

## Winchester Local Plan EIP

### Matter 12: High Quality, we designed places and living well

**Issue: Would the Plan's approach to achieving high quality design in the Plan's three spatial areas and the individual policies be clear, justified, and consistent with national policy and would they be effective?**

#### Strategic Policy D5: Masterplans

1. Would strategic policy D5 be clear in its policy wording and supporting text as to what development would require a masterplan (para 5.70 states '...assessed on a site by site basis...', strategic policy D5 states at different parts '...on larger sites ... significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users...') when they should be prepared, how they would be agreed by the local planning authority, and their status on that agreement? In this regard would the policy be clear and unambiguous so as to be effective?

The policy lacks clarity as to when a site will be expected to prepare a masterplan. The term 'significant development' is open to interpretation and could lead to some sites being required to provide a master plan where it may not be necessary. HBF would suggest that a specific definition is used as to when a development will be expected to produce a master plan. It is also unclear as to whether these will need to be formally approved by the Council prior to an application being submitted. The opening sentence in paragraph 5.71 suggests that plans will be agreed with paragraph 5.72 states that the masterplan should be prepared so that the main principles for developing the land can be identified and agreed. The Council must state in this policy whether it is expected for masterplans to be agreed by the local authority and the process for obtaining agreement and the status of any agreement.

2. Would its policy requirements provide appropriate flexibility so as to strike the right balance between ensuring high quality design and sustainable development is approved without delay?

No comment

3. Would this policy have a clear purpose, avoiding repetition in other Plan policies (e.g. site allocation policies and other design policies (strategic policies D1, D2, D3 and D4 in particular)?

No comment.

4. Would the third paragraph of strategic policy D5 provide the necessary clarity to ensure effectiveness, in particular

'... should be preceded by... '?

This reflects the wider concern as to if, when and how a masterplan would be approved by the council. Clarity as to what is expected is necessary.

5. Given that the Plan should be read as a whole, what is the justification for strategic policy D5xiii, xiv and xv?

For council.

6. Would the requirements of strategic policy D5xiv accord with Plan policy CN3iv, in relation to all new residential development?

For council.

7. Would the requirement for a management plan as part of the masterplan process be overly onerous?

The requirement for a management plan as part of masterplan is overly onerous. Such plans are more appropriately considered at reserved matters stage when the final detail of such plans can be agreed. HBF would suggest that this is deleted from the policy and a more appropriate location identified outlining that a management plan will be required to demonstrate at reserved matters how infrastructure and community assets will be maintained and managed following completion of development.

8. Should strategic policy D5xiii refer to green and blue infrastructure, for the purposes of soundness?

No comment.

9. Overall, would the policy provide the necessary flexibility to ensure that sustainable development is not unnecessarily delayed?

No comment.

D6 – Brownfield development making best use of land

1. This policy states that the local planning authority will prioritise development of previously developed land. How would this requirement be implemented and how would that requirement interact with strategic policy H2?

This policy, alongside H2, is fundamentally unsound in seemingly seeking to prioritise the delivery of previously developed lands over other sites in WCC. HBF recognises that there should be a focus in ensuring brownfield sites are allocated for development and on ensuring that development is maximised on these sites. However, given the Council cannot meet its housing needs on such sites, as is the case for WCC, there is nothing in national policy to

suggest that greenfield sites are delayed to allow these sites to come forward. HBF would recommend that the following is deleted from the opening sentence of the policy: “*the local planning authority will prioritise development of previously developed land*”

2. In referring to ‘...development land within existing settlements...’, would the policy accord with NPPF paragraph 89, which recognises that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent or beyond existing settlements? Would this capture previously developed land outside settlements close to facilities and services so as to make best use of land? Should it for the purposes of effectiveness?

No comment

**Mark Behrendt**

**Regional Planning Manager – SE and E**