

YOUR PLACE YOUR PLAN.

Winchester District Local Plan

Winchester City Council Local Plan Examination

Hearing Statement Matter 7: Housing allocations in South Hampshire Urban Areas (SHUA)

April 2025



Winchester
City Council

Matter 7 Housing allocations in South Hampshire Urban Areas (SHUA)

Issue: Whether the proposed housing allocations in SHUA would be justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Contents

Policy SH1 Newlands (West of Waterlooville)	3
Policy SH2 North Whiteley	7
Policy SH3 Whiteley Green	10
Appendix A	11

Policy SH1 Newlands (West of Waterlooville)

1. What is the evidence to support the delivery of additional dwellings at this site? Where would this take place and is clarification within the supporting text necessary for soundness? What would be the consequence on the delivery of employment uses? Would the provision of additional dwellings result in a high quality development that contributes to the needs of PfSH?

WCC response:

- 1.1 Newlands (West of Waterlooville) is identified as a sustainable location for strategic growth in the existing Local Plan (policy SH2) and this allocation is carried forward into the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) (policy SH1). Increasing the capacity of the site would be consistent with the need to make efficient use of development land, provided this would maintain an appropriate mix of uses and avoid harm to important features or constraints.
- 1.2 Paragraph 13.10 (page 371) of the Local Plan explains how the 300 additional dwellings proposed are expected to be achieved. The following sections expand on this and comment on whether clarification is needed.
- 1.3 Revised capacity of exiting phases – estimated 145 dwelling increase. The submission by West Waterlooville Developments Limited (Grainger PLC) to the Regulation 19 Local Plan (ANON-AQTS-3B5G-A/1/SH1) includes a Site Delivery Statement which helpfully sets out the proposed capacity of completed and remaining phases (pages 3-4), with the plan at the end of the document illustrating their location.
- 1.4 Some of the increase in capacity has already been achieved on completed phases, in particular Phase 1B (Private Rented Sector housing), 9A (Elm Green), and 9C / 11A (Kentidge Coppice and Daubenton Glen), with more minor increases / decreases elsewhere. Of the residential phases yet to be developed, the main capacity increases are in the various parts of Phase 6 (Local Centre), Phase 7 (Pavilion View), and 13B (Orchard View).
- 1.5 The overall effect of these changes is that about 145 more dwellings remain to be completed than estimated in the original masterplan. In general, these changes to existing phases have / can be achieved by the submission of reserved matters within the scope of the original outline planning consent. It should be noted that the 145 dwelling figure is based on earlier discussions with Grainger. Some of the capacity figures in the current Site Delivery Statement for future phases are higher and not necessarily yet agreed.
- 1.6 Land reserved for other uses – estimated 110 dwelling increase. This land consists of an area reserved for an extension to the first primary school (+27 dwellings) and land allocated for potential cemetery use (+84 dwellings). The school extension land (shown as 'school extension land' on the plan at the end of the Grainger Site Delivery Statement) is no longer needed as adequate

provision can be achieved at the second primary school. Hampshire County Council (as education authority) has confirmed that the land is no longer needed for school use and a planning application for 27 dwellings has been submitted and is under consideration.

- 1.7 The cemetery land (shown as an open area to the east of Phase 13B on the plan at the end of the Grainger Site Delivery Statement) was reserved for use by Havant Borough Council if required for a set period by the terms of a S106 obligation. Havant Borough Council has confirmed that the land is no longer required for a cemetery and the S106 obligation allows for it to be brought forward for other uses. The Grainger Site Delivery Statement (page 4) indicates that this area will be brought forward for sale in 2030 with occupations expected in 2034.
- 1.8 Older persons' housing scheme – estimated 45 dwelling increase. The outline planning consent for the Grainger part of Newlands was for 2,550 dwellings (including about 440 in Havant Borough) and other uses including '*a local centre (comprising retail, community building, land for healthcare, land for elderly care)*'. The 'elderly care' element is, therefore, in addition to the 2,550 dwellings (within the Grainger part of Newlands) for general housing and the S106 obligation refers to the provision of 85 extra care beds. The area is shown as 'extra care' as part of the Local Centre on the plan at the end of the Site Delivery Statement. The Site delivery statement refers to various parts of the Local Centre (Phases 6A – 6C) including the extra care (65 units) as part of Phase 6A.
- 1.9 Winchester City Council is working with Hampshire County Council (HCC) which is responsible for Adult Social Care, including setting the strategy for the care needs of the older population. HCC's strategy seeks to prevent or reduce demand, support people with emerging care needs to live independently in their own home for as long as possible and thus focus bespoke accommodation on those with the greatest needs. It seeks to develop and invest in provision of extra care and supported living as an alternative to residential care. The HCC's latest demand model recommends that additional capacity is required in the Waterlooville area.
- 1.10 Newlands is strategically well placed, close to the Winchester border with Havant Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council and Portsmouth City Council and well related to existing infrastructure for Older Persons housing. In providing affordable extra care housing (as the SHMA recommends at paragraph 5.38) it will be one of a range of products that will be accessible to a wider number of households. The number of extra care beds to be provided has yet to be finalised, but the Local Plan capacity estimate of 45 dwelling equivalents is based on an extra care scheme of about 85 beds (47 dwelling equivalents). Even if this reduced to the Grainger estimate of 65 units, the estimate for Phase 6 as a whole in the Site Delivery Statement (200 dwellings plus 65 extra care) is higher than assumed by the Council. Therefore, any potential reduction in extra care provision is likely to be offset by increased

housing provision elsewhere within the Local Centre. The details of development within the Local Centre area have yet to be agreed, so the precise split between general housing, retirement living and extra care is not yet finalised.

- 1.11 The above sections show how and where the additional 300 dwellings are proposed. They do not include further additional areas (M1 and M3) which Grainger has asked to be referred to in the explanatory text of the Plan. These are shown to the north-east of the development area, adjoining the main entrance roundabout, on the plan at the end of the Grainger Site Delivery Statement. The Site Delivery Statement estimates these have a combined capacity of about 68 dwellings (page 4).
- 1.12 This area was originally intended to be a mixed-use area linking the employment land at Newlands (now Proxima Park) to Waterlooville town centre. Part of the mixed-use land has already been developed for Private Rented Sector housing and Havant Borough Council's focus is now on regenerating Waterlooville town centre rather than extending it. The main employment allocation at Newlands (now known as Proxima Park) would be retained and this is treated as an employment commitment in the Local Plan (15.25 hectares remaining, Table A page 262). In addition, there are substantial other areas of employment provision immediately adjoining Newlands, with industrial estates / business parks to the north and Waterlooville town centre to the east.
- 1.13 Therefore, both Havant and Winchester Councils agree that areas M1 and M3 could be developed for residential uses without harming the delivery of employment uses. These areas are within Winchester City Council and, although Grainger has not formally requested an increase in the additional capacity, it does consider this could be increased by about 400 dwellings (the Grainger Site Delivery Statement estimates total provision of about 2,956 dwellings compared to the existing consent for about 2,550).
- 1.14 The Council proposes a more modest approach, given that details of Phases M1, M3 and 6 are not yet agreed, and Proposed Modifications have been put forward in the Schedule of Proposed Modifications ([SD14a](#)) to Policy SH1 and its explanatory text (PM189 and PM190) to increase the additional housing capacity to 'approximately 350' dwellings. These include reference to mixed use areas (Phases M1 and M3) in the explanatory text as requested by Grainger, which will also be shown on an updated 'Current Masterplan Area' plan on page 370 of the Plan (see question 2 below).
- 1.15 Newlands is located immediately adjacent to (and partly within) Havant Borough. While the City Council does not consider that the Local Plan should allocate specific developments for PfSH unmet needs, this site is clearly very well related to those authorities that have requested assistance with unmet needs (Havant and Portsmouth). Therefore, the Council considers that development at this location would result in high quality development that contributes to the needs of PfSH.

2. Should the policy map be modified to reflect the proposed changes?

WCC response:

1.16 The Policies Map shows the overall location covered by policy SH1 but does not show the location of specific uses or phases of development. As such, the Proposed Modifications above do not require a change to the Policies Map. However, the plan at page 370 of the Local Plan ('Current Masterplan Area') should be updated to show the various development areas more clearly and accurately, as suggested by Grainger, and the locations of the additional dwellings. An updated version is included at Appendix A and as a Proposed Modification ([SD14a](#), PM188).

3. Should policy SH1 require a Green Infrastructure Strategy and control its details to address mitigation of harmful impacts on European sites?

WCC response:

1.17 Yes. The Council recognises that Natural England is the competent authority with regards to matters affecting designated Habitats Sites. Natural England requested in their Regulation 19 consultation response that the HRA Addendum ([SD04a](#)) identified which individual site allocations will require mitigation in relation to recreational pressure on Habitats sites as a matter of clarification. Paragraph 5.10 of the HRA identified that Policy SH1 is within the 5.6km Solent Zone of Influence. In order to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Habitats sites the Appropriate Assessment recommended that an additional bullet point is added to the Policy to ensure a GI Strategy is implemented to avoid harmful impacts of the development, to provide facilities for dog walking and local walking reducing the impacts of recreational pressure on designated sites. The Council propose the following wording for SH1 (PM104) (updated to refer to 350 additional dwellings):

ix. Implement a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the additional (approximately 350) dwellings to avoid harmful impacts and mitigate the local and wider impacts of the development, including their phasing and long-term management and off-site measures required by the strategy to mitigate harmful impacts on European sites. New green infrastructure must seek to provide facilities for dog walking and local walks, to reduce trips to the SPA/Ramsar sites, and design of the greenspace must be agreed with Natural England, as part of a project-level HRA

Policy SH2 North Whiteley

1. This site carries forward land allocated in the existing Plan whilst identifying additional capacity. Would policy SH2 make this clear?

WCC response:

1.18 Yes, the first paragraph of policy SH2 is clear that the original land *'remains allocated to complete the development of about 3,500 dwellings'* and that there will be *'an additional approximately 200 dwellings'*. Furthermore, paragraph 13.20 explains that the original allocation for 3,500 dwellings is carried forward and how the additional capacity for 200 dwellings will be achieved.

2. What is the evidence to justify the indicative site capacities, given site constraints, including Ancient Woodland and hedgerows?

WCC response:

1.19 Site capacities were originally derived from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA, [HA04](#)) which uses an evidence based method to estimate site capacities. Subsequently, discussions with the landowners of the two main additional sites (land off Bluebell Way and land off Ridge Farm Lane) and consultation on the Regulation 18 Local Plan have resulted in the estimates included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) (110 dwellings and 50 dwellings respectively).

1.20 The land off Bluebell Way is controlled by a major housebuilder (Crest Nicholson) which supports the allocation of the site. A request for pre-application advice was submitted in 2023 for an illustrative scheme of 110 dwellings. This showed how the site could be developed while avoiding constraints, principally areas of hedgerow and ancient woodland to the west and north of (but outside) the site. A minimum 15m buffer was proposed between housing and the ancient woodland, consistent with the requirements of policy NE15 (itself reflecting advice from Natural England and the Forestry Commission). In most areas the separation between housing and ancient woodland / hedgerows was substantially greater due to the location of balancing ponds and open space. The Local Plan's estimated capacity of approximately 110 dwellings is based on the pre-application proposal.

1.21 Crest Nicholson's representation on the Local Plan refers to a planning application for 'circa 90' dwellings being submitted shortly, with a full suite of supporting studies and information. While this figure is reduced from the 110 included in the Local Plan, it is still in the order of 'approximately 110' dwellings and, given that the planning application has not yet been submitted, it is proposed that the estimate of 110 dwellings be retained.

1.22 The land off Ridge Farm Lane is owned by Hampshire County Council and discussions with the County Council confirm that the land is 'surplus to operational needs and is therefore considered available and deliverable'. Access to the land would be via the adjoining allocated development at North Whiteley and the County Council is contacting the North Whiteley Development Consortium to negotiate access provision.

1.23 The County Council estimate the capacity of the land at 45-50 dwellings, taking account of a wooded Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) which adjoins (but is outside) the site to the west and south (coinciding with ancient woodland to the south). No development proposals have yet been submitted, but these would need to comply with relevant policies such as NE15 relating to the protection of trees and hedgerows. The Council is, therefore, satisfied that the additional site is capable of being developed for the estimated capacity while taking account of the constraints applying.

1.24 There is also a small area of (previously developed) land to the south of Ridge Farm Lane (SHELAA site CU24), with a SHELAA capacity estimate of 8 dwellings. While this is too small to be allocated in its own right, it will be within the overall development area of North Whiteley and its inclusion justifies the rounding up of the capacity estimates for land at Ridge Farm Lane to 50 dwellings.

3. ED02 indicates the expected submission of a planning application for 90 dwellings on land off Bluebell Way, which is below the indicative capacity of 110 dwellings stated in the Plan. Should this be reflected in the policy?

WCC response:

1.25 No, as noted is response to question 2 above, no planning application has yet been submitted so the only scheme that has been considered is for 110 dwellings. The SHELAA estimated capacity of the sites making up this allocation is also about 110 dwellings (SHELAA sites CU34, CU44, CU45). If an application for 90 dwellings is forthcoming this would still be in the order of 'approximately 110' dwellings so it is proposed that the estimate of 110 dwellings be retained.

4. Would policy requirements adequately address impacts on Ancient Woodland and hedgerows, positively promote active transport infrastructure the adequately?

WCC response:

1.26 Yes, the promoters of both new site allocations have confirmed that their capacity estimates avoid ancient woodland / SINC's and allow for appropriate buffers. Policy SH2 refers to the need for development to '*reflect Whiteley's predominately wooded character*' (SH2, first paragraph) and requires protection

and enhancement of environmentally sensitive areas (criterion i). Criteria ix and x also require that the impact of development on biodiversity is assessed and a Green Infrastructure Strategy developed to avoid harmful impacts.

1.27 Other criteria of policy SH2 deal with sustainable transport measures, improvements to M27 junction 9, completion of Whiteley Way, etc. These have generally been secured through S106 / S278 agreements associated with the original North Whiteley development and are mostly complete or in the process of being implemented (e.g. M27 junction 9 improvements complete, Whiteley Way widening underway). Accordingly, the Council considered that the policy requirements in SH2 are adequate.

4. Would the policy in its introductory paragraph 13.16 clearly set out the potential for additional capacity, particularly with regard to the provisions of an extra care scheme?

WCC response:

1.28 The extra care scheme is specifically mentioned in paragraph 13.20, which states that *'an extra care scheme will contribute a further approximately 40 dwelling equivalents'*. The outline planning consent for the original 3,500 general housing units permitted at North Whiteley also refers to *'provision of an extra care facility (with scope for all uses to revert to residential if there were insufficient market demand)'*, confirming that the extra care provision is over and above the general housing allocation. The City Council aims to develop a scheme of about 80 extra care units, equating to 44 dwelling equivalents, which the Local Plan rounds to *'approximately 40 dwelling equivalents'*. If the City Council is unable to develop a scheme, the S106 obligation allows for another organisation (public or private) to produce the homes (Hampshire County Council consider that an Extra Care facility is needed in this location).

1.29 The Council does not consider that changes to paragraph 13.16 are needed, as this is referring in general terms to the overall capacity increase of 200 dwellings. Paragraph 13.20 refers to the extra care scheme as *'in addition'* (to extension to the proposed development area) which was intended to differentiate it from the new site allocations. However, in order to provide further clarification, a Proposed Modification (PM191) is proposed to the penultimate sentence of paragraph 13.20 as follows: *'In addition, the development of an extra care scheme (already permitted adjacent to the northern local centre as part of the outline consent for North Whiteley) will contribute a further approximately 40 dwelling equivalents'*.

Policy SH3 Whiteley Green

1. Would the supporting text to policy SH3 at paragraph 13.31 accurately reflect the potential for the presence of waste water infrastructure in relation to the site?

WCC response:

1.30 The Council previously included a criterion in the policy in relation to the waste water infrastructure in Cobham Grove and Bader Way. Following discussion with Hampshire County Council and Southern Water the Council can now confirm that the development proposals are outside of the public highway, and it was recommended that the requirement in relation to the easement was removed from the highway as reflected in the Southern Water Statement of Common Ground ([SD08k](#)).

1.31 The Council have revised the wording of paragraph 13.31 as a proposed modification (PM107) to reflect these comments as follows:

1.32 Paragraph 13.31 There are foul and surface water sewers ~~running across the site which would require an easement of 6m to be kept clear of all buildings and tree planting.~~ **located in Bader Way and Cobham Grove, with manholes in close proximity to the site boundary. It is important that the exact location of this infrastructure in relation to the site is established prior to the commencement of any construction, in liaison with Southern Water.**

Appendix A

Updated Map of Newlands (West of Waterlooville) on page 340 (PM188)

