

**Strategic
Planning**

City Offices
Colebrook Street
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 9LJ

tel 01962 840 222

fax 01962 841 365

telephone calls may be recorded

website www.winchester.gov.uk

Attn. of Linda Jewell
Head of Strategic Planning & Design
Fareham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Way
Fareham
PO16 7AZ

Your Ref:
Our Ref: SO/P04.20.12
Enq to: Steve Opacic
Direct Line: 01962 848101
Email:
sopacic@winchester.gov.uk

5 October 2012

Dear Ms Jewell,

Winchester District local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy

I refer to my discussions with your colleagues regarding your comments on the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1. We discussed whether you may be able to withdraw some of the Borough Council's objections to the Plan, or at least feel it not necessary to appear at the hearings, if I gave some clarification on the issues of concern to the Borough Council.

With regard to the issue of the gap between the New Community North of Fareham and Knowle/Wickham, I understand your concern to maintain the option of using and expanding the water treatment works at Knowle to serve the new community. As this is an existing facility with its own equipment and curtilage I can see no reason in principle why the gap policy (CP18) would prevent its expansion. On the basis that any expansion is likely to be within the existing site and involve water treatment infrastructure at ground level or below ground, rather than significant buildings, it would not seem likely to conflict with the requirement to avoid 'physically or visually' diminishing the gap or threaten its 'open and undeveloped character'. Also, given the commitment in Policy SH4 to cooperate with the Borough Council to help develop the new community I am sure the City Council would take a positive approach to helping to deliver the best solution for water treatment.

The Borough Council's other main area of concern relates to the timing and certainty of infrastructure provision associated with the North Whiteley allocation, particularly education and transport. The City Council also views these matters as a priority and has sought to make this clear in Policy SH3 and its explanatory text. You also mention concerns about the lack of a specific requirement for SUDS and this has been addressed by the Council's Proposed Modifications at Submission stage, which add a new criterion relating to impact on the water environment and flooding and specifically require a SUDS system.

Policy SH3 is clear that solutions to access issues must be implemented 'at an early stage of development' and this is a specific requirement for Whiteley Way. A new paragraph (3.73) was added at the Proposed Modification stage ([Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy. Schedule of Proposed Modifications. June 2012](#)) which specifically states that:



'due to shortfalls in both primary and secondary education locally these facilities should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity'. Also, since the Plan was submitted, the North Whiteley Consortium has produced a viability assessment ([North Whiteley Viability Report 2012](#)) and it is very clear from this that they are planning to provide transport and education infrastructure at an early stage and are modelling the costs of development on the basis.

Therefore, I hope you will agree that the City Council has made a number of changes to the Plan in an attempt to address the Borough Council's concerns and that things have moved on since these were first submitted. I would also say that the approach adopted in Policy SH3 is consistent with that for the other strategic allocations (West of Waterlooville and Barton Farm) and this has been successful in securing appropriate infrastructure provision and timing through conditions and S106 agreements in both cases. The City Council is therefore seeking to stick with a proven and successful approach rather than include overly prescriptive requirements in the Policy.

I would be grateful if you would consider the above matters and let me know if the Borough Council feels able to update its position. The Inspector has set a deadline of 12th October (noon) for hearing participants to submit any statements they wish to produce and it would seem most appropriate for any changes to the Borough Council's position to be documented in such a statement. Alternatively, it would be possible for the Council to withdraw its objections or notify the Programme Officer that it no longer wishes to attend the hearings at a later date.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Opacic
Head of Strategic Planning