

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

Waltham Chase 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 WC1 Morgans Yard	
Total Number of Representations received	5	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	4	1
Sound	1	4
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	3	2
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>One respondent questioned whether Waltham’s Chase was correctly categorised in the settlement hierarchy. Three questioned whether Morgan’s Wyard (WC1) would come forward, given it has been allocated for a long period of time. The low amount of affordable housing (10%) achieved in the current application on the site) was also highlighted.</p> <p>Three respondents considered additional site(s) should be allocated in this settlement.</p> <p>Southern Water supported the approach in the policy to waste water infrastructure. The NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB requested that the policy highlight the potential need for additional health infrastructure.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/16/WC1 ANON-AQTS-3299-G/10/WC1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/19/WC1 ANON-AQTS-3BPV-M/2/WC1</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3288-E/2/WC1</p>		
<p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether this site can be relied upon to come forward; • Whether additional sites should be allocated for development; and • Whether the policy adequately addresses potential infrastructure requirements. 		

Policy/Evidence base document	WC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Jonathan Quarrell
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3288-E
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3288-E/2/WC1
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response.</p> <p>Concerns that Morgans Yard will not come forward, and is subject to constraints as outlined in paragraphs 14.190 to 14.193 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Morgans Yard Planning Application 21/02439/FUL was presented to the Planning Committee on Tuesday 12th December 2023. The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the committee report and update notes; but also added additional requirements, including a requirement for the installation of a fixed pelican crossing point to the new pathway to ensure the safety of children crossing the road in this area.</p> <p>6.71 We note that the current planning application is still pending determination because, as we understand it, a Section 106 Agreement has still not been signed and there are major concerns with development viability.</p> <p>6.72 It is important to note that Morgan’s Yard was allocated for development on the basis that it could deliver a planning policy compliant quantum of affordable housing. Only 10% is now envisaged and the delivery of policy compliant affordable housing was an identified requirement for Waltham Chase that was envisaged to be catered for in a plan-led manner. It is clear that the amount of affordable housing required in Waltham Chase will not now be met and the existing deficiencies will be exacerbated unless new housing is allocated to bolster the supply.</p> <p>6.73 The scale of development envisaged at Forest Farm would only just make up this shortfall of affordable housing in Waltham Chase and in our view even more sites should be allocated that will deliver more affordable housing up to the end of this plan-period, and a failure to do so is not keeping up with the realities on the ground.</p> <p>6.74 We note too that the occupants of Morgans Yard are still trading, and this will be having a bearing on the assessment of the site’s viability.</p> <p>6.75 We are concerned and object to the fact that Morgans Yard is the only allocation for Waltham Chase and it is not new, it is merely ‘rolled over’ as an undelivered and failed site.</p> <p>Morgans Yard is located further away from the centre of Waltham Chase than our client’s site.</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 (commenting on policies and evidence base) Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base - includes pictures and tables) Supporting document 1 (Map of site - Land at Winchester Road) Supporting document 2 (Briefing note - Winchester Settlement Gap)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	WC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Limited
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BPV-M
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BPV-M/2/WC1
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. Objections raised stating the categorisation of Waltham Chase as an intermediate settlement is incorrect and it should be placed higher in the settlement hierarchy. Reference made to previous settlement hierarchy assessments and the inclusion of allocations in Waltham Chase in previous Local Plans.</p> <p>Objects to the wording in paragraph 14.189 goes on to state "However, given the constraints around the village, particularly the narrow settlement gap with Swanmore, and the substantial level of allocated land remaining to be developed, no new sites are allocated in this Plan".</p> <p>Representation notes that previous local plans identified development sites within that gap and make the case that site SH11 is entirely contained within an existing field parcel which benefits from boundary vegetation including hedgerows and trees and as such it is already visually well contained. The extent of built development would not extend materially further east into the gap than the recent development to the south at Hawthorn Grove (the northern part of the WC4 allocation). Argues that development of site SH11 would constitute a rounding off of the settlement and retain an appropriate gap with Swanmore. Retention and reinforcing of landscaping would support features identified as important in the sense of separation between Waltham Chase and Swanmore.</p> <p>Representation also notes that adopted site WC1 is likely to deliver fewer homes, and fewer affordable homes, than envisaged in the adopted local plan, and Land at Lower Chase Road has no significant constraints to development and could deliver the full 40% affordable provision (about 36 dwellings), thereby meeting the shortfall in affordable housing delivery at Morgan's Yard and making a meaningful contribution towards affordable housing provision in the District.</p> <p>We note that that previous comments from members of the Parish Council in their response to the nomination of sites (Appendix 2 of the Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper, 2022) in relation to Land South of Lower Chase Road included "a. This would allow development at the outer edges of the Parish b. Not sewerage issues that are known at that end of the Parish c. Clear access onto the main highway d.</p>

	<p>Services nearby e. Joins up with other development behind (mushroom farm and Forest Gardens)" and "Based on WCC Numbers and Hierarchy, 1st choice".</p> <p>Furthermore, Bargate Homes has a track record of successfully delivering high quality housing developments within Waltham Chase. Bargate are proud to have worked collaboratively with Winchester City Council, Shedfield Parish Council, and the local community from site selection stage through to the planning applications and the delivery of their developments at Forest Road. Their Hawthorn Grove development provides a unique opportunity for Land South of Lower Chase Road to be accessed from this built development (via the existing access onto Forest Road) rather than from Lower Chase Road, as a final phase of development rounding off the settlement edge. It should therefore be allocated for the development of about 90 dwellings.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Waltham Chase should be categorised as a larger rural settlement and Land South of Lower Chase Road (ref. SH11) should be allocated for 90 dwellings. The Policies Map should also be amended to show the allocation of SH11.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	A new allocation for Land South of Lower Chase Road (ref. SH11) should be added to the larger rural settlements grouping of allocations within the MTRA section of the Plan (starting at pg. 386). The table on pages 389 and 390 should be updated accordingly. Paragraph 14.189 should be deleted, and a new paragraph introduced to state that Land South of Lower Chase Road has been allocated for the development of 90 dwellings. The table 'Waltham Chase Housing Sources' on pg 497 should be amended to include the new allocation at Lower Chase 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?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<p>Have you submitted supporting information?</p> <p><i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Letter (comment on Policies and Evidence Base - includes tables)</p> <p>Supporting document 1 (Transport advice - Land north of Meon Green, Forest Road, Waltham Chase)</p> <p>Supporting document 2 (Vision Document - Land South of Lower Chase Road, Waltham Chase)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	WC1
Name of respondent (or client)	Gleeson Land
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3299-G
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3299-G/10/WC1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Whilst in principle we do not object to the allocation of Morgans Yard, it should not be the only site relied upon to meet the future housing needs of Waltham Chase. As set out in the table at page 497 of the local plan, the site is forecast to deliver 80 homes within the plan period out of 117 assumed for Waltham Chase. The other dwellings are anticipated to come from 'net completions in or adjoining settlement 2020-2023' (eight dwellings), 'outstanding permissions at 2023' (nine dwellings) and a windfall allowance (20 dwellings). The site is an allocation in the existing local plan, so not only has it not come forward for development already despite its existing allocation, but the site is also still operational for a number of employment uses and showroom/sales facilities, albeit areas of the site are undeveloped and there appears to be a strategy the relocation of some jobs on site. Whilst we acknowledge the submission of application 21/02439/FUL for 80 dwellings on the site, it has been submitted for more than three years and it is not clear why it has not yet been determined, despite going to planning committee with a recommendation to approve in December 2023. The cost of construction for a residential development has increased exponentially in the three-year period and it may be the case that the development, including decontamination of this brownfield site, is no longer viable.</p> <p>As Morgans Yard is the only site allocated to meet the housing needs of Waltham Chase, it would be prudent to include at least one more should this site fail to deliver in order that the settlement achieves some development.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	N/A – the allocation of at least one further site in Waltham Chase is necessary
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	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	WC1
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/16/WC1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	Whilst there has been good collaboration between the ICB and WCC during the Local Plan process, our request is an amendment to the policy as outlined in the full response which has been submitted via email on 08/10/2024. - Whilst there is supporting text for healthcare infrastructure there is no inclusion within the policy that directly supports the need for sufficient healthcare infrastructure. The policy needs an inclusion to contribute to infrastructure
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

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

Policy/Evidence base document	WC1
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/19/WC1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy WC1 Morgans Yard: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.</p> <p>Supporting Text: Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for the area where this site is allocated. In accordance with this, we undertook an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposal at each site.</p> <p>The assessment revealed that local sewerage infrastructure in closest proximity to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposals for the number of dwellings at the site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement will be provided through the New Infrastructure charge, but Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of network reinforcement aligns with the occupation of the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.</p> <p>Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections to the sewerage network, even when capacity is limited. Planning policies and planning conditions, therefore, play an important role in ensuring that development is coordinated with the provision of necessary infrastructure, and does not contribute to pollution of the environment, in line with paragraph 180(e) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023).</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	

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

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modification](#) to Local Plan policy WC1 (page 501) to clarify the position regarding potential infrastructure requirements in response to the representation from the HIOW ICB.