

SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North

- Support - 1
- Neither support of object - 11
- Object - 32

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

Comments in support of SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-N814-V	I support this Policy SW01 but I really want to support the Settlement Boundary Adjustment to the south for which there wasn't a tab to press in this consultation. I support the settlement boundary adjustment under para 14.125 for the Land off Chaucer Close. Several SHELAA submissions and representations have been made over the last 10-12 years for at least the east end (shown darker green) colouring being a natural extension into on otherwise redundant and now derelict parcel of land immediately to the west of Nos 1 and 2 Cottages. I cannot speak for the owners of the rear gardens of the dwellings to the south west but this darker green area would provide more than adequate access to serve the modest number of dwellings that could be accommodated within the land area as a part or whole of the proposed boundary adjustment	Comments noted and support welcomed. Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N8B6-F	Summary of the representation received. Additional info saved on SP.	(This representation was submitted under SW07 Swanmore, but refers to

	<p>Site Location</p> <p>2.1. The subject site is held under an option to Beechcroft Land Ltd who are actively promoting the site for residential purposes.</p> <p>POLICY SW01 – WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION PLAN NOVEMBER 2022</p> <p>ITEM 1 – SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION.</p> <p>4.1. As above we support the proposed allocation at policy SW01 of the RCP for the following reasons.</p> <p>4.2. The existing Local Plan’s spatial strategy will be carried forward to an extent, but there is a requirement to evolve this to provide for future housing needs in locations which are most sustainable, and which can best meet the District’s needs. Most of the development contemplated in the existing Local Plan now has planning permission. This means that there is a requirement for new sites to be allocated to meet the needs of those short, medium and long term.</p> <p>4.3. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) confirms in paragraph 11 that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan making this means that: ‘all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet the development needs of their area....’</p> <p>4.4. Details relating to housing needs and provisions for the District are provided in Table H2 of the RCP. Provision is made for the development of about 15,620 dwellings over the local</p>	<p>this site allocation at South Wonston, which was SW07 in the SHELAA)</p> <p>Comments noted. The support for both the wider strategy of the plan and this particular allocation are welcomed.</p> <p>The availability of the site is also noted.</p> <p>The detailed representation contained an indicative scheme including possible numbers and disposition of housing. The layout and site design included a proposed location for site access from West Hill Road.</p> <p>The allocation in the Reg 18 Plan does not represent any judgement or endorsement of the developers’ scheme – including the housing numbers and types.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>plan period from 2019 to 2039. In terms of distribution, it is proposed that 4,250 dwellings are to be allocated in market towns and rural areas (Strategic Policy H1).</p> <p>4.5. This strategy reflects the advice provided within the Framework where it is established in Paragraph 78 that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This is echoed in the new PPG on rural housing. Equally, Paragraph 68 of the Framework makes clear that small and medium-sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly.</p> <p>4.6. South Wonston is identified within the RCP as an 'Intermediate Rural Settlement' and in such settlements, new sites to accommodate around 50 to 60 dwellings are to be identified. Paragraph 14.124 of the RCP confirms that there is the capacity for the development of around 70 dwellings at South Wonston.</p> <p>4.7. It is considered entirely reasonable that South Wonston is capable of accommodating up to 70 dwellings and that 40 of these dwellings are to be located on land at West Hill Road North. South Wonston has a number of facilities and services as detailed in Chapter 2 above, including leisure, retail, medical and educational facilities. Furthermore, there are good public transport links to the nearby towns of Winchester, Whitechurch and Andover, all of which provide more extensive services and facilities along with employment opportunities.</p> <p>4.8. Furthermore, it is considered that the allocation of additional housing within South Wonston will meet the needs of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the Parish which have been set out in recent survey work. It has therefore been established locally that there is a community need for the provision of market and affordable housing which this scheme would provide. Thus, it is our view that the additional housing within South Wonston would realise local community aspirations.</p> <p>4.9. In relation to the allocation of the site at Land at West Hill Road North, (Policy SW01) for residential purposes, this allocation is fully supported at this location 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 reminiscent of 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.</p>	
--	---	--

Comments which neither support nor object to SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BE-X Environment Agency</p>	<p>Based on the information currently available, the site raises some environmental concerns that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Further work will be needed to show how these issues can be satisfactorily addressed to ensure no environmental impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPZ 	<p>Comments regarding groundwater sensitivity are noted and a criterion will be added to the policy to ensure that proposals take this into account:</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add new criteria –</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal Aquifer <p>Water Quality The protection of the groundwater will need to be considered as part of this site - specific policy.</p>	<p>‘xi Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.’ An explanation will also be added to the supporting text to explain the reason for this new criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add additional text to end of paragraph 14.131 as follows:</p> <p>‘As the site is located on a principal aquifer, any proposed development will need to avoid any contamination to this aquifer.’</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86Z-7	<p>GP Surgeries South Wonston Sutton Scotney Gratton Surgery (Main and Branch) NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB - Primary Care Response</p> <p>The GP surgery that serves these potential sites are currently have capacity for 1,404 patients as of October 2022 in terms of estate, but the practice feel that should the sites proposed be developed, they would require further workforce. The surgery has already seen an increase of 300 in the last year, which, should it continue, will reduce the capacity shown above to zero before the Local Plan is adopted. Additionally, the PCN base some of their ARRS staff in this location, as one of the few with capacity across the locality. Gratton Surgery note that the national accepted average is around between 1,800 - 2,000 patients per WTE GP, and they</p>	<p>Officers have held a number of meetings with the ICB to understand further this representation and others on proposed site allocations in the regulation 18 draft Local Plan. Further information has been sought from the ICB to provide more detail on the nature and scope of any deficit in GP surgery facilities and how it may be resolved. This includes confirmation of which surgeries serve proposed allocations and which may require improvement. At this point it is considered prudent for the Plan and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to note this position and</p>

	<p>have 2,100 patients per WTE already. They currently employ a model in the practice using Advance Nurse Practitioners to do on the day work, however more patients would require more GP time and Nurse time.</p> <p>Winchester City Council – Local Plan Policies Due to the additional healthcare activities that will derive from the Local Plan we believe that there should be references to healthcare in policy SW1 to inform potential developers of the requirement for these impacts to be mitigated.</p>	<p>set out a mechanism to deal with any necessary infrastructure requirements arising from this request. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include the most recent information received from the ICB regarding the capacity of infrastructure and identified need for any improvements.</p> <p>Recommended Response:</p> <p>Insert new paragraph in supporting text as follows –</p> <p>14.176 This allocation falls within an area which is served by one or more GP practices. The NHS Integrated Care Board has advised that the relevant practices are working from surgeries which fall below relevant NHS space standards for the number of people on the current practice patient list. Further details are set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Developers are encouraged to contact the ICB at an early stage to understand what the current position is, and any requests for support from the ICB to fund expansion.</p>
--	--	---

<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)</p>	<p>Policy SW01 Land at West Hill Road North This is a site close to a sharp right-hand bend with poor sightlines at the junction of Alresford Drove and Grindelwald. Alresford Drove itself is a narrow single carriageway rural road with no footway which causes problems when vehicles meet each other or equestrians and pedestrians. There are existing highway safety concerns related to vehicles speeding and the risk to pedestrians and horses.</p> <p>Any proposed allocation at this site will need to prove it can provide safe and suitable access for all users and will not worsen the highway safety issues on Alresford Road. If the site is likely to have a negative impact on highway safety it will need to provide or contribute towards a scheme to mitigate the problem.</p> <p>The existing footway provision on Grindelwald does not extend as far north as the site and as part of the proposals the County Council would expect the development proposals to provide a footway along the length of the site boundary.</p>	<p>The response from HCC suggests that it is possible to achieve satisfactory access to the site, but there needs to be careful site planning to ensure that suitable access can be provided safely. There are existing highway issues regarding the junction between Alresford Drove and West Hill Road North (Grindlewald) which will affect where and how this access is provided.</p> <p>Additional wording is therefore recommended to specifically require that the access be provided at a safe distance from the junction. Additional wording is also recommended to the text to ensure that highway safety issues and the provision of safe and suitable access are adequately addressed as part of the design process for this site.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend Policy SW01 by adding the following wording to the end of criteria iii) – ‘at a safe distance from Alresford Drove’</p>
--	---	--

		<p>Amend paragraph 14.129 by adding additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –</p> <p>‘As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they can provide safe and suitable access for all users and address highway safety issues on Alresford Drive.’</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86M-T Hampshire County Council (Schools)</p>	<p>Land West Hill Road North 40 dwellings are likely to generate up to 12 additional primary age pupils and 8 secondary. The site is served by South Wonston Primary School and Henry Beaufort Secondary. It is likely that these could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.</p>	<p>The representation from the Local Education Authority (HCC) suggests that additional secondary school place provision may be required as a result of this development, but that primary is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>It is recognised that there is local concern regarding school capacity and that the situation may alter depending on the nature of other proposed allocations and the timing of their constructions, that will affect the catchment(s) of HB in particular. As no specific requirement is currently identified, it would not be appropriate to include this in the policy.</p> <p>This development will not be until after 2030 and neither will the large</p>

		<p>scale developments that affect Henry Beaufort (W1 and W2) so the situation should be kept under review. The city council will continue to liaise with the LEA in respect of required school places as part of continuing IDP work.</p> <p>In recognition of this uncertainty, it is considered appropriate that attention is drawn to this issue within the policy criteria and supporting text. Although only secondary is currently highlighted by HCC, it is suggested that reference is also included due to the future uncertainty.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add the following at the end of criteria xii) of Policy SW01 – including addressing any need for education provision (Primary and Secondary) to meet the needs of the development. Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 14.131 –</p> <p>The site lies within the catchment areas of South Wonston Primary and Henry Beaufort Secondary School. Advice from the Local Education Authority has indicated</p>
--	--	---

		that it is likely that the development could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	To increase traffic in this section of South Wonston needs to seriously consider the safety of the corner from West Hill Road and Alresford Drove Road and take steps to massively improve this	Amendments have been made to the policy and text to address this as a result of comments from HCC, as described in the response above Recommended Response: No Change
BHLF-KSAR-N8TZ-5	Paragraph 14.127 acknowledges the existence of The Drove Road as a PROW with the status of a restricted byway. This means there is a right to ride and drive a horse along this historic route but motorised vehicles are excluded. The policy SW01 in criterion ii. should say 'public rights of way' rather than 'footpaths' in recognition of the importance and higher status of the rights of way network that surrounds the settlement including the restricted byway along the northern boundary of the site.	<i>ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F is identical representation.</i> The Drove Road is a PROW. There are also a number of other active travel routes around South Wonston for a variety of different users, such as some footpaths and some cycleways etc. An amendment is recommended to the policy to clarify the status of Drove Road. HCC are also keen to improve active travel links and usage and additional wording is therefore recommended to

		<p>acknowledge the role and variety of such routes in the area.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend Policy SW01 criteria ii as follows –</p> <p>‘...linkages to †The Drove Road PROW/existing footpaths around the site.’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 14.130 by adding additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –</p> <p>‘As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to provide active travel links across the site and links to the surrounding network of PROW and other active travel routes’.</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8TH-K</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.128 Any Development “in such a way as to minimise visual intrusion into the wider landscape” • Environmental 8 and 10 “important to protect wider views to the North” “minimise light pollution and visual intrusion into the wider countryside area” <p>The proposed 40 houses is greater the 15/hectare typical of the parish. When would the type of housing and impact to the wider views be understood and communicated, single or double</p>	<p>The site design process would develop a layout of development that would illustrate the proposed location, type and height of housing, across the site. The design process includes careful consideration of a number of factors as set out in general design policy D1 and D4 in relation to the MTRA area. This would include consideration of the</p>

	<p>storey? Can we be reassured that 3 storey town houses would not get permission?</p> <p>Light pollution is almost zero to the North; will there be an assessment for light pollution and potential loss of a beautiful night sky? Has ample consideration gone into the brown field oil site on the A272 before considering green field agricultural sites?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.129 “the junction with Drove Road has poor visibility” <p>Has, or will an assessment be carried out and communicated on the risks of a single track road and blind bend? The village is effectively a 1 mile Cul-de-Sac, any development will add risk to village road and pedestrian users and push traffic to use the Drove Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.131 Infrastructure “Do not currently have adequate mains sewage and drainage” <p>Has, or will an assessment been carried out and communicated on any detrimental effect on existing services, including clean water supply pressure and capacity required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and GP surgery. <p>Are there additional spaces being provided for what I understand to be full school and GP surgery?</p> <p>We and many of our neighbours moved to, and remain in South Wonston because it is RURAL and provides a soothing environment, a sense of wellbeing and LOW potential for</p>	<p>context of the site in relation to the existing village and wider landscape.</p> <p>Appropriate lighting will be considered as part of the design process.</p> <p>The Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper (DSSS) (as updated 2024) explains why this site was selected and why other sites - such as the oil site referred to – were rejected.</p> <p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) took account of the existing levels of facilities and services in potential development locations. The council is liaising with all infrastructure service providers in respect of required infrastructure provision. The process is further detailed in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) prepared as part of the Reg 19 Plan.</p> <p>In relation to specific issues – Highways safety – see response to HCC above. Schools capacity – see response to HCC above.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>development, as opposed to an URBAN area with a higher potential for development. I ask that if there is capacity and suitability in a more urban area or brownfield site, that this is considered.</p> <p>We must keep and treasure our agricultural open space.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The hierarchy used is wrong, employment opportunities post build are nil 2. Worthy down development is within the parish and must form part of existing development count. 3. It is stated that South Wonston has a healthcare facility, this is not true and needs to be removed from the count. 4. The local plan commits to brownfield development before greenfield ('negative impacts for loss of greenfield land'), the old oil site at Stockbridge Road is brownfield but dismissed for development, this breaks the commitment from WCC to put brownfield first. 5. Development of land outside of the settlement boundary means building into the countryside and greenfield land. 6. Assumptions have been made on services and infrastructure without consideration of detail or resolution. 7. Already high pollution levels will be increased by the development and ongoing need for the addition travel pollution for an increased urban population, a local risk to health and wellbeing. <p>I ask that these points and attached mentioned document get due consideration to reverse any decision made for additional development of greenfield sites within and attached to the parish.</p>	<p>GP capacity – see response to ICP above.</p> <p>Mains sewage, water supply, pressure and capacity – see detailed response provided under this heading below.</p> <p>Issues relating to the use of greenfield land for development, the account taken of existing nearby development, the settlement hierarchy and increases in travel and pollution are considered in detail below under the development strategy, hierarchy and transport and traffic headings.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
--	---	---

ANON-KSAR-NKT4-J	<p>The proposal for housing development in South Wonston falls mostly outside the development boundary to the north of the village. No notice has been taken of the pressure on utilities, especially sewerage and water supply in this proposal. Not enough attempt has been made to find brownfield sites for small infilling, and no consideration has been given to developing to the south of the village. No notice seems to have been taken of the local expression of objections when residents were consulted by the parish council and this seems to make a mockery of the consultation process. It was not nimby-ism but real concerns for the pressure on utilities and other practical considerations.</p>	<p>The plan prioritises brownfield development where appropriate and possible. However, the scale of required development necessitates some allocations on greenfield sites.</p> <p>The DSSS sets out details of the council's assessment process, including an analysis of the various sites promoted via the SHELAA process.</p> <p>A detailed response on utilities, including sewerage and water supply is provided below.</p> <p>Comments in relation to consideration of the views of the Parish Council are also covered below.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
------------------	---	--

Comments which object to SW01 - Land at West Hill Road North		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKFA-H	<p><u>SWPC – SHELAA RESPONSE</u> <i>In addition to specific comments in relation to site allocation SW01, the SHELAA response of South Wonston Parish</i></p>	<p><i>This representation was submitted under Comments on Other Topics.</i></p>

	<p><i>Council has also been re-submitted in response to the Reg 18 draft local plan. The main points this raises are summarised below.</i></p> <p>Main conclusion of the SWPC SHELAA response: South Wonston Parish Council ..., given the constraints and concerns that have been noted in our submission do not agree that any development take place on the nominated SHELAA sites.</p> <p>A summary of the main general concerns is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devt Strategy - The climate emergency housing needs to be in a location with better public transport/access • Allocation of Numbers is flawed – hierarchy require better justification of the allocation of the numbers as we consider the allocation system to be flawed. • Hierarchy – Methodology and scoring are flawed • Climate emergency - Due to lack of facilities eg employment and public transport, most new residents would travel by car – increase in carbon footprint and pollution • Public transport - Lack of bus means most people will travel by car • Traffic Increase -Lack of public transport and restricted road system = increase in traffic generally and at congested exit from Downs Road onto Christmas Hill. • Road access - Access to sites, but restricted road system, unmade and unsuitable roads. 	<p><i>The main points are summarised here. The full version of South Wonston Parish Council’s SHELAA Response can be seen in Appendix 3 of the Development Strategy and Site Selection 2024 document.</i></p> <p>It is recognised that the Parish Council do not support any development at South Wonston. Some representations to SW01 consider that sufficient account has not been taken of the views of local residents and the Parish Council.</p> <p>There is a requirement to provide for additional development throughout the plan period. The amount of housing required is still set by the Standard Method and there are no special circumstances justifying a deviation from this. The Housing Topic Paper discusses this in more detail.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not possible to reject additional housing development per se. The development strategy of the plan seeks to provide for the required level of development in an appropriate manner. The strategy has been subject to a sustainability</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Infrastructure - Current capacity strained re water supply/sewerage, bus service and road quality</p> <p>Water - Significant upgrade & investment in services required</p> <p>Water quality - Concern re sewage into treatment plant off Andover Rd and then into the Itchen</p> <p>Broadband - Inadequate</p> <p>Health - Current provision cannot cope. No Drs</p> <p>School - Current school has no available space</p> <p>Wildlife & habitats - Open land around the boundary is rich in wildlife. Detrimental to biodiversity. Known protected species in the vicinity.</p>	<p>appraisal which considered it represented a sound approach.</p> <p>The particular concerns raised by the SHELAA response, and the representations of the Parish Council and other respondents are given detailed consideration below, listed by the specific issues raised.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B South Wonston Parish Council</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary adjustment – Land at Chaucer Close</p> <p>Before proceeding to the site allocation SW01 proposes to adjust South Wonston's settlement boundary to include Land at Chaucer Close and the adjoining back gardens of 63-69 Wrights Way. South Wonston is the only recipient of such a proposal. The pronouncement that the adjustment "is to be made" shows scant regard for the community engagement encouraged elsewhere in the plan. Consultation should have taken place before the draft was released. Access to development here can only be gained through the front curtilages of Canterbury Cottages. A previous application for the adjacent field was withdrawn. The Parish Council don't wish the settlement boundary to be adjusted just to make development acceptable in planning terms in an area classed as countryside.</p>	<p><i>The Parish Council's representation on this was submitted under Missing Policy category.</i></p> <p>The area in question comprises the land of the SHELAA site SW03. The site has therefore been subject to consideration by the Parish Council and local residents as part of the Parish's community engagement process.</p> <p>This area of land has been subject to several planning applications, and it is considered acceptable in principle from a landscape point of view. HCC as the highway authority, did not object to the planning applications in principle, subject to the applicant</p>

		<p>demonstrating that suitable access can be provided, although they would be unlikely to publicly adopt this due to the number of properties that would be using the access.</p> <p>Due to these constraints, this site is only likely to be able to provide a small number of dwellings, below the level which would generally be allocated within the local plan. Nevertheless, due to the need to accommodate additional housing in the local plan, the presence of a willing developer and there being no objections in principle to the development, it is considered appropriate to allow for a limited amount of development by means of a small adjustment to the settlement boundary in that location.</p> <p>Development would only be permitted if it could satisfactorily address the access, landscaping and design issues in relation to the existing surrounding properties that were identified as part of previous planning applications.</p> <p>Recommend Response: No Change</p>
--	--	---

<p>ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J South Wonston Parish Council</p>	<p>The policy SW01 is unsupported by the Parish Council. The site is greenfield, outside the current settlement boundary, intruding into the countryside. It is classed as a sensitive landscape. There will be little benefit from forty houses to local character, biodiversity, air quality, water quality and current waste management facilities (which will require extensive improvements). The site is some distance from local facilities. Winchester, the wider county and London are yet further away. The local bus service is insufficient and car use is high, even within the village. Commuting is common. North Hampshire already has poor air quality. Increased traffic from the development won't help reduce carbon emissions. More journeys on foot, cycle or by car will add to problems already experienced at the junction with West Hill Rd North and Alresford Drove (a notorious bottleneck, frequently used) and will create a hot spot at the new access. The site has already been rejected for affordable housing for Highways, policy and separation issues. Would a much larger development be any more acceptable in planning terms?</p>	<p><i>See responses under specific issues as set out below.</i></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4 ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NKTZ-R ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7 ANON-KSAR-NKRG-3 ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E ANON-KSAR-NKRU-H</p>	<p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be focussed more on the larger settlements, that have a greater capacity and range of facilities. • Development should be focussed on brownfield sites. • It is not compatible with Winchester's concerns regarding the climate emergency as will result in additional vehicle trips and increase in pollution. 	<p>The development strategy was informed by a number of factors including the settlement hierarchy, the quantity of development required and the need to achieve a suitable balance of development throughout the plan area.</p> <p>The strategy for the distribution of development broadly follows the approach in the existing plan, with</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3 ANON-KSAR-NK6Q-H ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5 ANON-KSAR-NKFW-7 ANON-KSAR-NKR3-F ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T ANON-KSAR-N8YS-3 ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8YA-H ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J ANON-KSAR-N83N-R ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X BHLF-KSAR-N8RS-V ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B</p>		<p>Winchester being the focus for development along with the other larger settlements of the district. It was also considered appropriate to have some degree of disbursement of development in proportion to the locations of settlements and their relative levels of sustainability.</p> <p>South Wonston is classified as an intermediate settlement, where a modest amount of development could theoretically occur.</p> <p>The distribution of development is set out in Policy H3 of the plan. The Development Strategy and Site Selection Background Paper (DSSS) 2024 provides further detail on the approach taken.</p> <p>The plan focusses on appropriately located brownfield development where possible. However, the scale of development means that some greenfield sites will need to be allocated. It is recognised that there are likely to be fewer opportunities for brownfield development within the smaller settlements, where more modest allocations are proposed.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>The development strategy was subject to the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), which included a sustainability appraisal and considered that the proposed strategy would be an appropriate approach. The Reg 19 Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Assessment which considers the volume and patterns of traffic generation and proposes mitigation where necessary.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7 ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5 ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J ANON-KSAR-N83N-R</p>	<p><u>Quantity of development and calculation of apportionment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Wonston should not have the amount of housing allocated, taking regard of the size of the village in comparison to other settlements. • Why have other settlements in the intermediate category not been allocated housing? • Why can't South Wonston take account of the development at Worthy Down, which is just outside the village and uses its facilities? This approach has not been taken at Ravenswood. 	<p>The DSSS 2024 summarises how the relative distribution of housing was reconsidered, following representations on the Settlement Hierarchy Review 2022 and the Reg 18 Draft Local Plan strategy. This confirms that the position of South Wonston within the intermediate category is still considered correct and therefore an appropriate location for a modest amount of development.</p> <p>The settlements in the intermediate category were all assessed as potential locations for new development. Following suitable evaluation, development is not being proposed within all of these</p>

		<p>settlements due to a number of factors, such as local constraints and availability of suitable sites. The DSSS sets out this process and reasoning in more detail.</p> <p>The local plan's approach takes account of recent developments only where they occur within or adjoining particular settlements as a general principle. The approach to development in the southern parish area has been revised following the Reg 18 consultation, as explained in the 2024 DSSS.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5 ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J ANON-KSAR-N83N-R ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X BHLF-KSAR-N8RS-V ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B</p>	<p><u>Hierarchy is flawed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hierarchy does not take account of the relative sustainability of the settlement and the range of facilities and services within it • The scoring of facilities and services on which the hierarchy is based is flawed. • There are no health facilities within South Wonston. • The bus service is inadequate and over-represented in the scoring. • Employment in South Wonston is very limited. • There is not high quality broadband. 	<p>It is recognised that South Wonston does not contain the range of facilities and services of higher order settlements, towns and cities. However, as explained above and within the strategy of the plan, it is considered reasonable to consider a modest amount of development in the village and that this is also appropriate in terms of the overall sustainability of the district.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review has been updated in response to</p>

		<p>comments received and make necessary corrections. The status of the bus service provision in the area has been re-evaluated. The methodology reflects that there is at least 1 employer in the settlement. A detailed explanation of the scoring in relation to broadband provision is also provided.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review reflects that there is not a GP surgery in South Wonston. It is noted that the IIA refers to a healthcare facility and this will be corrected as the plan progresses.</p> <p>The resulting altered scores for facilities and services does not change the category of South Wonston, which remains as an intermediate rural settlement in the 2024 Settlement Hierarchy, with a moderate level of services and facilities and a location where a modest amount of development could be considered. It is therefore considered that the site allocation SW01 is still appropriate.</p> <p>The revised scoring for facilities and services and the resulting settlement</p>
--	--	---

		<p>hierarchy is described in more detail in the Settlement Hierarchy Paper 2024.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4 ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NKTZ-R ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7 ANON-KSAR-NKRG-3 ANON-KSAR-NK7X-S ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E ANON-KSAR-NKRU-H ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3 ANON-KSAR-NK6Q-H ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5 ANON-KSAR-NKFW-7 ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F ANON-KSAR-NKR3-F ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T ANON-KSAR-N8YS-3 ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8YA-H ANON-KSAR-N8GV-M</p>	<p><u>Transport and traffic concerns</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The high car ownership and poor bus service means that there will be an increase in traffic as a result of proposed development • The local roads are inadequate to cope with the increase in traffic, with many being constrained, un-made or unadopted • Additional traffic is likely to exit onto Christmas Hill, adding to existing congestion in this location. • Impact of construction traffic • Concerns about access and safety of the West Hill Road / Alresford Drove corner • The status of Drove Road as a PROW should be recognised 	<p>The plan recognises that the smaller settlements and more rural areas of the district have higher car dependency. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) considered the levels of car usage and public transport provision as part of its evaluation of sites.</p> <p>HCC Highways have assessed all of the site allocations in the Reg 18 and they have confirmed that access is achievable. The Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Transport Assessment that has assessed and identified the mitigation that is required to deliver the site allocations in the Local Plan. This has been agreed by HCC Highways and National Highways.</p> <p>The council has liaised with HCC Transportation in respect of the prospective SHELAA sites. They did not identify any concerns regarding</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N ANON-KSAR-N83N-R ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X BHLF-KSAR-N8RS-V ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B</p>		<p>the quantity of development being proposed in South Wonston. They identified constraints in relation to some of the sites, due to the suitability of their access but considered that SW01 could be developed subject to certain criteria, as set out in their representation and WCC proposed response above.</p> <p>HCC is seeking appropriate improvements in the area as part of its Local Transport Plan Part 4. HCC is undertaking a district-wide Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which will consider the potential for improved walking and cycling links.</p> <p>To support active travel opportunities in the area, Policy SW01 requires proposals to provide pedestrian and cycle links through and around the site and linking to existing routes into the village centre.</p> <p>The potential disturbance caused by the development of this site would be managed through appropriate conditions and the preparation of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>The status of Drove Road is recognised in the Policy, and the proposed changes below set out further clarifications on how transport impacts will be managed.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Amend Policy SW01 by adding the following wording to the end of criteria iii) – ‘at a safe distance from Alresford Drove’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 14.129 by adding additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –</p> <p>‘As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they can provide safe and suitable access for all users and address highway safety issues on Alresford Drove.’</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4 ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K ANON-KSAR-NK7X-S ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure and Utilities Capacity - General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure is not adequate and will not cope with additional development. • Health - Current provision cannot cope. No Drs in South Wonston. • School - School has no available space • Bus service inadequate • Water supply and sewage capacity concerns 	<p>The council is liaising with all infrastructure service providers in respect of required infrastructure provision. The process is further detailed in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) prepared as part of the Reg 19 Plan.</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3 ANON-KSAR-NK6Q-H ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y ANON-KSAR-NKFW-7 ANON-KSAR-NKR3-F ANON-KSAR-N8YS-3 ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8YA-H ANON-KSAR-N8GV-M ANON-KSAR-N8G7-N ANON-KSAR-N83N-R ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality concerns regarding treatment and discharge • The village already has a deficit of open space (though two respondents noted a nearby play area) • Scheme should include community growing space. 	<p>WCC is continuing to liaise with local Integrated Care Board (ICB) regarding GP premises and has included additional text that encourages early dialogue with the ICB.</p> <p>The Local Education Authority (HCC) was consulted as part of the development of the local plan and specifically regarding the proposed allocations. They did not identify any issues in relation to the required capacity of the primary school. A detailed analysis of their comments is provided above and amendments have been recommended to the policy and text to address any potential future issues, having regard to planned developments and local concerns. WCC is continuing to work with HCC regarding future education requirements as part of the IDP work.</p> <p>Public transport provision is outside the control of WCC. It is recognised that the use of private car is higher in rural areas and the policy requires improvements in active travel links to encourage use of other modes of travel and support existing bus services. HCC is seeking appropriate</p>
---	---	--

		<p>improvements in the area as part of its Local Transport Plan Part 4.</p> <p>There are recognised concerns regarding water and sewage provision in the area. A detailed response is provided on these issues below.</p> <p>It is considered that the open space requirements in the policy are in line with existing deficits identified in the Open Space assessment and policy NE3.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKEH-Q ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K ANON-KSAR-NK7X-S ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J ANON-KSAR-N83N-R ANON-KSAR-N8WP-X</p>	<p><u>Water Supply, Quality and Sewage issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply and sewage system already an issue locally. Significant upgrading and investment in services is required <p>Some respondents have also expressed concerns that necessary improvement packages will not be available in a timely manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality - Concern re sewage into treatment plant off Andover Rd and then into the Itchen The settlement is close to groundwater source protection zones 	<p>The council is liaising with Southern Water the service provider in respect of known issues in relation to water supply and sewage connection and disposal in the area. Improvements are planned in the vicinity as discussed in IDP at Appendix 1 which contains a letter from Southern Water dated 18th July 2024, outlining actions in relation to this. A new pipeline is to be constructed from Sutton Scotney, through South Wonston into Harestock, Waste Water Treatment Works to address sewerage capacity issues in the local</p>

		<p>area. This work has been delayed due to adverse weather conditions, but Southern Water state that this should be completed in advance of the planned development of this site, post 2030.</p> <p>Improvements are also planned as detailed in this letter, to drainage infrastructure along with upgrades to water treatment works which should improve both sewage capacity and the treatment of water to address concerns regarding potential pollution of the Itchen.</p> <p>Although the local plan cannot redress existing issues of water supply and disposal in the area, it is hoped that the planned upgrades will address these. The letter from Southern Water also sets out the processes for arranging access to their network from existing properties under a number of situations.</p> <p>In respect of the development being proposed for SW01 therefore, improvements should be in place prior to the commencement of development. Nevertheless, the policy requires developers to liaise</p>
--	--	--

		<p>with the service provider and provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity for supply and drainage, and/or make arrangements for appropriate water drainage and disposal as appropriate, to allow for flexibility as to how this is achieved.</p> <p>The proximity to Groundwater Source Protection Zones is acknowledged and the policy has been amended in recognition of this.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add new criteria –</p> <p>‘xi Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.’ An explanation will also be added to the supporting text to explain the reason for this new criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Add additional text to end of paragraph 14.131 as follows:</p> <p>‘As the site is located on a principal aquifer, any proposed development will need to avoid any contamination to this aquifer.’</p>
--	--	--

<p>ANON-KSAR-NKUE-4 ANON-KSAR-NKNZ-J ANON-KSAR-NK1V-H ANON-KSAR-NK3F-3 ANON-KSAR-NKWP-H ANON-KSAR-NKTZ-R ANON-KSAR-NKRW-K ANON-KSAR-NK9D-7 ANON-KSAR-NK7M-E ANON-KSAR-NKZF-A ANON-KSAR-NK6C-3 ANON-KSAR-NKKJ-Y ANON-KSAR-NKF5-5 ANON-KSAR-N8YJ-T ANON-KSAR-N8YW-7 ANON-KSAR-N8E6-J</p>	<p><u>Landscape and wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site allocation is in a sensitive landscape location that should be protected from development • There are concerns regarding wildlife and protected species in the area • The site is recognised in the council’s evidence base as having a negative impact for biodiversity and landscape • Potential for light pollution 	<p>The site does not have any particular landscape designation that would require protection. However much of the open areas to the north of South Wonston, have been identified as being sensitive in terms of the potential to affect wider views - including the land of this, and other SHELAA sites being promoted. In view of the need to accommodate new development, this site was considered the most suitable option in the area when all factors were taken into consideration. The site selection process is set out in the DSSS 2024, which summarises the criteria used to assess this and the alternative sites around South Wonston and explains why this site was selected.</p> <p>Criteria ii) of the policy requires an overall site plan that minimises wider landscape impacts and vi) requires the retention of existing vegetation around the site boundary where possible, together with additional planting to increase screening. Criteria vii) requires landscape buffers to protect the wider views to the north.</p> <p>The site is improved pasture land, it does not have any ecological</p>
---	--	---

		<p>designation and is not identified as priority habitat. Ecological assessments will be carried out as part of the design process for the development of the site, which will identify key species, including any with particular protection. Evaluation and protection of existing trees and hedgerows provides habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>National and local policy requires development proposals to deliver net gains in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Plan seeks to reduce any potential light pollution impacting upon the South Downs National Park and refers to the Dark Skies Technical document. Policies to biodiversity protect important species which may be impacted. It is considered that this location is less sensitive for light pollution than others (primarily nearer the South Downs National Park).</p> <p>Recommended Response: No Change</p>
--	--	--

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	None	<p>Pages 35-37 of this document set out an extract from the IIA prepared in support of the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The IIA for the Proposed Submission Plan contains minor updating to reflect the presence of services. The effects recorded for criteria 1a and 4e have been updated to major negative for the allocation SWO1. However, this update did not result in a change to overall effects recorded for IIA 1 (as well as 2 and 7 which were based on the same criteria) or IIA 4, when considering the other relevant criteria alongside access to GP surgeries.</p>
Comments from HRA	None	N/A

Amendments to text for Policy SWO1:

14.127

Environmental

14.129

Access

Add additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –

As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that they can provide safe and suitable access for all users and address highway safety issues on Alresford Drive.

14.130

Add additional wording at beginning of paragraph as follows –

As part of the design process, proposals for this site will need to provide active travel links across the site and links to the surrounding network of PROW and other active travel routes.

14.131

~~Infrastructure~~

Add additional wording at end of paragraph as follows –

As the site is located on a principal aquifer, any proposed development will need to avoid any contamination to this aquifer. The site lies within the catchment areas of South Wonston Primary and Henry Beaufort Secondary School. Advice from the Local Education Authority has indicated that it is likely that the development could be accommodated within the existing primary provision but a contribution towards a secondary expansion may be required.

14.172

Add new paragraph as follows –

14.176 This allocation falls within an area which is served by one or more GP practices. The NHS Integrated Care Board has advised that the relevant practices are working from surgeries which fall below relevant NHS space standards for the number of people on the current practice patient list. Further details are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Developers are encouraged to contact the ICB at an early stage to understand what the current position is, and any requests for support from the ICB to fund expansion.

Amendments to Policy SW01:

Policy SW01 Land at West Hill Road North

Land at West Hill Road North, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the about 40 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific requirements: Nature & Phasing of Development

- i. The development is phased for the latter part of the Local Plan period and permission for housing development will not be granted before 2030;
- ii. Provide an overall site plan indicating the general siting of development, open space, landscaping and access points that minimises wider landscape impacts, provides vehicular and pedestrian and cycle access to the site and indicates linkages to **the Drove Road PROW**/existing footpaths around the site. Any applications for all or part of the site should demonstrate how the proposal will accord with these principles and achieve the form of development intended by this allocation as a whole;

Access

- iii. Provide a vehicular access to the site from West Hill Road North **at a safe distance from Alresford Drove**;
- iv. Provide a new footpath/cycleway links at the south-eastern ~~along eastern~~ edge of the site to connect with existing ~~as part of a~~ routes into the village centre;
- v. Provide pedestrian/cycle links through or around the site to the Drove Road PROW;

Environmental

- vi. Retain and enhance existing planting/trees/hedgerows around the borders of the site except where their removal is necessary for access and visibility purposes and increase screening with additional planting;
- vii. Provide landscape buffers to protect the amenities of existing properties to the south of the site and any wider views from South Wonston village to the north;
- viii. Provide on-site, informal green space and children's play space in accordance with the approach set out in policy NE3;
- ix. Provide a lighting scheme to enable a secure environment for residents and users of the site and minimises light pollution and visual intrusion into the wider countryside area;

Other Infrastructure

- x. Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network and/or make arrangements for appropriate water drainage/disposal in collaboration with the service provider;
- xi. **Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected;**
- xii. Contribute to infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms **including addressing any need for education provision (Primary and Secondary) to meet the needs of the development.**

SW07: Land at West Hill Road North

Proposed use: Residential use



IIA Objective	Score
IIA1: climate change mitigation	Minor negative (-)
IIA2: travel and air quality	Minor negative (-)
IIA4: health and wellbeing	Minor positive (+)
IIA7: services and facilities	Minor negative (-)
IIA8: economy	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA9: biodiversity and geodiversity	Minor negative (-)
IIA10: landscape	Minor negative uncertain (-?)
IIA11: historic environment	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA12: natural resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA13: water resources	Minor negative (-)
IIA14: flood risk	Negligible (0)

IIA objective 1: To minimise the District's contribution to climate change through a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources and facilitate the aim of carbon neutrality by 2031

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 1a: Minor positive (+); 1b: Minor positive (+); 1c: Major negative (--); 1d: Major negative (--); 1e: Major negative (--); 1f: Major negative (--); 1g: Major positive (++); 1h: Major positive (++); 1i: Major negative (--)

Justification: The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 401-800m of a primary school. It is not within 2,000m of a secondary school. It is not within 1,200m of a town centre. It is not within 800m of a district or local centre. It is not within 2,000m of a railway station. It is within 300m of a bus stop. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open county or registered common land. The majority of it is within an area where average commuting distance is in 81-100% range for the plan area.

IIA objective 2: To reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the District and improve air quality

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 4: To improve public health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities in the District

Overall effect: Minor positive (+)

Score by criteria: 4a: Negligible (0); 4b: Negligible (0); 4c: Negligible (0); 4d: Negligible (0); 4e: Minor positive (+); 4f: Major positive (++); 4g: Major positive (++)

Justification: The site is not within 500m of an AQMA. The majority of it is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are below 50 dB and the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are below 55 dB. The site does not lie within a noise contour associated with Southampton Airport. It is not within 400m of a wastewater treatment works or within 250m of a waste management facility. The site is within 401-800m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. The site contains no open space, open county or registered common land. It is within 200m of a public right of way or cycle path.

IIA objective 7: To ensure essential services and facilities and jobs in the District are accessible

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 8: To support the sustainable growth of the District's economy

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is not in existing employment use.

IIA objective 9: To support the District's biodiversity and geodiversity

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 9a: Negligible (0); 9b: Negligible (0); 9c: Negligible (0); 9d: Negligible (0); 9e:

Justification: The site is not within an internationally or nationally designated biodiversity site or within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for 'residential' or 'all planning applications'. It is not within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland. It is not within 200m of a priority habitat. It is not within 100m of a water course. The site does not intersect with a county or local geological site.

IIA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

Overall effect: Minor negative uncertain (-?)

Justification: The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity

IIA objective 11: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment including its setting.

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is rated 'green' for risk of effects on heritage assets.

IIA objective 12: To support the efficient use of the District's resources, including land and minerals

Overall effect: Significant negative (--)

Score by criteria: 12a: Major negative (--); 12b: Minor negative (-); 12c: Negligible (0)

Justification: The majority of the site contains greenfield land. A significant proportion of the site ($\geq 25\%$) is on Grade 3 agricultural land or less than 25% of the site is on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Less than 25% of the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

IIA objective 13: To protect the quality and quantity of the District's water resource

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site falls within a Source Protection Zone 2 or 3, falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (groundwater), or falls within a drinking water safeguard zone (surface water).

IIA objective 14: To manage and reduce flood risk from all sources

Overall effect: Negligible (0)

Score by criteria: 14a: Negligible (0); 14b: Negligible (0)

Justification: Less than 25% of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3. Less than 25% of the site has a 1 in 100 year or 1 in 30 year risk of surface water flooding.