Lane and</p>

	<p>Christmas Hill. The assessment concludes the site is in an area of high landscape sensitivity, contributes to the distinctive setting and identify of the village and protection from development is the preferred option.</p> <p>2.111 South Wonston is affected by issues concerning water supply and wastewater infrastructure capacity. It is understood that the Council has engaged with Southern Water regarding a programme of infrastructure improvements in the area. However, there is uncertainty whether necessary improvements (to be delivered by Southern Water) providing sufficient capacity to accommodate development will be in place by 2030. Delays to WWTW improvements may also affect the ability to achieve nutrient neutrality in terms of nitrogen and phosphorus pollution of the River Itchen.</p> <p>2.112 At Regulation 18, Hampshire County Council (transport) has raised concerns in relation to transport impact and highways safety. HCC has raised concerns regarding the ability to achieve safe and suitable site access that will not worsen highways safety issues on Alresford Road. Therefore, it is uncertain whether the site is deliverable in transport terms.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>2.113 In conclusion, the proposed allocation at South Wonston is not justified or effective and should be removed from the Local Plan. The proposed allocation is not consistent with the settlement hierarchy and the availability of 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</p>
<p><b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b></p>	
<p><b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>  <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i></p>	<p>Yes  <a href="#">Form (referring to letter)</a>  <a href="#">Supporting information (commenting on policies and proposed site)</a></p>



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



<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Helen Claydon
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B47-S
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B47-S/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>Because it is a green field site, no consideration for the wildlife and habitats that are there. Close to a very narrow road and dangerous corner on Alresford Drove so not very sound. There will be noise and light pollution in a very dark rural area and this will affect the bat populations. No consideration for the archaeology as it is very close to the South Wonston Barrow.</p> <p>What consideration has been made for the overwhelmed doctors surgery and the water and sewerage or the total infrastructure for a new housing estate. Has the number of extra cars been considered with the environmental issues that will cause. Is there enough school places for the children.</p> <p>With regard to the build how many lorries and how much destruction to the environment. What about nitrates and net zero?</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	Do not build on a green site. or just do not build!! How can this possibly be made legally compliant or sound when you want to maintain environmental issues and net zero when building new houses goes totally against this.
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	I do not want the Winchester area to become another Eastleigh with not a sign of green areas, Winchester City Council and the government seem to want to cover our beautiful land in concrete. I know we need more homes but there are places and places to build.
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Helen Elizabeth Aldridge
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B8D-A
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B8D-A/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The proposed area is on a busy overused rural road junction, which was never designed to meet the increasing traffic needs of the village. I have an allotment on that junction and I have seen so many near misses in last few years and a huge increase in cars using this back entrance to the village, which is not designed for this use.</p> <p>The village simply cannot cope with any more cars, the bus service mentioned is not fit for purpose, buses only run every hour and impossible to get back from Winchester in the evenings.</p> <p>We do not have a dr surgery as mentioned, it is only used a couple days a week and the small rural practice at Sutton Scotney is already overused.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i>	No

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



<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Jane Tandy
<b>Personal reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-326K-Y
<b>Full reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-326K-Y/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	
<b>Sound?</b>	
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	I am writing to object to further development in South Wonston. We have a poor bus service, one road in and out which causes extreme congestion at certain times of day. The local school is on the main road and the number of vehicles parking to collect and drop off children already pose a dangerous hazard to other vehicles. Alresford Drove is one way and very narrow and that will be used by any new houses at that end of the village. We do not have the infrastructure to support more building. Until the local services are much improved more houses should not be a consideration. The local secondary schools are already at capacity and children are having to go to Perins at Alresford, this is most unsatisfactory and more children will just make the problem worse.
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i>	No

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



<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Jill Lee
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B83-S
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B83-S/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>Preamble</p> <p>Doesn't reflect the site was found to be highly sensitive in the landscape appraisal and should be protected from development as preferred option. Need to make more of this.</p> <p>Close attention to materials used for roofs and elevations won't minimise visual impact of development. Limits on height or siting could do but aren't considered.</p> <p>Safe and suitable access. Are you sure one can be provided? If so why not specify distance from corner for clarity?</p> <p>Address highway safety issues on Alresford Drove, what is this supposed to mean? Need to be specific, what are the issues and how are they to be addressed?</p> <p>Very weak wording in respect of the aquifer. EA also specified protection of ground water and the aquifer. You have ignored this.</p> <p>Drainage, there should be much more on this given the sensitivity of the site and absence of mains drainage.</p> <p>Actual Policy.</p> <p>Distance from corner to be specified.</p> <p>Amount of open space to be specified given you have found South Wonston to be deficient to the amount of 6 hectares.</p> <p>Linkage points to existing footpaths should be specified to avoid loss of vegetation.</p> <p>Boundary planting can't be retained and enhanced if it needs to come out for visibility.</p> <p>Point vii doesn't make any sense. Do you mean views of South Wonston from the north?</p> <p>There is no mains sewer so how will point X be achieved?</p> <p>Xi EA asked for No environmental impacts on the SPZ and principal aquifer as well as protection of ground water. You have not included this.</p> <p>Hampshire county council highways asked for a footpath to be provided for the length of the site boundary but you have failed to include this requirement in the policy wording. They also highlighted that they would require a financial contribution to make any highways improvements needed but that has not been included specifically in the policy and it must be because of the financial implications for the developer.</p>



	<p>HCC also consistently get the name of the road wrong which doesn't inspire confidence. The road is not called Grindelwald.</p> <p>Give all the uncertainty and errors I don't believe the site is deliverable.</p>
<p><b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b></p>	<p>Answer the points raised above as well as all from Reg 18 which were ignored and take into account the requirements of statutory consultees which also need to be costed to ensure they are achievable.</p>
<p><b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b></p>	<p>As above although I do not consider the site should be allocated at all given all of the mistakes in the evidence base and wrongly awarded points that resulted in South Wonston being put in the category of intermediate settlement and which have not all been corrected confirming the view that the Reg 18 responses were not assessed in time to influence the Reg 19 plan.</p>
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>  <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>

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	John Cooper
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32DP-J
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32DP-J/2/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	Yes
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The text and policy assume that South Wonston is a Intermediate Rural Settlement. However it appears that the current infrastructure has not been correctly assessed and South Wonston should be a Small Rural Settlement.</p> <p>Policy SW01 also appears to be in conflict with policy SP3 Developing in the Countryside</p> <p>This development requires an extension of the settlement boundary of South Wonston. I note the view of the Parish Council that it "considers the settlement boundary adjustment to be unsound, in that due process wasn't involved, and inconsistent with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and National Planning Policy Framework 16c in that the principles of Community Involvement weren't observed."</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	<p>Review of the infrastructure assessment and resulting classification of South Wonston as Intermediate instead of a Small Rural Settlement.</p> <p>Review for the settlement boundary adjustment.</p>
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	<p>iii. Provide a vehicle access to the site from West Hill Road North at a safe distance from Alresford Drove. However in view of the increased traffic from this development accessing the village from the east along Alresford Drove, this policy explicitly prevents development of this site until a full two way road is provided along Alresford Drove east of West Hill Road.</p>
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	John Moore
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B4M-F
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B4M-F/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) is a document which the council is legally required to prepare alongside the local plan. There are still mistakes in the allocated scores on the IIA for SW01, meaning the impacts of the proposed boundary change and allocation for South Wonston are totally inaccurate. The claim that we have a NHS doctors surgery in the village is not true, we do not have any Employment opportunities in the village and we do not have super high speed Broad Band, all these have been scored incorrectly. To keep in line with NPPL rules an Agriculture Land Classification Survey should happen during planning application, to my knowledge no reference to the biodiversity issues have been submitted so the 2024 Integrated Impact Assessment special criteria scoring method fails to reflect the negative effect of this. If the allocation of scoring on the IIA was correctly applied, then the SW01 site would have never been considered for planning allocation in the first place</p> <p>Over and above that, there currently is no mains drainage at the proposed site, with the closest properties being served by septic tanks. I am aware of the proposed undertaking by Southern Water for a new pumping station at Sutton Scotney with the upgrade to receiving sewer via South Wonston and Harestock. This is proposed to be complete by 2030, will it be adequate and will it even be ready in time?</p> <p>More importantly the proposed site is located next to a blind, 90 degree turning, into a single track road. There is very little space for any road improvements, there certainly is no space to put the proposed pavement and cycle lane. Safety must be and always will be the most important issue at any new development. 40 new house would probably mean an extra 40 to 80 cars, plus a plethora of delivery lorries and vans using this dangerous bit of road. This site would and could only contravene Highway Safety, and should be considered hazardous and dangerous to all users and in particular pedestrians/children walking to the school and local store, an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>The site as you know is a greenfield site, the priority of building on a greenfield site goes against National Planning Policy Framework 2023.</p> <p>There appears to be many inconsistencies with the IAA, National Planning Policy Framework with both Highway Safety issues and building on a greenfield site that I consider the proposed planning for SW01 does not meet legal requirements, and is not sound or comply with the duty to co-operate. This application should never have got to this part of the overall process.</p>

<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	John Smith
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32ZZ-J
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32ZZ-J/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	policy 480-490 see my comments
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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 supporting information or further correspondence was received from respondent

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Laurence Markham
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BW6-U
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BW6-U/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	Yes
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The document is not legal in my mind, as it is not accurate:  Arlesford Drove is a single lane and not suitable for increased traffic.  There is currently no high speed broadband where I live (20mps is not high speed, 100+ is).  There is currently no Post Office, it closed down and there are no facilities in the new village shop which just reopened.  The medical building in the village is NOT a public GP surgery.  The bus services have been reduced in the village in September, which in particular makes connectivity catching trains not aligned with the railway timetable. There is also no service on Sundays.  Thank you</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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.*



<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Lyn Tilley
<b>Personal reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32YV-D
<b>Full reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32YV-D/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	
<b>Sound?</b>	
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>I am submitting this email as I have read with some concern about the proposed construction of 40 dwellings on land West Hill Road North, South Wonston.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My concerns include the impact on already overstretched services in the village, ie gas, electricity, water and internet access.</li> <li>• An additional 40 homes will presumably affect the school intake numbers, together with an increased impact on the local surgery.</li> <li>• The roads are already in very poor condition, (only being poorly “patch” repaired) and a minimum of 40 (possibly 80) extra vehicles will simply exacerbate this condition further.</li> <li>• The village drainage system is already failing resulting in flooding of the roadways and some homes.</li> </ul> <p>Also, in this age of alleged “environmental awareness” it dumbfounds me that this argument becomes of little or no consequence when these development plans are allowed, with the disappearance of yet more green fields will again impact on the insects, birds, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Why is this argument only important and adhered to when it suits, with the obvious neglect of our roadside verges, and hedgerows allowing them to become totally overgrown and untended, and obliterating road signs to the point of endangerment to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians alike.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	

<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Morag Kirby
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/8/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	Whilst there has been good collaboration between the ICB and WCC during the Local Plan process, our request is an amendment to the policy as outlined in the full response which has been submitted via email on 08/10/2024. - Whilst there is supporting text for healthcare infrastructure there is no inclusion within the policy that directly supports the need for sufficient healthcare infrastructure. The policy needs an inclusion to contribute to Health infrastructure as per the Education reference
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes <a href="#">Letter (commenting on policies)</a>

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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Neil Robert McFarlane
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-329Y-G
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-329Y-G/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment for SW01 contains factual inaccuracies and appears to have been completed in a biased manner. It also breaches the National Policy Framework 2023.</p> <p>There is no Doctors surgery in the village, it is a part time offshoot of the Gratton Surgery in Sutton Scotney. There are no employment opportunities of any substance or note.</p> <p>There is no high speed broadband link.</p> <p>There is no mention of the biodiversity impact and issues this development would have, especially the many species of bat that frequent this area. There is no mains sewerage nearby, and the latest development in the area at Le Franaye Place, is prone to spills. How would another 40 houses be possible. As the proposed site is "Greenfield" this goes against the National Policy Framework 2023.</p> <p>The proposed site is adjacent to a dangerous corner and narrow road. The approach to the proposed site along West Hill Road North is a frequently used "rat run" with traffic approaching too fast. There are insufficient pathways and space for cyclists to navigate now, let alone with another 40 houses. The bus service is extremely limited and there is no service at all in the evening. Therefore it is inevitable there would have to be a substantial increase in traffic, between 40 - 80 residents cars, plus visitors, on an already dangerous stretch of road.</p> <p>The proposed development would also change the character and appearance of the the whole area in a detrimental manner. The adjacent area is used by dog walkers, ramblers and cyclists, which would become considerably more dangerous with the increased traffic.</p> <p>There would also be a considerable impact on the privacy of the 3 most affected homes, adjacent to the development site, including my own. What provisions would be taken to protect this ?</p> <p>Another 40 homes, will likely mean another 100+ residents, including a number of children of varying ages. The existing village Primary School is already full. Where will the children go to school, especially with the approved development of 120 homes in adjoining Sutton Scotney? The local infrastructure just cannot accommodate this. If they cant go to school in the village, then where and how would they be transported? If at another school, this would have o be by car, creating increased traffic and danger on Downs Road, at School times.</p>

	In summary, I believe the Integrated Impact Assessment has a number of inaccuracies and has been scored incorrectly and untruthfully. The proposed application does not meet legal requirements and should have been declined before now.
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	None - the application does not meet legal or regulatory requirements.
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Peter Guberg
<b>Personal reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32Y9-G
<b>Full reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32Y9-G/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	
<b>Sound?</b>	
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Concern with how the village has been assessed as being capable of supporting the number of proposed dwellings. The village does not have its own GP surgery. The assessment also suggests that there are employment opportunities within the village. Other than the school and church every other potential employer is, I believe, a family concern.</p> <p>My next concern is the proposed location of the development within the village. The village has grown up in a fairly typical linear fashion, mostly along Downs Rd which forms the backbone and main route through the village. Almost all of the traffic to and from the eastern end of the village travels along this road, with a small amount using Alresford Drove. Alresford Drove is of course a cause of concern itself because of its narrowness and the 100 degree acute bend where it turns into West Hill Rd North. The addition of 40 extra dwellings at this location would cause an extra 200 trips per day. As the provision of public transport to the village is poor it is likely that most of these journeys will be by car. Most of these journeys will therefore be cars travelling the full length of the village.</p> <p>Travel and bus routes. The village lies along a single bus route. - number 75, which has of course only recently been changed from the 86, which used to go to an entirely different destination (with little or no consultation that I was aware of). The village lies between the train stations of Winchester and Micheldever Station. The times, frequency and reliability of the bus service just does not support this. Any mention within the local plan about sustainable transport is in reality almost completely pointless. I have used the new cycle route to reach Winchester Train Station on several occasions out of necessity. I cycle in London between the station and several offices across the City and the East of London, and I feel a lot safer in London than I do when in the Winchester district. The roads are in such a poorly managed state. Even the new cycle path becomes difficult to navigate with large thick brambles being allowed to grow across more than half of the width of the path within the first year that the route was opened between South Wonston and Andover Road.</p>

	<p>The village currently has a lack of green open space as measured by national policy. The village has increased the number of dwellings as garden infill has occurred where possible, and I am sure will continue to do so as suitable properties come to market. A new development in the proposed location will do nothing to improve this situation.</p> <p>Concerns raised about the way that this consultation has been handled - there appears to be a rush to complete this, and a lack of any genuine consultation or response to submissions. Indeed the Parish Council have commented on the speed and lack of response.</p> <p>Question whether it is necessary or right that every town, village or hamlet is asked to contribute towards a local plan by increasing its size.</p> <p>To summarise:  The assessment of the village to support the development is flawed and inaccurate.  The location would lead to increased journeys that would impact and affect the vast majority of current residents.  There is no possible sustainability pay off possible because of the lack of useful transport links.  The current village boundary should be respected; it has reached its natural limit.  The consultation process as not gone well or smoothly. Important stakeholders have raised valid concerns.  The demand that every community takes a share of the suggested burden risks irreparable damage to some more than others,</p>
<p><b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b></p>	
<p><b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b></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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Philip Lee
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B5P-K
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3B5P-K/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>Site SW01 is described as 'highly sensitive' in the landscape appraisal and should be protected from development as preferred option. So why has this been ignored ?  Safe and suitable access.  'Address highway safety issues on Alresford Drove, what does this mean?  All previous application for this site were refused on the grounds that the access was totally unsuitable. Alresford drove is a single track lane and access to the site will be from a blind corner. Highways have not provided any proper explanation of why the highways access is now suitable when nothing has changed and the SW01 does not go into any detail. Of course it doesn't, it can't because it is impossible to provide safe access.  Policy. 'Distance from corner to be specified. '  Amount of open space to be specified  Linkage points to existing footpaths should be specified to avoid loss of vegetation. impossible !  Boundary planting can't be retained and enhanced if it needs to come out for visibility.  Hampshire county council highways asked for a footpath to be provided for the length of the site boundary but you have failed to include this requirement in the policy wording. There is no space for this, so it again lacks any of how it could be achieved.  Drainage, there should be much more on this given the sensitivity of the site and absence of mains drainage. There is no mains sewer at this end of the village and everyone has septic tanks.  This makes the site totally unsuitable.</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	<p>It is not possible to make it legally compliant when the South Wonston feedback was clearly not responded to in time and therefore not taken into consideration in a transparent manner as set out in the SCI.  The site should be not allocated at all given all of the mistakes in the evidence base and wrongly awarded points that resulted in South Wonston being put in the category of intermediate settlement and which have not all been corrected as the Reg 18 responses were not assessed in time to influence the Reg 19 plan.</p>
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	I suggest that SW01 is removed from the Winchester local plan else the local plan will be unsound for the reasons above.

	SW01 has been incorrectly assessed, the IAA still says that South Wonston has a doctor's surgery which it doesn't. It is claimed that South Wonston has the same employment opportunity as Winchester and scores 2 points. This is an example of the incorrect assessment as an intermediate settlement which has been pointed out in the feedback but ignored by the planning team. There is no employment opportunity in South Wonston.
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	richard timmons
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32HS-S
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32HS-S/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	The land Sw01 is bounded by hedges that contain bats. Also the fields are home to red wing birds. Both species are protected under the wildlife act.
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	An in-depth analysis and study should be undertaken immediately. I believe a previous study in 2022 showed evidence of bats.
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	Further long term study should be under taken
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b> <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

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Richard Timmons
<b>Personal reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32YS-A
<b>Full reference number</b>	BHLF-AQTS-32YS-A/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	
<b>Sound?</b>	
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my dismay at the proposed development in South Wonston for 40 new homes on an undeveloped rural location.</p> <p>My main objection would be the impact on the bat population in the hedge rows bordering the site. This is a protected animal under the wildlife and countryside act.</p> <p>Previous surveys have shown evidence of bats.</p> <p>Also the fields are the habitat of the Red Wing bird. Although migratory there are native colonies of this bird.</p> <p>The proposed development is completely pointless when Winchester has a brownfield site , complete with infrastructure that could accommodate 800 houses.</p> <p>The Bushfield site near Badgers Farm would negate the need to build on any rural locations around Winchester.</p> <p>Regards</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>	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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Samantha McNeill
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BNN-A
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-3BNN-A/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>1. Transport Links and Infrastructure: The NPPF encourages development that promotes sustainable transport (Chapter 9). Given the poor transport links in the area, any further development could increase reliance on private cars, leading to traffic congestion and increased emissions. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF highlights that "significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable" through public transport and non-car transport options. If South Wonston lacks sufficient public transport infrastructure, further development would not align with these sustainability goals.</p> <p>2. Poor Internet Connectivity: High-quality communication infrastructure is crucial for economic growth and social well-being. The NPPF (Chapter 10) stresses the importance of supporting the expansion of electronic communication networks, including full-fibre broadband connections (Paragraph 118). If South Wonston suffers from poor internet connectivity, this would hinder economic development, remote working opportunities, and access to digital services. Developing homes in an area with inadequate broadband could exacerbate these issues.</p> <p>3. Lack of Prospects and Activities: The NPPF promotes "strong, vibrant, and healthy communities" through well-designed places with accessible services (Paragraph 8b). If South Wonston lacks employment opportunities, educational institutions, or recreational activities, the addition of more homes could strain existing services and further isolate residents. Chapter 8 encourages developments that promote social interaction and provide for shared spaces, which may not be possible if the community's needs are not being met.</p> <p>4. Impact on Wildlife and Natural Environment: Chapter 15 of the NPPF focuses on conserving and enhancing the natural environment, including protecting important habitats and biodiversity (Paragraphs 174 and 175). If the proposed development site has any ecological importance or supports local wildlife, building homes on this land could be detrimental. Policies in the NPPF state that planning decisions should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible, which would argue against any harm local wildlife.</p> <p>5. Unsustainable Development:</p>

	<p>The overarching principle of the NPPF is to support sustainable development (Paragraph 11). Since the village's infrastructure may not support additional growth without substantial investment, any development in South Wonston could be unsustainable. The lack of services and infrastructure would likely lead to increased social and environmental issues. Furthermore, the Framework supports a plan-led system, meaning that development should be guided by local plans that take into account the area's needs and constraints.</p>
<p><b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b></p>	<p>To make the Strategic Policy 1 (SP1) legally compliant and sound, several adjustments might be necessary based on the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidelines:</p> <p>Positively Prepared: SP1 needs to ensure it provides a strategy that meets the area's objectively assessed needs, including housing, employment, and infrastructure, while also taking into account any unmet needs from neighbouring areas, where practical. If the policy doesn't address these needs effectively, it could be deemed unsound. Modifying SP1 to explicitly focus on these aspects could improve compliance.</p> <p>Justified: SP1 must be based on proportionate evidence and a comparison of reasonable alternatives. If it doesn't offer clear evidence for the chosen strategy, adjustments should be made to present a more compelling justification for the selected approach, demonstrating why it is the most appropriate strategy (NPPF_December_2023).</p> <p>Effective: The policy must be deliverable over its intended period and facilitate cooperation on cross-boundary strategic matters. If SP1 lacks clear evidence of how these objectives will be achieved or of cooperation with neighbouring authorities, revisions will be necessary to show that joint working has been effectively carried out and that the policy can realistically be implemented(NPPF_December_2023).</p> <p>Consistency with National Policy: SP1 needs to align with the national policy by promoting sustainable development, as outlined in the NPPF. Modifications may be required if the policy doesn't fully reflect national priorities like environmental conservation, sustainable transport, and housing standards.</p>
<p><b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b></p>	<p>Any proposed development at West Hill Road North must ensure that local infrastructure, including transport links and internet connectivity, is upgraded to meet the demands of the community. Developments must incorporate measures to protect local wildlife and biodiversity, providing compensatory habitats where necessary. Additionally, developments should contribute to the provision of local amenities, including social, recreational, and economic opportunities, ensuring that the needs of current and future residents are met in a sustainable manner.</p>
<p><b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b></p>	
<p><b>If no, please explain</b></p>	
<p><b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b></p>	<p>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</p>
<p><b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b></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.*

<b>Policy/Evidence base document</b>	SW01
<b>Name of respondent (or client)</b>	Thomas Forrester
<b>Personal reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32UT-7
<b>Full reference number</b>	ANON-AQTS-32UT-7/1/SW01
<b>Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Sound?</b>	No
<b>Complies with duty to co-operate?</b>	No
<b>Policy/Document comment</b>	<p>I'm not a legal expert in council policy, the question is not aimed at local residents. The ignores the unsuitability of the roads adjacent to the site or the congestion it will generate. The school parking, bus and waist water facilities also do not support the scale of the proposed plan with adversely harming local residents. The proposed scheme has could generate an average of 80 extra vehicles. The road is already dangerous, without pavements and adjacent to a blind bend to ancient road Alsford Drove.</p> <p>The waste water system frequently overflows on the southern boundary of South Wonston. The new pipe from Sutton Scotney will aggregate the problem as observed when tests were carried out in September 2024</p>
<b>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</b>	<p>Cut the number of dwellings by at least 50%</p> <p>Install waste water pumping station and a new link to the waste water system.</p> <p>Improve the road and create pavements on both sides of the road both in West hill road North and Alsford Drove adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Build a new primary school away from the village to take pressure off the existing school which serves Worthy and other villages too.</p>
<b>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</b>	Do you honestly think it's reasonable for me to rewrite your policy for you. It isn't.
<b>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</b>	
<b>If no, please explain</b>	
<b>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</b>	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
<b>Have you submitted supporting information?</b>	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.*

**WCC Response.**

Comments noted.

**WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:**

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification](#) to text at 14.169 & 14.170 for clarification purposes regarding Alresford Drove Road.

[Proposed Modification](#) to criterion vii to Policy SW1 in respect of health and wellbeing infrastructure in response to the HIOW ICB representation.