

## Appendix 12: Stakeholder Event: Scenarios

*“Live for the Future... a Sustainable Winchester District”*

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: VISIONING  
STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP 0930-1300 22 MARCH 2007  
King Alfred Hall, Winchester Guildhall**

### **VISIONING FOR THE LDF FOR THE NEXT 10-20 YEARS POTENTIAL SCENARIOS FOR SPATIAL PLANNING**

This session considered which development planning scenario might best address the drivers and issues and aspirations for Winchester District. Four options were considered, with the four groups moving around the room to ensure they considered each scenario.

**Scenario A: Concentration of Development within Larger Defined Settlements**

**Scenario B: Dispersal of Development within Existing Settlements**

**Scenario C: New Settlement at least 5000 dwellings**

**Scenario D: Release of Major Development Areas**

Following is a summary of responses.

	<b>Spatial Option 1: Concentration of developments within the larger defined settlements</b>	<b>Spatial Option 2: Dispersal of development in existing settlements- by expanding these settlements</b>	<b>Spatial Option 3: New Settlements</b>	<b>Spatial Option 4: Release of Major Development Areas</b>
<b>Housing</b>	<p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth may allow Whiteley's infrastructure to be improved.</li> <li>▪ Need to work with neighbouring districts.</li> <li>▪ Growth at Winchester more easily accommodated than in smaller market towns.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities to enhance centres.</li> <li>▪ Could add benefits for communities in decline.</li> <li>▪ Will help keep existing facilities if limited growth allowed e.g. schools.</li> <li>▪ Will allow a more focused</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some ex-defence sites may become available.</li> <li>▪ 40% affordable housing more achievable and better housing mix.</li> <li>▪ Better opportunities to plan for longer term housing need.</li> <li>▪ Micheldever Station is only</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Allows for a high number of houses therefore will meet housing need.</li> <li>▪ Barton Farm is deliverable in terms of land ownership.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land ownership can constrain</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to improve transport infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Growth in Whiteley &amp; Wickham may not help Districts affordable housing.</li> <li>▪ Housing needs in Winchester will not be met by developments in the south.</li> <li>▪ Most affordable housing needed in Winchester but market housing also required.</li> </ul>	<p>approach to meet the local needs of these settlements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Less opposition from local community.</li> <li>▪ Allocation of Greenfield sites where these are of low quality e.g. biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some settlements do not have distinct centres.</li> <li>▪ On small sites affordable housing is limited.</li> <li>▪ Would need to identify potential infill sites and extensions with the local community.</li> <li>▪ Good design is critical.</li> <li>▪ Unsustainable concept.</li> <li>▪ Need to look at relationship with market towns.</li> <li>▪ Flood risk may be a problem for some settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>potential site (can build at existing rail node).</p> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will use Greenfield land.</li> <li>▪ Housing needs survey shows demand is in the City not elsewhere.</li> <li>▪ New settlement not required as main RSS housing growth not planned for Winchester.</li> <li>▪ Easier to develop Greenfield sites so no incentive for developers to build on brownfield.</li> <li>▪ The decision is bigger than the district (RSS).</li> <li>▪ Less integration with existing communities.</li> <li>▪ Micheldever may just benefit Basingstoke residents and increase commute to London.</li> </ul>	<p>delivery e.g. Whiteley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public opposition .</li> <li>▪ Proposals may benefit Portsmouth and Southampton more than Winchester (particularly affordable housing/housing need and economy).</li> <li>▪ Issue re: military accommodation situation.</li> <li>▪ May have negative impact on the sustainability of villages and towns.</li> <li>▪ Allocating major development areas may limit flexibility in the short term.</li> </ul>
<b>Transport</b>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities for improvement at Whiteley.</li> <li>▪ More housing in Winchester, extension of existing settlements, would help fund improvements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Road infrastructure inadequate (especially east – west movements) and will limit bus service improvements.</li> <li>▪ Additional traffic pressure in Winchester - need to restrict carts in City.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will benefit some settlements but not others.</li> <li>▪ Don't need to build large new roads.</li> <li>▪ Opportunities to provide better public transport services.</li> <li>▪ Carbon emissions should be key issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to consider accessibility issues – large variations between settlements.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Benefits of economy of scale e.g. transport and infrastructure and opportunities for new transport infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Size of settlement important if too small may lead to more commuting e.g. 5,000 too small to support new rail station.</li> <li>▪ Capacity of rail network.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities for green travel plans and new public transport infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Barton Farm could increase congestion in the city.</li> <li>▪ Car travel will still be an issue.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could reduce parking availability in Winchester to improve environment.</li> <li>▪ Difficult to manage infrastructure benefits compared to other scenarios.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May increase need to travel by car-particularly in some settlements and where facilities are poor.</li> <li>▪ Must have holistic approach to transport.</li> <li>▪ Lack of access to facilities and services.</li> </ul>		
<b>Environment</b>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May be environmental benefits if measures are built in.</li> <li>▪ Southern settlements are attractive – these could provide a better quality of life.</li> <li>▪ Southern settlements provide gateway to National park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pressure on historic character of towns and countryside .</li> <li>▪ 30% housing need in other market towns, 50% in Winchester.</li> <li>▪ Green wedges important – must retain accessibility for residents.</li> <li>▪ Has Winchester met its environmental limits?</li> <li>▪ River Itchen very vulnerable – water extraction and International Designation.</li> <li>▪ Market towns already large enough, growth will involve a deliberate decision to change character .</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keeping settlements viable will help protect built environment .</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Putting housing in unsustainable small villages will only cause greater problems.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Easy to plan renewable energy schemes in large new settlements e.g. combined heat and power.</li> <li>▪ Opportunities to “push the envelope” e.g. low carbon community .</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Negative landscape impact.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities for eco-homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is there sufficient water/waste water facilities to accommodate extra housing?</li> </ul>

<p><b>Facilities</b></p>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can build on Whiteley's existing facilities, growth may provide improvements in facilities but must be provided with housing.</li> <li>▪ Could help reverse trend to de-centralise facilities.</li> <li>▪ Growth could improve Winchesters Cultural facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Winchester may have reached housing saturation point.</li> <li>▪ Not enough centres of growth to be of wide benefit.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will help to keep existing facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Small development cannot fund contributions needed to benefit communities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If large enough can accommodate infrastructure in a timely manner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Constraints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cost of new infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Larger schemes can inject significant funding to address specific problems.</li> <li>▪ Opportunities for better overall infrastructure.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---	--	---	---