

# CHAPTER 12: NEW COMMUNITIES

## 12.1. Knowle - (paragraphs 12.1 - 12.27, NC.1)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.02	1216/1 & 2	P S Middleton
NC.01	213/2	Bovis Homes Ltd
NC.01	227/14	Bewley Homes plc & R C H Morgan Giles
NC.01	261/69	Government Office for the South East
NC.01	510/1	Martin Moyse
NC.01	532/1	Residents of Knowle
12.22	261/70	Government Office for the South East
12.22	1431/2	Wickham Parish Council

### ISSUES

- 1 Does Proposal NC.1 and the related text include excessive detail and/or comply with Government Guidance? (261/69)
- 2 Should the area of Dean Villas and Totsome Cottages be deleted from the area within the defined H.2 policy boundary for Knowle? (532/1)
- 3 Should additional development be permitted in Knowle to create a more sustainable community? (213/2, 510/1)
- 4 Should development opportunities be provided in larger more sustainable settlements, in preference to Knowle? (227/14)
- 5 Will development at Knowle and the West of Waterlooville MDA further increase the use of adjacent rural roads? (1216/1 & 2)
- 6 Has the provision of a small proportion of sports fields at Wickham to serve Knowle had regard to the provisions of Circular 1/97? (261/70)
- 7 Should land to the west of Mill Lane, Wickham, to the north-east of the Community Centre, be included in the search area to meet these needs? (1431/2)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 12.1.1 The section on Knowle has been carried through to the Review Plan from the adopted Local Plan, incorporating some minor amendments providing some updating. It is evident that it originates from the even earlier Winchester Southern Parishes Local Plan and the text in this Review states at para 12.14 that the development should be complete by 2005. The Council also confirm in their proof that they anticipate the development will be completed before the Local Plan Review is adopted. In these circumstances, I agree with GOSE that the policy and text contains excessive and unnecessary detail which also has largely been overtaken by events. Accordingly, I cannot see any purpose in retaining this section in the Plan and consider it could be deleted in its entirety.
- 12.1.2 With regard to the second issue, I am content that the settlement boundary encompassing the built-up area at Knowle is appropriately drawn with respect to Dean Villas and Totsome Cottages. Although those dwellings pre-date much of the new development, it appears that they were initially provided for employees of the

former hospital and therefore do have a very close affinity with that building, which forms the nucleus of the new settlement at Knowle.

- 12.1.3 Turning to the third issue, extensive planning, landscape and highways evidence was advanced on behalf of the objectors to promote significant extensions to the north and south of the defined settlement boundary at Knowle to accommodate further development. They indicate it was one of the 11 areas examined as a potential MDA in the Hampshire Structure Plan Review during the 1990s. However, despite having a number of acknowledged benefits, it was not one of those selected by the County Council and hence, it is not one of the four MDAs identified in the approved Structure Plan (Review) 1996-2011. Consequently, in conjunction with the need to find a new use for the Listed former hospital building, a Masterplan was produced for a new village, incorporating sufficient enabling development to ensure viability, particularly as it required an entirely new road to be constructed from the A32, prior to commencement. The scheme involved the provision of basic community facilities for residents and funding for extensions and alterations at nearby Wickham Primary School. The defined settlement boundary area encompasses the areas proposed for residential and business uses and incorporates existing housing (see issue two above).
- 12.1.4 The objection seeks to extend the settlement boundary to incorporate up to 400 additional dwellings, 3.5ha of employment land and a new primary school. It is apparent that Knowle is effectively a small new village lying between Fareham and Wickham. Although it is argued by the objector that the additional development they propose would improve its sustainability, that is an argument that could be applied to almost any settlement, as could the similar justification advanced that it would serve to provide more affordable housing. Furthermore, it would represent a considerable proportional growth in the number of dwellings and employment and greatly increase the extent of built development in this area of predominantly open countryside.
- 12.1.5 Whilst I can accept that a degree of concealment could be afforded by the local topography and mitigation planting, the proposal would nevertheless add to the physical extent of development that is already visible from elevated vantage points to the south. It was further argued that by providing about 8,000sq. m. of additional employment floorspace here, it would decrease the outflow of workers from the site. However, it is apparent that the levels of employment now proposed at Knowle were reduced from what had originally been envisaged for a variety of reasons. Moreover, despite the claim by agents that there is a demand for employment floorspace in this locality, there is an oversupply within the District generally and in addition, Knowle is positioned in the south of the District between the major employment areas approved at Whiteley and proposed in the Plan at the West of Waterlooville MDA. In addition, this rural locality and category B settlement does not figure highly in the sequential approach recommended in Government guidance when considering sites for new employment use.
- 12.1.6 Although it was asserted that consideration could be given to re-opening the railway halt close to the employment area, I agree with the Council that such a scheme would not be financially viable for the settlement, even with the extra development mooted. Whilst footpath and cycleway links were also suggested, the rural location makes walking and cycling improbable options for the majority and despite the possibility of utilising existing bus services, I consider the level of service is unlikely to attract many away from car use. With regard to the objectors' proposal for a new school, the Education Authority indicate the existing provision at Wickham is adequate and that there is scope for further extensions if necessary to accommodate the scale of further development proposed by the objectors.
- 12.1.7 In sum, I do not regard the locality as appropriate for the scale of development that is proposed by the objectors and I am dubious whether it would lead to the outcomes suggested. To that extent I am entirely in accord with the sentiment expressed in issue four.

- 12.1.8 In issue five, the objector is concerned about the potential congestion on rural roads arising from increased traffic generation from the developments at Knowle and West of Waterlooville. However, the Council indicate that is why the former is served by a completely new road and the latter is subject to a Masterplan which places high importance upon ensuring that the design and layout does not result in unacceptably excessive traffic flows on unsuitable rural roads. From all the evidence I have seen and heard, I am satisfied the matter of transport planning has been attributed due weight in the evolution of the Plan.
- 12.1.9 Issue six raises the question of whether some playing field provision for Knowle should be located at nearby Wickham. However, the Council indicate that such facilities are assessed on a parish basis. As the need for children's play areas and general informal recreational use is fully met on site and there is a retained playing field at Knowle, almost all of the community's requirements for sport and play are met on site. However, it was decided that the small shortfall would be better combined with other facilities in the larger settlement of Wickham, rather than to contrive a further area at Knowle merely to meet an arithmetical calculation. I regard this as being an entirely appropriate approach. The objector in issue seven considers land west of Mill Lane, Wickham should be used for sports field purposes. However, the Council indicates that land east of Mill Lane is identified for this use in the Plan under Proposal RT4, following consultation with the Parish Council.
- 12.1.10 In light of the fact that the development at Knowle is largely a *fait accompli*, which is reflected in the low level of representations engendered, I conclude that the policy and text should be deleted.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 12.1.11 That the Plan be modified by deleting the policy and its accompanying text.  
(INFORMATIVE - As a consequence of this recommendation, the Council might wish to consider renaming this Chapter: Major Development Areas.

## **12.2. West of Waterlooville - (paragraphs 12.28 - 12.38, NC.2)**

#### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT & REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN**

See Appendix 1 to this Chapter

#### **INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 12.2.1 This section of the Plan attracted a large number of objections at Deposit stage. These ranged widely from challenging the principles to questioning very detailed components and have the most part now largely been overtaken by events as the Revised Deposit deleted the majority of the text and the alternative development options. This action garnered the support of GOSE, Environment Agency, East Hampshire District Council and Hampshire County Council. Although there were a few objections to the Revised Deposit many of these have been addressed through the evolution of the MDA Masterplan, which has proceeded alongside the Local Plan Inquiry process and was subject to a parallel public consultation exercise that informed its preparation in addition to the objections made to the Deposit Local Plan. Indeed, the Masterplan layout was formally endorsed by the West of Waterlooville Forum on 15 April 2004, (Plan M/25 Rev P) and I was advised at the close of Inquiry that planning applications were due to be submitted imminently based thereon. Thus, where objectors have unresolved issues regarding details of the MDA, I am satisfied they will be afforded yet another opportunity of airing them in the normal development control process. Other unresolved objections are covered below or elsewhere in my Report or relate to a level of detail that would be inappropriate for a Local Plan.

- 12.2.2 Therefore, I regard the three paragraphs that remain in the Revised Deposit as generally providing an appropriate introductory text, while the policy (NC.2) extensively sets out the criteria to be met. However, in order to provide improved clarity, particularly in the light of Havant BC's objection, I consider it should be explicitly stated that the number of dwellings should be expressed as: *at least 2000* rather than *up to 2000* to comply with the Structure Plan and indicating that the figure relates to the combined area in both Districts, notwithstanding that it was assigned solely to Winchester in Table A of the Structure Plan for administrative convenience and because Havant at that time envisaged very little being within their District.
- 12.2.3 If it is expressed in these terms, I consider it unnecessary to place a definitive figure for the amount that should be in Winchester District. However, if the precise figure that will be provided in Havant is finally resolved following modification procedures and adoption of the Havant Borough Local Plan by the time this Plan is published, it will enable a figure for Winchester to be inserted. It is conceivable that there will be planning permissions and legal agreements in place for the MDA when the Modified Plan is published, and I thus anticipate the text will be capable of being suitably updated and the policy simplified to reflect the status of the Masterplan and planning applications for the Baseline MDA at that time. I accept the Council's FPC12.03 proposing modifications to Inset Map 41a to take account of the approved Masterplan layout (Plan M/25 Rev P) would provide appropriate updating of the Plan.
- 12.2.4 The Council advanced a Pre-Inquiry Change PIC12.01 to add further cross-referencing to other Plan policies in criterion (ix), but as I have indicated elsewhere in my Report, extensive cross referencing to other policies within the main body of a discrete policy should be avoided and I therefore do not support it. However, I do accept the Further Proposed Change FPC12.A, which the Council advanced in respect of policy criterion (v) replacing *Purbrook Heath Road* with *the A3*, in the interest of clarity and accuracy as the former is regarded as unsuitable to accommodate the traffic flows envisaged from the MDA. The additional Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(i) proposes the replacement of *main ridgeline* with *highest point*, and a similar modification to para 12.76 is proposed by FPC12B(i), both of which I also find acceptable.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.2.5 That the Plan be modified:
- a) by updating the Inset Map in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.03 to reflect the approved MDA Masterplan (Plan M/25 Rev P).
  - b) by amending the policy and introductory text to reflect the status of the Masterplan and any planning applications relating to the MDA at the time of publication and indicating that the requirement is to provide a total of at least 2000 dwellings within the Baseline allocations in the combined MDA area that straddles the boundary with the neighbouring Havant Borough Council.
  - c) by simplifying the development criteria listed and omitting cross-reference to other policies.
  - d) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.A in respect of policy criterion (v) replacing *Purbrook Heath Road* with *the A3*.
  - e) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(i) in respect of policy criterion (viii) replacing *main ridgeline* with *highest point*.
  - f) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.B(i) in respect of para 12.76 replacing *main ridgeline* with *highest point*.

## 12.3. Masterplan (paragraphs 12.39 - 12.41)

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1215	236/5	George Wimpey Strategic Land

### ISSUE

Should the Local Plan specify that the Masterplan Framework represents the preferred option of the Council for the implementation of the MDA? (236/5/REVDEP)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.3.1 As indicated above, the MDA Masterplan has been formally agreed for the Baseline component of the MDA by the constituent authorities and this paragraph can be suitably updated and subsumed within the introductory text, while para 12.41 appears redundant and could be satisfactorily deleted.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

12.3.2 That the Plan be modified by:

- a) updating paragraph 12.39 and subsuming it within the introductory text;
- b) deleting paragraph 12.41.

## 12.4. Development Principles (paragraphs 12.42 - 12.45)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.43	378/4	Salway

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1220	236/6	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1223	362/2	P Hill

### ISSUES

1. Will the southern access road improve traffic flow through Purbrook at the expense of the existing quality of life (noise, pollution) in the countryside to the west Purbrook and/or lead to 'rat running' along Purbrook Heath Road? (378/4, 362/2REVDEP)
2. Whether the new paragraph RD12.20 and the issue of 'phasing' is sufficiently clear? (236/6/REVDEP)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.4.1 The first issue concerns transport matters and particularly the fear that additional traffic will use unsuitable rural roads to the west of the MDA. I am aware that this is an issue that is foremost in the minds of the highway planners and was advised that the detailed layout and junction designs will be scrutinised to ensure the major traffic flows will be directed to routes most capable of accommodating them, together with promoting measures where appropriate and necessary to discourage any significant additional traffic from using the rural lanes to the west.

12.4.2 With regard to the second issue, the Council advanced PIC12.02 which deletes *up to* relating to the Baseline figure and inserts a reference to the Reserve housing provision to accommodate up to 1000 dwellings. Whilst this would bring the wording into line with that used in the Structure Plan it does not remove the objector's concern relating to ambiguous reference to phasing in para RD12.20. The Council concede that the approved Masterplan brief suggests the MDA will not be phased, but rather be subject to a continuous development commencing in several locations simultaneously. They further indicated that the mention of a phased release of land was intended to reflect the universally recognised need for a comprehensive development programme to ensure that implementation of all the ancillary infrastructure proceeds in a coherent manner and that not all of the land may be required if higher densities are implemented. However, I consider the matter has become confused by the added reference to the Reserve provision. I advance a suggested rewording of RD12.20 to address the confusion and phasing issues.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

12.4.3 That the Plan be modified: by rewording RD12.20 as follows:  
*Inset Map 41 identifies areas for residential, mixed use, employment, community facilities and other uses and infrastructure to accommodate the Baseline provision of at least 2000 dwellings. It is envisaged that development of the MDA will commence in several locations simultaneously and it will be necessary to secure a comprehensive development programme to ensure the implementation of all the ancillary infrastructure proceeds in a coherent manner. The Inset Map also indicates the maximum extent of the Reserve site for up to 1000 dwellings, which may be reduced in size if higher densities than currently envisaged are achieved in the Baseline allocation.*

## 12.5. The "Area of Search" (paragraphs 12.46 - 12.48)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.46	219/4	Bryant Homes Ltd
12.47	1091/2	E Goodman

### ISSUES

1. Should the MDA identify land for housing beyond the plan period and make provision for the necessary infrastructure? (219/4)
2. Should the local authority plan for the development of the reserve allocation at Waterloooville? (1091/2)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.5.1 These two objections were addressed by alterations that were incorporated in the Revised Deposit Plan deleting reference to *area of search* and substituting *reserve area* in its place. This land is a strategic reserve that has been identified to cater for any decision by the strategic planning authorities in Hampshire that further land releases beyond the identified Baseline requirement are needed. Although some objectors expressed concerns about the likely availability of this land, due to its dependence upon progress on the Baseline allocation, it accords with the Structure Plan's identification of this locality for that purpose and I found no suitable available alternative substitute.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.5.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 12.6. An Integrated and Balanced Community (paragraph 12.49)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.49	1091/3	E Goodman

### ISSUE

Can Waterlooville support major development of the scale envisaged? 1091/3

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.6.1 The Waterlooville MDA proposal is being planned as a comprehensive development with additional community facilities, employment and town centre enhancement in conjunction with the neighbouring Havant Borough Council and in accordance with the strategic requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan. I am satisfied the Masterplanning exercise has taken account of all conceivable infrastructure requirements that are needed to support the scale of housing development proposed.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.6.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 12.7. Housing (paragraphs 12.50 - 12.52)

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1228	1437/3	East Hampshire District Council
RD1228	236/8	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1229	236/9	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1229	2285/3	Executors of E.S Edwards (Deceased)

### ISSUES

1. Should the layout of the residential areas apply the principle of home zones? 1437/3REVDEP
2. Are the proportions proposed for the housing mix and affordable housing justified? (2285/3REVDEP, 236/8REVDEP, 236/9REVDEP)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.7.1 In the first issue, whilst the Council concede that the principles of home zones may be appropriate for inclusion in the detailed design of parts of the MDA, they regard the specification of street layouts as too detailed a matter for inclusion in the Local Plan. My interpretation of the objection is that it raises questions over whether developers' contributions will adequately ensure the necessary improvements to infrastructure are implemented beyond the MDA. However, I am satisfied that where these can be directly attributable to the MDA development, they would be capable of being covered appropriately through use of Planning Obligations.

12.7.2 With regard to the proportions of smaller dwellings and affordable homes deemed appropriate to be provided, these topics are aired in greater detail in the Housing Chapter. Whilst the objector regards the 50% provision of smaller (1 & 2 bed) units as unduly prescriptive, I consider that it is not unreasonable having regard to household size, the assessment of demand and the shortfall in the existing provision. However, with regard to affordable housing, the Council have relented on their former

stance of requiring a 50% provision within the MDA and have advanced Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(ii) deleting reference thereto and providing elaboration of which other authorities the area is intended to serve. I share objectors' concerns that such a high proportion could have had adverse impacts upon housing delivery and in Chapter 6 I have thus recommended a figure of up to 40% affordable housing in the MDA, which should now be incorporated in the modified text here.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

12.7.3 That the Plan be modified generally in accordance with FPC12.A(ii), but with the second sentence altered and combined with the third sentence to read: *This Plan seeks up to 40% affordable housing in the MDA within Winchester District (see Policy H5) which is intended to meet a wider sub-regional need, and will contribute to ....*

## **12.8. Employment (paragraphs 12.53 - 12.57)**

### **OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
12.56	261/74	Government Office for the South East

### **ISSUE**

How does provision of training meet the Circular 1/97 guidance on Planning Obligations?

### **INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

12.8.1 GOSE questioned whether the reference in para 12.56 to requiring developer contributions towards the provision of training schemes for local people complied with advice in Circular 1/97. The Council consider that provision of new jobs within the MDA is an important sustainability issue. They maintain that where "Local Labour in Construction" schemes are in place to assist in the training and retraining of the local economically active population, that it is entirely proper to seek contributions to support and extend such schemes. They cite research undertaken on behalf of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation as supporting their view that such agreements would be directly related to the development site and have a planning purpose.

12.8.2 Whilst I can appreciate that such schemes would improve the local skills base, the wording states: *Developers will be expected to contribute to the provision of training schemes for local people, which will assist with development and business take-up.* To my mind, this confuses the construction process and the end user and also fails to recognise that many companies provide on-site or in-house training. In those circumstances, the wording appears unduly prescriptive and/or confusing. I note the text continues by referring to possible scope for Single Regeneration Budget funding, this adds another dimension and uncertainty. To my mind, the text of para 12.56 should either be deleted or clarified and expressed in a manner that complies with Circular 1/97, which requires contributions to be necessary, relevant and reasonable.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

12.8.3 That the Plan be modified either by deleting para 12.56 or expressing the sentiments it contains in a clarified manner that also complies with Circular 1/97 requirements.



## 12.9. Resource Centre (New Subheading; paragraphs RD12.31 – 12.32)

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1231	1433/7	Hampshire County Council
RD1232	2018/1	A Beeston
RD1232	1079/2	A Norris
RD1232	156/1	Alan Cooper
RD1232	600/1	Alastair Pratt
RD1232	167/1	C Crascall
RD1232	2101/1	C Tarrant
RD1232	755/1	D L Morgan
RD1232	2262/2	D W Lock
RD1232	2090/2	Donald Wright
RD1232	1437/5	East Hampshire District Council
RD1232	2081/2	F Harrison
RD1232	82/2	Gwen Blackett
RD1232	2104/1	H V Dodson
RD1232	1433/8	Hampshire County Council
RD1232	2255/1	I Udal
RD1232	2082/2	J Harrison
RD1232	2274/3	J R G Cobbett
RD1232	168/1	John Crascall
RD1232	685/1	John Harvey
RD1232	731/1	Julie Morgan
RD1232	599/1	Katherine Bedford
RD1232	1077/2	M Norris
RD1232	2296/1	M Synnott
RD1232	2296/2	M Synnott
RD1232	2102/1	N J Tarrant
RD1232	2324/1	P J Sleeman
RD1232	157/2	Pam Cooper
RD1232	2091/1	Patricia Wright
RD1232	2306/1	Pete Sanders
RD1232	2103/1	R P Dodson
RD1232	572/1	Rebecca Havill
RD1232	117/1	Robin McIntosh
RD1232	2094/1	Rosemary Platt
RD1232	684/1	Susan Harvey
RD1232	83/2	William Blackett

### OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PI1203	156/1	Alan Cooper
PI1203	755/1	D L Morgan
PI1203	2104/1	H V Dodson
PI1203	731/1	Julie Morgan
PI1203	2335/1	Linda Bowden
PI1203	10/1	M. Beauvoisin
PI1203	157/1	Pam Cooper
PI1203	117/1	Robin McIntosh
PI1203	732/1	S C Griffiths
PI1203	2336/1	Sally Beard
PI1203	116/1	Sheila McIntosh
PI1203	82/1	G Blackett
PI1203	83/1	W Blackett

## ISSUES

1. Should the resource centre be renamed to “Resource Recovery Park” and should the main detail be included within the Minerals and Waste Development Framework prepared by Hampshire County Council? (1433/7REVDEP)
2. Has the need for and location of the resource centre been justified and have the traffic implications been fully considered? (156/1REVDEP 167/1REVDEP 82/2REVDEP 168/1REVDEP 157/2REVDEP 117/1REVDEP 83/2REVDEP 684/1REVDEP 685/1REVDEP 731/1REVDEP 755/1REVDEP 1077/2REVDEP 1079/2REVDEP 1433/8REVDEP 2081/2REVDEP 2082/2REVDEP 2090/2REVDEP 2091/1REVDEP 2094/1REVDEP 2101/1REVDEP 2102/1REVDEP 2103/1REVDEP 2104/1REVDEP 2262/2REVDEP 572/1REVDEP 599/1REVDEP 600/1REVDEP 2255/1REVDEP 2296/1REVDEP 2296/2REVDEP 2306/1REVDEP 2324/1REVDEP 2018/1REVDEP 1437/5REVDEP 2274/3REVDEP)
3. Should the plan make specific reference to Purbrook, Widley and Waterlooville rather than “nearby settlements and residential areas” when referring to the need to minimise traffic impact? (156/1PIC, 82/1PIC, 83/1PIC, 755/1PIC, 2104/1PIC, 731/1PIC, 2335/1PIC, 10/1PIC, 157/1PIC, 117/1PIC, 732/1PIC, 2336/1PIC, 116/1PIC)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 12.9.1 The objection by Hampshire County Council in the first issue seeks to alter the name of this facility. Although the Council are ambivalent about the change of nomenclature, as this section of text has been included at the specific request of the objector and it is they who would be implementing the proposal, I consider it would be appropriate to describe it in the manner they suggest.
- 12.9.2 Issue two concerns the general paucity of information about what this site will comprise in detail. I am advised that the decision on the facilities to be provided and its precise location within the employment allocation has not been finally determined and will in part be influenced by the outcome of the County Council’s consultation on their Material Resources Strategy. This in turn will be ultimately incorporated in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework. However, the County Council have indicated that a biomass plant is not proposed there and they seek the exclusion of any reference thereto. The Council advanced Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(iii) which deletes the sentence that mentions it, thereby addressing the County Council’s concern and also those of the objectors who raised fears about such a plant in this location.
- 12.9.3 The Council also advanced PIC 12.03 to address objectors’ concerns regarding possible traffic impacts on nearby settlements, which I endorse. Although some objectors raised concerns about traffic generation and possible harmful effects from potential on-site processes upon occupiers of neighbouring dwellings/ employment buildings, the majority accept there is a need for such facilities. I am satisfied that the proposal merely identifies and safeguards the site at this juncture, in accordance with SEERA advice. Detailed proposals would necessarily evolve following in-depth studies to ensure they meet environmental, technical and operational objectives and any planning application would need to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment and conditions or legal agreements applied to impose appropriate controls.
- 12.9.4 In issue three, the objectors sought to expand the text of PIC12.03 to include reference to additional settlements within neighbouring Havant that could be affected by traffic generated. However, the Council indicate that as the jurisdiction of this Plan does not extend beyond the Winchester District boundary it would be inappropriate for the Plan to make proposals in respect of them. Nevertheless, I am conscious that the planning applications in respect of the MDA straddle the boundary of the two Districts and both Councils will have an involvement in determining them. In these circumstances, I can see no harm in adding the three additional settlements to the list already included in the text, particularly as routeing restrictions in Winchester District could have implications on those parts of neighbouring Havant Borough.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

12.9.5 That the Plan be modified:

- a) by renaming the section *Resource Recovery Park*;
- b) in accordance with FPC12.A(iii);
- c) in accordance with PIC12.03;
- d) by adding *Purbrook, Widley and Waterlooville* to the list of settlements in the final sentence of para RD12.32.

## 12.10. Transport (paragraphs 12.58 - 12.61)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.58	1387/16	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1236	1437/6	East Hampshire District Council
RD1236	289/2	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
RD1236	362/3	P Hill
RD1236	2311/2	The Rowans
RD1237	1079/3	A Norris
RD1237	156/2	Alan Cooper
RD1237	2085/1	B Scarth
RD1237	167/1	C Crascall
RD1237	2101/2	C Tarrant
RD1237	755/2	D L Morgan
RD1237	2262/3	D W Lock
RD1237	2090/3	Donald Wright
RD1237	1437/7	East Hampshire District Council
RD1237	2081/3	F Harrison
RD1237	236/10	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1237	82/3	Gwen Blackett
RD1237	2104/2	H V Dodson
RD1237	2082/3	J Harrison
RD1237	2120/1	J Thrush
RD1237	685/2	John Harvey
RD1237	731/2	Julie Morgan
RD1237	289/3	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
RD1237	1077/3	M Norris
RD1237	2084/1	Mary Winifred Scarth
RD1237	2102/2	N J Tarrant
RD1237	362/4	P Hill
RD1237	2091/2	Patricia Wright
RD1237	2103/2	R P Dodson
RD1237	2094/2	Rosemary Platt
RD1237	116/1	Sheila McIntosh
RD1237	684/2	Susan Harvey
RD1238	1437/9	East Hampshire District Council
RD1238	1437/10	East Hampshire District Council
RD1238	2117/6	Havant Borough Council
RD1239	2324/2	P J Sleeman
RD1239	2306/2	Pete Sanders
RD1239	572/2	Rebecca Havill

## OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PIC1204	214/3	Grainger Trust Plc
PIC1205	236/4	George Wimpey Strategic Land
PIC1205	214/4	Grainger Trust Plc

## ISSUES

1. Does the Plan adequately provide for enhanced public transport provision? (1387/16)
2. Has the need for and location of the resource centre been justified and have the traffic implications been fully considered? (572/2REVDEP 2324/2REVDEP)
3. Will the Southern Access Road lead to an increase in traffic along Purbrook Heath Road to the detriment of access to the Rowans Hospice and increase congestion in Purbrook to the detriment of the success of the A3 Bus Route? (362/3REVDEP 362/4REVDEP 2311/2REVDEP 82/3REVDEP 116/1REVDEP 151/1REVDEP 156/2REVDEP 167/1REVDEP 684/2REVDEP 685/2REVDEP 731/2REVDEP 755/2REVDEP 1077/3REVDEP 1079/3REVDEP 2081/3REVDEP 2082/3REVDEP 2084/1REVDEP 2085/1REVDEP 2090/3REVDEP 2091/2REVDEP 2094/2REVDEP 2101/2REVDEP 2102/2REVDEP 2103/2REVDEP 2104/2REVDEP 2120/1REVDEP 2262/3REVDEP)
4. Is the Plan sufficiently clear about the timing for the provision of the Southern Access Road and its junction configuration? (236/10REVDEP 289/2REVDEP 289/3REVDEP)
5. How will traffic heading north from the MDA gain access to the A3(M) and will the proposals lead to increased traffic through Horndean? (1437/7REVDEP)
6. Should the Plan refer to the need for developer contributions towards the extension of the South Hampshire light rail transit route to Waterlooville? (1437/6REVDEP)
7. Is sufficient provision made to facilitate walking and cycling to local secondary schools from the MDA and will sufficient improvements be made to secondary schools in the Waterlooville area? (1437/9REVDEP, 1437/10REVDEP)
8. Does the Plan provide for adequate integration between the MDA and Waterlooville Town Centre? (2117/6REVDEP)
9. Would the road links to the Brambles Business Park lead to unacceptable increase in traffic flows and potential harm to existing businesses? (2306/2REVDEP)
10. Whether PICs 12.04 and 12.05 are necessary and reasonable (214/3 & 4PIC, 236/4PIC)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 12.10.1 The text objected to in the first issue was deleted in the Revised Deposit and I am content that the matter of accessibility to public transport service in the MDA has been a priority in the evolution of the Masterplan.
- 12.10.2 The matters raised in the second issue have been addressed above in section 12.9.
- 12.10.3 Issue three concerns the Southern Access Road (SAR), which is intended to provide a southerly route into the MDA from the A3 and to ease congestion in Purbrook village centre. Purbrook Heath Road will have a connection into it as a local access road serving the recreation ground, hospice etc and the countryside beyond. Hence, it is not planned to route the main traffic flows to and from the MDA along Purbrook Heath Road. Indeed, the Council indicate that if necessary, traffic management measures could be installed to reduce the potential of its use by non essential traffic. It is also not planned to provide any direct link between the MDA and Newlands Lane in the countryside to the west due to its inadequate width and visibility.
- 12.10.4 In the fourth issue, the Council indicated that the Southern Access Road Study concluded that the road should be provided before 1400 dwellings are completed at the very latest, on traffic generation grounds. It is also apparent that it is required to provide a new bus priority link as part of an integrated transport system for the MDA to enable residents to benefit from it at the earliest opportunity. Moreover, it is likely to be used as the route for drainage infrastructure and potentially for construction

traffic. Thus, the Council state that it is expected to be provided at an early stage for these reasons, rather than immediately before it becomes necessary purely on traffic generation grounds. I also assume that the indicative figure of 1400 dwellings would be lower if there is significant early implementation of employment development in the MDA.

- 12.10.5 I am content that highlighting the requirement to be implemented at an early stage in the development will enable the precise details of its timing to be negotiated at the planning application stage, together with the other infrastructure requirements and made the subject of legal agreement accompanying any planning permissions. Thus, whilst it is evident that some development can proceed in advance of its completion, it does form part of the essential comprehensive infrastructure for the MDA, which will comprise an entirely new community. I am sure the developers would also wish to see this made available at the earliest practical opportunity, not only for the convenience of the purchasers of their dwellings, but because the early provision of infrastructure and ancillary facilities also assists in construction programming, marketing and community building.
- 12.10.6 On the matter of the detailed design of the junction of the SAR with the A3, as this detail is still evolving, the Council advanced FPC12.B to delete “*at or*” so that it refers to the junction being in the vicinity of Ladybridge roundabout. As the final location and design have not yet been determined, and may be dependent upon land acquisition, I am content that this provides sufficient indication as to where it will be generally located and also accords with the terminology used in the Havant Borough Local Plan. Although there was criticism of the latest design of a proposed junction to the south of Ladybridge roundabout prepared by the Council’s consultants and the Council acknowledged it is better to use existing junctions where possible, they pointed out that they wished to retain all options open for the planning application that was expected to be submitted shortly after the close of the Inquiry, as there are several solutions possible. Accordingly, I do not consider it appropriate to be prescriptive about the precise location of the proposed junction of the SAR with the A3, which in any event lies outside the District boundary.
- 12.10.7 Turning to the fifth issue, the approved Masterplan provides for two northern accesses, one onto the Asda roundabout, which provides access to good connections with the A3(M) and the other to Hambledon Road. The Council indicate these will provide satisfactory access to the north and east and avoid traffic heading towards Horndean.
- 12.10.8 Issue six concerns developer contributions towards provision of a light rail transit route, but this scheme was not supported by the Department for Transport. The A3 Bus Priority corridor remains as the relevant link to the South Hampshire Rapid Transit System for the foreseeable future, while contributions will be required to provide links to the A3 bus priority route. I am satisfied the Plan suitably addresses this.
- 12.10.9 In the seventh issue, the need to provide satisfactory walking and safe cycling routes within the MDA and improvements to secondary schools in Waterlooville are already highlighted in para 12.65, which I am satisfied can be implemented by direct provision or through developer contributions.
- 12.10.10 Issue eight arises from Havant BC’s concerns that close integration between the MDA and Waterlooville town centre could be impeded by the barrier that Maurepas Way (South) represents and they wish to ensure good access links are provided. Havant suggest that Maurepas Way could be closed and the traffic diverted along the MDA spine road, whereby physical pedestrian linkage between the MDA and the centre could be achieved at ground level. However, as Winchester DC indicated, the spine road would then act as a divide between the western and eastern parts of the MDA and ultimately carry almost double the traffic flows that Maurepas Way now has.

Whilst I accept Havant's suggestions that segregated crossings could be made of the MDA spine road, the same is true for Maurepas Way.

12.10.11 The objection stems from the evolution of Havant BC's Draft Waterlooville Town Centre UDF, which includes a proposal to relocate the Asda store. Havant's suggestion of closing Maurepas Way and diverting traffic through the MDA originates from results of a public exhibition where respondents favoured that course, while the second most favoured option was to span over the road with a building. The MDA developers' preferred solution to integration, which proposes narrowing Maurepas Way and installation of a toucan crossing, was second least favourite option only to a footbridge link. However, it became apparent that Havant's stance on road closure is based on the views of just 80 respondents who attended the public exhibition.

12.10.12 Hence, whilst it is clear to me that closure of Maurepas Way indisputably would provide unhindered physical integration between the town centre and the MDA, it is not the only means to achieve apposite linkage. Moreover, it is important to retain a consistent approach to integrated transport and consider all forms of accessibility to the centre including by public transport and by car where either walking or cycling is unlikely to be the preferred option due to distance or bulkiness of purchases. Whilst I am satisfied that some solutions for ensuring integration of the MDA with the town centre are more attractive than others, several suitable options exist that do not necessitate closure of Maurepas Way and in any event the road lies largely outside Winchester District. Therefore I do not regard it as either necessary or appropriate to specify road closure provisions within the neighbouring District as a prerequisite to achieve integration. Although Havant suggested as an alternative, that reference could be made in Policy NC2 to implementing traffic calming measures on Maurepas Way (South) to facilitate integration of the centre with the MDA, I do not regard that as appropriate either in view of the alternative possible solutions, which could include grade separated crossings of the road. I also consider that as the areas involved lie outside the MDA, the issue would be more appropriately addressed in Havant's emerging Waterlooville Town Centre UDF or as part of the consideration of any major planning application that may be submitted before the former is adopted.

12.10.13 The objector in issue nine is concerned about the potentially harmful impacts that increased traffic could cause for existing commercial enterprises at Brambles Business Park by the two proposed road connections (RD12.39). However, the Council indicate that the 30ha employment site within the MDA was sited adjacent to the existing Brambles Business Park as they regarded it to be the most logical position where it could be associated with established commercial premises and conveniently positioned to gain most direct access to the principal traffic routes. The links through to Brambles Park from the MDA are intended to provide permeability between the two. Whilst the objector fears that the new accesses would negate existing voluntary traffic management measures to ameliorate previous problems experienced at Brambles Park, the Council indicated that they would encourage its extension to the new employment area, including an extension of the bus service. Moreover, a Transportation Assessment would be required with any planning application and any measures to control traffic impacts that are deemed necessary could be imposed through conditions and legal agreements.

12.10.14 The Council indicated that the links are depicted to demonstrate an intention that the two areas should be integrated rather than established as separate entities. While the objector supported the establishment of vehicular links and they did not object to the Elettra Avenue option, they were concerned about the Waterberry Drive access due to the need to acquire third party land and the potentially harmful impact upon nearby sensitive business operations. The Council stated that they would be prepared to be flexible about the precise position, particularly as they preferred to see the links achieved through negotiation rather than by compulsory acquisition. I am satisfied that its depiction by an arrow provides adequate flexibility. However, I remain concerned that the wording of para RD12.39 could be interpreted as implying that access to the MDA spine road from the employment areas would be resisted,

which I was advised is not the intention. Accordingly, this should be addressed by a revision of the wording, possibly by reference to *access links*.

12.10.15 The Council advanced PIC12.04 to specifically address the matter of construction traffic and PIC12.05 indicating the requirement for a Transport Assessment to support any planning application together with encouragement of non-car transport modes, which were welcomed by the objector and suitably address those particular concerns. I consider the latter would also inform any appropriate routeing measures for HGVs that would be required. They also indicated that any application for the Resource Centre would be required to be supported by an Environmental Statement so that various likely impacts can be assessed.

12.10.16 Finally, whilst Grainger Trust objected to the mention of Purbrook Heath Road in PIC12.04, I consider it should remain, as it is agreed as being unsuitable for MDA traffic. Moreover, despite the objections to PIC12.05 by Grainger and Wimpey, I am satisfied that only works directly attributable to the MDA development will be capable of being required under a Planning Obligation, in accordance with Circular 1/97.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

12.10.17 That the Plan be modified:

- a) in accordance with FPC12.B
- b) by revising the wording of RD12.39 to indicate that access links are proposed between the proposed employment area and Brambles Business Park while also providing transport connections to the remainder of the MDA and that Transportation Appraisals would inform decisions regarding appropriate measures required for lorry routeing.
- c) in accordance with PICs12.04 & 12.05

## 12.11. Cemetery (paragraph 12.69)

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1242	2201/1	A Barrett
RD1242	2134/1	A Chambers
RD1242	2177/1	A Cole
RD1242	2204/1	A Fullard
RD1242	2168/1	A H Hall
RD1242	2152/1	A Harris
RD1242	2212/1	A J Bolton
RD1242	2171/1	A J Hampshire
RD1242	2175/1	A James
RD1242	2258/1	A L Crook
RD1242	1079/4	A Norris
RD1242	646/1	A W Fuller
RD1242	2236/1	Adam Rennel
RD1242	141/1	Alan Cobb
RD1242	156/3	Alan Cooper
RD1242	2254/1	Alfred Huntley
RD1242	2202/1	Andrew Fullard
RD1242	2223/1	Andy Thorpe
RD1242	2267/1	Ann Ozouf
RD1242	2166/1	Anthony Cocker
RD1242	2184/1	Anthony DeFano
RD1242	2145/1	B Coupland
RD1242	2256/1	B Hall
RD1242	2233/1	B Van Steen
RD1242	2230/1	B Whale
RD1242	2198/1	Barry Ford
RD1242	2214/1	Barry Manns
RD1242	2128/1	Brian Kidd
RD1242	2157/1	C A Benford
RD1242	167/1	C Crascall
RD1242	2170/1	C D Herbert
RD1242	2203/1	C Fullard
RD1242	2169/1	C Hall

RD1242	2144/1	C J Coupland
RD1242	2164/1	C Read
RD1242	2101/3	C Tarrant
RD1242	147/1	C. J. Wearn
RD1242	2234/1	Carla McIntyre
RD1242	2219/1	Carol Hobbs
RD1242	659/1	Charles Pool
RD1242	726/1	D Barber
RD1242	2122/1	D Campell-Lendrum
RD1242	2187/1	D Clark
RD1242	755/3	D L Morgan
RD1242	2126/1	D M Bolton
RD1242	2240/1	D Murphy
RD1242	2151/1	D P Barnes
RD1242	2260/1	D Streton
RD1242	2262/4	D W Lock
RD1242	152/1	David Jones
RD1242	2228/1	David W Hughes
RD1242	2191/1	Deanne Hart
RD1242	2190/1	Deborah Hart
RD1242	151/1	Debra Jones
RD1242	661/1	Dereck Riddell
RD1242	2229/1	Dianne Hughes
RD1242	2137/1	DPD Weston
RD1242	2130/1	E Langford
RD1242	2139/1	E P Gilson
RD1242	125/1	E Priddy
RD1242	1437/11	East Hampshire District Council
RD1242	2131/1	Ebm Heyburn
RD1242	2259/1	Elaine Toghil
RD1242	2162/1	Eve Woodley
RD1242	2081/4	F Harrison
RD1242	688/1	Fay Harvey
RD1242	2154/1	Felicia Miceli Hyde
RD1242	2117/7	Forward Planning
RD1242	2242/1	G Doggett
RD1242	2112/1	G M Wearne
RD1242	2180/1	G Mitchell
RD1242	2148/1	G S Barnes
RD1242	82/4	Gwen Blackett
RD1242	678/1	Gwen Hunt
RD1242	2210/1	H Bolton
RD1242	2104/3	H V Dodson
RD1242	2019/1	Hannah Muir
RD1242	2133/1	Harold Chambers
RD1242	2113/1	Helen Wearn
RD1242	2153/1	Hellen Harris
RD1242	2235/1	Ian Johnson
RD1242	2244/1	J A Watt
RD1242	145/1	J Allen
RD1242	2211/1	J Bolton
RD1242	2226/1	J Chivers
RD1242	2082/4	J Harrison
RD1242	2181/1	J M Mitchell
RD1242	2243/1	J Powell
RD1242	24/1	J. A. Cleife
RD1242	2172/1	James Fraser
RD1242	2192/1	James Hart
RD1242	164/1	Jo Watts
RD1242	168/1	John Crascall
RD1242	685/3	John Harvey
RD1242	731/3	Julie Morgan
RD1242	1063/1	K A Jennings
RD1242	2209/1	K Bolton
RD1242	2186/1	K Clark
RD1242	2199/1	K Ford
RD1242	2163/1	K Read
RD1242	2183/1	Karen Purkiss
RD1242	2205/1	Kate Townsend
RD1242	2161/1	Katy Woodley
RD1242	2167/1	Kristina Anne Cocker
RD1242	2195/1	L Cobb
RD1242	2176/1	L Cole
RD1242	2196/1	L J Brown
RD1242	2125/1	Lionel Bolton



RD1242	2239/1	Lundford
RD1242	2149/1	M A Barnes
RD1242	663/1	M A Riddell
RD1242	2185/1	M DeFano
RD1242	2141/1	M Garner
RD1242	2138/1	M Gilson
RD1242	2098/1	M H Hawkes
RD1242	669/1	M Harvey
RD1242	2096/1	M Hobbs
RD1242	2179/1	M Jay
RD1242	2225/1	M K Hodge
RD1242	2124/1	M Lewis
RD1242	1077/4	M Norris
RD1242	2206/1	M Townsend
RD1242	2216/1	M Watt
RD1242	143/1	M. J. Neil
RD1242	2136/1	Martin
RD1242	2135/1	Martin
RD1242	2213/1	Mavis Manns
RD1242	2173/1	Michelle Fraser
RD1242	2194/1	Moira Steward
RD1242	2221/1	Ms Wiseman
RD1242	2092/1	N Harvey
RD1242	2102/3	N J Tarrant
RD1242	735/1	N Lincoln
RD1242	2193/1	Nicola Steward
RD1242	2200/1	P Barrett
RD1242	2227/1	P Chivers
RD1242	2188/1	P Conner
RD1242	2174/1	P D James
RD1242	2156/1	P E Benford
RD1242	2143/1	P Hardy
RD1242	2237/1	P J Brumhill
RD1242	2241/1	P Lundford
RD1242	2158/1	P Moth
RD1242	2231/1	P Q Dervis
RD1242	144/1	P. T Neil
RD1242	157/4	Pam Cooper
RD1242	2129/1	Pamela M Kidd
RD1242	2091/3	Patricia Wright
RD1242	2197/1	R Brown
RD1242	2189/1	R Conner
RD1242	2140/1	R Garner
RD1242	2142/1	R Hardy
RD1242	2103/3	R P Dodson
RD1242	2257/1	R T Crook
RD1242	2253/1	Rita Huntley
RD1242	160/1	Robert Osachuk
RD1242	2208/1	Robert Townsend
RD1242	2094/3	Rosemary Platt
RD1242	2127/1	S A Barber
RD1242	2238/1	S E Gridley
RD1242	676/1	S F Hunt
RD1242	2159/1	S Moth
RD1242	2160/1	S Moth
RD1242	139/1	S. N. Allen
RD1242	2220/1	Sean Aicken
RD1242	2178/1	Simon Jay
RD1242	2121/1	L Steggles
RD1242	2155/1	Stephen Hyde
RD1242	165/1	Steven P. Watts
RD1242	684/3	Susan Harvey
RD1242	660/1	Sylvia Pool
RD1242	2224/1	T Bartram
RD1242	2146/1	T G McInally
RD1242	2123/1	T Lewis
RD1242	2215/1	T Smith
RD1242	2222/1	Teresa Irish
RD1242	2311/4	The Rowans
RD1242	2182/1	Tim Purkiss
RD1242	2217/1	Tomlin
RD1242	2218/1	V Davey
RD1242	2150/1	V P Barnes
RD1242	25/1	V. W. Cleife
RD1242	2097/1	Valerie Hawkes

RD1242	2147/1	W M McInally
RD1242	148/1	Wearn
RD1242	2232/1	Y Munro
RD1242	158/1	Yvonne Osachuk

### ISSUE

Will the proposed location for the cemetery have a detrimental impact on Rowans Hospice and/or meet the requirements of Havant Borough Council?

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.11.1 There was considerable interest from respondents regarding the precise location of the proposed cemetery, with many considering it was insensitive to locate it adjacent to Rowan's Hospice in the Revised Deposit Plan. However the MDA Masterplan layout, approved by Winchester and Havant Councils in April 2004, now shows it positioned adjacent to London Road, north of Milk Lane. The area to the north of the hospice is shown as an area for "habitat creation and to meet informal recreational needs". The Council introduced FPCs12.01 & 12.03 to reflect the Councils' recent decision which addresses the objections by amending the text and Inset Map 41a.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.11.2 That the Plan be modified in accordance with FPC12.01 and FPC12.03.

## 12.12. Integration with Waterlooville Town Centre (paragraph 12.70)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.070	261/75	Government Office for the South East

### ISSUE

Should the Plan set out guidance on integration with Waterlooville Town Centre which is within Havant District? 261/75

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.12.1 GOSE indicate that Plans should not specify land use provisions in respect of areas outside its administrative boundaries. Whilst that is strictly true, it would be parochial in the extreme to ignore the fact that the MDA is planned as an urban expansion of Waterlooville with the majority proposed on land within Winchester District, although the existing settlement is predominantly within Havant. Moreover, the town centre is intended to be the main focus of higher order facilities for the planned new community as part of a comprehensive development. Hence, it is entirely appropriate to make reference to this in the Plan and the importance of securing integrated transport links thereto. Moreover, the section objected to is explanatory text rather than policy and to my mind serves to highlight the important nexus between the two.

12.12.2 Havant BC's concerns about providing the most effective means of integration is addressed in 12.10 above.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.12.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 12.13. Recreation and Open Space (paragraphs 12.71 - 12.72)

### OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.71	261/76	Government Office for the South East

### OBJECTION TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1244	1437/12	East Hampshire District Council

### ISSUES

1. Should the plan extend its land use preferences outside its administrative boundary?  
261/76
2. Should a local gap be maintained between Waterlooville and Purbrook?  
1437/12REVDEP

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.13.1 GOSE's objection in issue one refers to the mention of neighbouring Havant's Open Space Standards, which they regard as inappropriate. I am mindful that the MDA needs to be planned comprehensively and to that end the Masterplan has had regard to existing provision within Havant. However, as matters have moved on and the Masterplan Framework has been jointly agreed, the Council advanced FPC12.02 to delete the text added at Revised Deposit Stage. Nevertheless, I consider the entire text of paragraph 12.71 is redundant, as the size and distribution of the recreational open space provision has been established in the approved Masterplan. Hence, I consider the entire paragraph can safely be deleted.

12.13.2 The Revised Deposit addition of a reference to an urban park was interpreted by the objector in issue two as intended to provide a Local Gap between Purbrook and Waterlooville, which they regarded as insufficient to serve that function. However, it is not only apparent that the urban park was not designated as a Local Gap in the Winchester Local Plan, but that feature has not been carried through to the agreed Masterplan and my recommendation to delete the paragraph overcomes that point. That said, I am satisfied that whilst it is insufficient to warrant designation as a Local Gap a degree of separation is nevertheless maintained by designation of a 6.59ha cemetery and 5.5ha sports field, and in any event there is continuous development on the eastern side of London Road.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.13.3 That the Plan be modified by deletion of paragraph 12.71.

## 12.14. Local Gap (paragraph 12.80)

### OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
C3/ 12.80	236/1	Wimpey Strategic Land

### ISSUE

Whether the Local Gap between Waterlooville and Denmead is appropriately defined.

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.14.1 Although the principle of the Waterlooville/ Denmead Local Gap was accepted by the objector as a laudable planning measure, they challenged its precise extent, maintaining that it included more land than is necessary to achieve its purpose and that it failed to follow field boundaries. They seek the removal of land south of Closewood Road from the designated Local Gap.

12.14.2 Whilst some landscape evidence was advanced by the objector to illustrate that there is little intervisibility between the two settlements due to the local topography, and mature hedgerows the Council maintain that this is not the sole determinant and the designation is as much to do with providing physical separation as with any visual assessment of the landscape. They do not assert that the land has any great landscape value but consider its value lies in the role it has of providing physical separation as one travels between the settlements. They refer to sporadic development that lies within the Gap that serves to weaken the experience of leaving one and entering the other and hence also of their separate identities. To reduce the width of the Gap by a quarter, in line with the objector's suggestion, would provide a further weakening of its role and threaten its effectiveness.

12.14.3 Whilst I would frequently agree with the objector that field boundaries represent clear and defensible boundaries upon which to base land use designations, in this instance, the edge of the West of Waterlooville urban extension is delimited by the high voltage overhead power lines. Whilst these do not form a continuous feature at ground level, the pylons are clearly widely visible in the landscape and the wayleave below them is an inhibitor to built development. The Council does not wish to see development extend westwards beyond the route of the power line and to designate the eastern boundary of the Gap some distance to the west of the overhead lines would in reality place such intervening land under threat of development pressure. I therefore agree with the approach that the Council has adopted of defining the Gap extending up to the designated settlement limits and I am conscious that this Gap has already been relegated from Strategic Gap in the adopted Plan to Local Gap in this Review to cater for the MDA proposals.

12.14.4 I regard the Local Gap here as being essential to prevent the coalescence of the expanding Waterlooville with nearby Denmead and I am aware of the considerable development pressures hereabouts. I find the Council's approach of using the edges of the defined settlement boundaries as the limits of the Local Gap is entirely logical and particularly where it coincides with a defensible feature in landscape and land use terms, such as the overhead power lines in this instance.

### RECOMMENDATION

12.14.5 That no modification be made to the Plan.

# 12.15. Winchester City (North) (paragraphs 12.84 - 12.89, Proposal NC.3)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT & REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

See Appendix 2 to this Chapter

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

### INTRODUCTION

12.15.1 Proposal NC.3 for a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North), comprising approximately 2000 dwellings and associated physical and social infrastructure, is without doubt the single most controversial proposal of the Plan. This is illustrated in part by the very large number of objections received from local residents which, together with objections from development interests, led to the Council identifying in excess of 100 issues in its consideration of its response (see Appendix 3 to this chapter). I have had regard to all these issues in my consideration of Proposal NC.3 and the accompanying text of the Plan and these have informed my judgement and conclusions. But to provide a detailed response on an individual issue by issue basis would result in an unnecessarily lengthy report including, inevitably, repetition where, as in many cases, the issues overlap. Furthermore, the number of issues that have effectively determined my recommendation to the Council is very much smaller, whilst notwithstanding the considerable detail submitted in the evidence, the determining factors for a Local Plan allocation are essentially ones of principle. Bearing these points in mind, I have structured this section of my report on the following basis and it is within this format that I address those matters that are central to my analysis and conclusions.

- The background to and the principle of a Reserve MDA in this location;
- The thrust of the additional arguments raised in the objections by
  - i. The Save Barton Farm Group (SBFG) and other local residents.
  - ii. CALA Homes
  - iii. Eagle Star Estates Limited
  - iv. Bovis Homes Ltd and Heron Land Developments Ltd
  - v. Kier Land
  - vi. Winchester City Residents Association
  - vii. CPRE
- Other Matters

### BACKGROUND TO, AND PRINCIPLE OF, THE MDA

12.15.2 Policy H2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996 – 2011 (Review) (or 'the Structure Plan') requires a 'baseline' provision of 7,295 dwellings in the Winchester District in the period 1996-2011. In Chapter 6 the Local Plan Review explains the Council's general strategy and the more detailed proposals for the supply and distribution of those dwellings and I have already dealt with the objections to the text and policies of that Chapter earlier in my report. In addition to the baseline provision, Policy H4 of the Structure Plan states that a reserve housing provision will be identified in local plans to accommodate 14,000 dwellings in the period 2001-2011. Of these, 7,000 would be located in 'northern Hampshire', including 2,000 dwellings in a Winchester City (North) MDA. Policy H4 goes on to say that the need for allocations of land to be released to accommodate this reserve provision will be

determined by the local and strategic planning authorities in the light of the policies in revised RPG9, the Regional Planning Guidance for the South East which determines the overall level of housing requirement in Hampshire and in other counties in the region.

12.15.3 Leaving temporarily aside the choice of the exact location for the reserve MDA, it is therefore clear that the principle of a reserve housing provision in or around the north of the city of Winchester is established in the Structure Plan. Furthermore, in my view the principle also extends firstly to the form of that provision (as a Major Development Area or 'MDA') and secondly to its scale (2,000 dwellings). On the first point, the glossary to the Structure Plan defines a 'Major Development Area' as an area identified in that Plan for 'large-scale, mixed use development'. Policy MDA1 of the Structure Plan provides a more detailed explanation of the concept:

*'In each area, provision will be made for the co-ordinated and integrated development of transport, housing, employment, health, community and social facilities, shopping, education, formal and informal recreation and leisure facilities and other identified local needs. In determining the location of land uses, the local planning authorities will seek to ensure that adequate opportunities are provided to meet all locally generated needs. Provision may also need to be made for facilities and/or infrastructure which serve a wider area where such need is identified during the preparation of the local plan.*

*It is expected that the development of these areas will require major transport schemes..... together with local access requirements and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Enhanced public transport, traffic management, traffic control and information systems will be necessary in the Major Development Areas and in those parts of the Transportation Strategy Areas affected by the proposals.*

From this description I consider it is clear that the concept of an MDA is intended to be one that seeks to create a 'New Community' that has a significant degree of self containment and self sufficiency but which also integrates well with its surrounding area. In my view this is particularly the case where the MDA is envisaged to take the form of a single comprehensive development, albeit phased, on a single site.

12.15.4 The second point is that the concept of a 'New Community' also depends on its scale, as without a minimum population size the development would not cross the threshold needed to provide at a local level the range of services indicated in Structure Plan Policy MDA 1. As the Council says, by ensuring the MDA is of a sufficient size to deliver a sustainable community there will need to be a critical mass of people to sustain and make viable key social and economic infrastructure associated with the development. Structure Plan Policy H4 refers to 2000 dwellings as the size of the Winchester City (North) reserve MDA and indeed it is the minimum total figure chosen by the Panel for new MDAs at the Structure Plan Examination in Public in the light of the criteria of PPG13. The issue of the minimum size is against the background that the necessity for the reserve MDA in itself is justified by it forming part of the strategic housing provision in northern Hampshire in Structure Plan Policy H4.

12.15.5 From the two preceding paragraphs it will be clear that it is the Structure Plan that has already determined (i) that there will be a reserve provision of 2,000 dwellings; (ii) that the provision will be in the comprehensive form of a MDA, and (iii) that the location will be in or close to the north of the city of Winchester. Planning legislation requires a Local Plan to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan for the area that it covers and I do not therefore regard any of these three matters to be within the discretion of the Council to alter, even if it was minded so to do. That said, it is equally clear that a substantial number of objections do seek to amend the general location, scale and form of the reserve housing provision. And although I recognise that many objectors may be unaware of the constraints imposed by the procedural framework, I too must limit my observations to those matters which I can properly

consider. I must therefore reject in principle the arguments of the objectors who, for example, consider that the need for a reserve MDA site in the general area of Winchester City (North) has not been fully justified or that its identification at this stage is unnecessary or premature; that the scale of development would be too great, in excess of the sustainable needs of Winchester and incompatible with other planning objectives; and that a development of this size should in any event be located elsewhere within the sub region or outside the region where there is greater capacity for it to be accommodated.

- 12.15.6 However the final matter that falls within the ambit of the background to and principle of the reserve MDA is the Plan's process of selection and eventual choice of Barton Farm as the preferred site and this is a matter that legitimately falls both within the scope of the Plan and my remit to consider the duly made objections. There are substantial differences between the Deposit Plan and the Revised Deposit in this regard in that the former document shows just an 'Area of Search' for the reserve MDA, whereas the Review Plan identifies a specific site and more detailed policies for its land use and infrastructure. In Topic Paper 7 the Council has described in some detail the process leading up to the inclusion of an Area of Search in the Deposit Plan and the subsequent further work to identify a specific site in the Revised Deposit. Although I will not repeat that process fully here, the main stages and conclusions nonetheless need to be clearly identified to establish a context for the objections to the Plan and the basis for my response to them.
- 12.15.7 The assessment commenced in early 2001 with the identification of evaluation criteria (initially 12 and subsequently 15) to identify the most suitable areas of land for inclusion in the Area of Search. After the criteria had been the subject of data collection and analysis, six sub areas were identified for evaluation against them. The first key outcome was that two of the sub areas, sub-area 1 at Littleton and sub-area 4 at Barton Farm / south of the A34 performed significantly better against the evaluation criteria than the other four. Following a refinement of the methodology to remove any inherent bias arising from the transport criteria, sub areas 1 and 4 continued to perform better than the others and the consequential necessity to give them further detailed consideration was the formal starting point for the Area of Search. Because both sub areas had performed poorly against at least some of the criteria, the major constraints were in each case then factored into the process including, in the case of land at Barton Farm / south of the A34, the exclusion of the area to the east of the railway line.
- 12.15.8 In the case of Littleton, the exercise found that the resolution of any one constraint would result in an increased impact on one or more of the others. This led the Council to conclude that accommodating an MDA in this area would be likely to result in a less satisfactory form of urban development than could be accommodated on land at Barton Farm / south of the A34. Accordingly, Littleton was excluded from the Area of search, which was subsequently identified in the Deposit Local Plan under Proposal NC.3 as the area adjoining the built up area of Winchester with boundaries of the A34 to the north, Andover Road to the west and the railway line to the east.
- 12.15.9 Objectors to Proposal NC.3 in the First Deposit included the observation by the County Council that the identification of just an Area of Search was inadequate and that the Proposals Map needed to identify the actual boundary of the reserve MDA, whilst the policy itself should also include policies setting out the requirements for its Masterplanning. The District Council accepted that this further work had to be done in order for the Plan to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan. And with the significant assistance of information supplied by established development interests in the land, the Council produced technical reports on the appraisal of the Area of Search in terms of landscape, ecology, transport, hydrogeological and hydrological conditions, archaeology and preliminary work on an 'appropriate assessment' of the potential effects of the reserve MDA on the River Itchen SSSI and candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC). At the same time, a second area of work was carried out to assess the land use and infrastructure requirements of the reserve MDA.

- 12.15.10 The Council has explained how in parallel with these technical studies, the principles and conclusions of the 1999 'Future of Winchester Study' were placed at the centre of its consideration of how to accommodate the reserve MDA within the general location identified by the Structure Plan and, subsequently, the refined Area of Search. The key inputs from the Study were that (i) as a compact city, Winchester would be best served by a successful 'seamless' integration of new development with the existing built up area; (ii) that the location of development in the south of the Area of Search would have transport advantages and enable easier walking and cycling to key facilities, including the city centre and the railway station, and (iii) development in the south of the Area of Search would be least damaging to the landscape character and setting of the city, as it is the northern area with its more open character and longer distance views that is more susceptible to the visual intrusion of development into the countryside.
- 12.15.11 With the technical appraisals indicating that there were only relative as opposed to absolute constraints on the southern part of the Area of Search and the fact that the eastern and western boundaries are physically formed by the railway line and Andover road respectively, the remaining issue was the delineation of a northern boundary of any development. There were two obvious choices for a 'defensible boundary'; a natural, landscape feature in the form of the Barton Farm ridgeline or a man made boundary in Well House Lane. However, although significantly more preferable in minimising the effect on the landscape, the former resulted in too small an area to accommodate the reserve MDA. In contrast, the Council's analysis showed that if the site extended as far north as Well House Lane, this would be of sufficient size to accommodate the reserve MDA as a potential compact and medium / high density urban extension to Winchester.
- 12.15.12 Although the issue of an alternative site at Littleton in the form of the St John Moore Barracks was briefly re-visited in January 2003, the outcome of the process was the formal identification of the reserve MDA as the area bounded by the built up area of Winchester, the railway line, Andover Road and Well House Lane on the Proposals Map (Inset Map 45) of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Plan published in May 2003. Following the guidance in the County Council SPG 'Implementing Policy H4', Proposal NC3 was also revised to add detailed criteria to set out the requirements of the development. The need to release the site for development is reviewed annually by the strategic planning authorities (in consultation with the District Council) and depends on whether the monitoring process has indicated that the housing supply position is such that there is a 'compelling need' for more land.
- 12.15.13 The choice of Barton Farm as the reserve MDA as a result of the evaluation process has led to objections firstly on the basis that the selection procedure was flawed and secondly that the characteristics of the site are such that it is inherently unsuitable for the designation. I deal with the former in the paragraphs immediately below and the latter in the remaining sections of this part of my report, which refer to the views of the organisations listed in paragraph 12.15.1 above.
- 12.15.14 As stated in paragraph 12.15.5 above, many objectors are not cognisant of the of the constraints imposed on the Council by Structure Plan Policy H4 and the requirement to comply with that policy as part of the necessity for the Plan to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan. However in addition, there is criticism to the effect that even with those constraints the site selection process in PPG3 has not been followed and that a brownfield site (or sites) should have been given preference over the greenfield site at Barton Farm. In my view however the process is consistent with PPG3 guidance to the extent that the MDA has a reserve status to be implemented only if the combination of other land sources fails to deliver the required housing numbers. The reserve MDA would, if triggered, serve the needs of a wider area than Winchester, but insofar as the Plan is able, it prioritises the development of the capacity in the existing built up areas of the District. As regards the finding of a single large site for comprehensive development (as required in this instance by



Structure Plan Policy H4) there is clearly no brownfield site available in north Winchester. And as an urban extension, the site is the next most sustainable option under the guidance in PPG3.

12.15.15 A second body of criticism by many objectors is that the site selection process is technically flawed and / or has been misdirected. For the most part I reject that criticism. I have set out the sequence of events in paragraphs 12.15.7 – 12.15.12 above, where in my view it can be seen that within the parameters set by the Structure Plan the Council adopted an entirely logical approach. The final selection of the overall area for detailed evaluation is to my mind consistent with Structure Plan Policy H4 and the Key Diagram and in addition the six sub-areas are a sensible division of that area. I have also carefully considered the 15 evaluation criteria and these are comprehensive in their coverage and include sound planning objectives which, where appropriate, take into account the particular needs of Winchester and its setting. The methodology used by the Council for its assessment has an academic pedigree and has previously been successfully tried and tested by other local authorities in Hampshire in their appraisals of the merits of alternative locations for MDAs.

12.15.16 The detailed criticisms in objections include complaints that data used was incomplete, inaccurate and out of date and that the evaluation criteria could have been improved in their scope and detailed content, with different weightings applied. However I do not consider it to be within my remit to undertake an in-depth critical examination of these alleged shortcomings. Firstly there is the fairly obvious point that the objectors have, not unreasonably, approached the selection process within the framework of their own objectives (be it the development of a particular site, the promotion of a particular interest or indeed the aim of preventing development in the form, scale or location proposed by the Plan). Secondly, although not mentioned in my summary of the process in paragraphs 12.15.7 – 12.15.12, I am satisfied that the Council has attached considerable weight at every stage of the exercise to community and interested party involvement and adopted a genuinely consultative approach with the active participation of 'stakeholders'. In addition to councillors and officers of the Council itself, these included representatives from the County Council and relevant parish councils, local interest groups, statutory undertakers and service providers, government offices and development interests. Clearly such a consultative process cannot provide a satisfactory outcome to all participants; it is, after all, the Council that has to take the decisions and remain accountable for them. However from all that I have heard and read, I have seen no evidence that the Council at any stage moved in a different direction from that logically suggested by its technical work, having also taken on board the expertise, advice and, where it existed, the consensus of opinion amongst the stakeholders.

#### OBJECTIONS BY THE SAVE BARTON FARM GROUP (SBFG) AND OTHER LOCAL RESIDENTS

12.15.17 The SBFG has over 4,000 supporters and is listed by the Council in Appendix 1 of Topic Paper 7 under 'Local Interest Groups' as one of the stakeholders in its consultative process in the emerging Review of the Local Plan. In addition to the representations of the SBFG to the Inquiry, a large number of local residents have made individual objections to Proposal NC.3 and the majority of these are no doubt also supporters of the organisation. Although there are individual views that have been expressed in those objections which I have read and taken into account, I consider it reasonable to regard the SPFG's written evidence and formal submissions to the Inquiry as being generally representative of the substantial body of local opinion opposed to the Plan's designation of the reserve MDA in the triangle of land bounded by the built up area of the city, the railway, Andover Road and Well House Lane (for ease of reference referred to hereinafter as 'Barton Farm'). To the extent that the competing development interests referred to in the sections of my report below have covered the same ground, to avoid undue repetition my response below also covers the thrust of their arguments.

12.15.18 A substantial part of the SBF's evidence challenges the principle of the need for a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North) and the process through which Barton Farm was selected. However, as I have already explained in this section of my report, I am of the view that the former is established by the Structure Plan and that the latter potentially deserves my support as the result of an essentially objective, comprehensive, technically competent and transparent exercise underpinned by fairness and logic. I have noted the opposite conclusion of the SBF, which considers that the process was distorted by the geographically narrow range of the alternative sites and the fact that as a green wedge Barton Farm is bound to score highly because of its proximity to existing urban facilities. However for the reasons stated in paragraphs 12.15.15 and 12.15.16 above, I reject that view. In any event the fact remains that the selection process has been completed and cannot be re-visited. The outcome of that process was that although Barton Farm was subject to a number of constraints, these were not 'absolute' in the sense of precluding development, but 'relative' in that they would influence not the principle but the details of the scheme, in particular its layout. The view of the SBF is that individually and / or collectively these constraints do in fact make Barton Farm an unacceptable location for development and that the area should remain as an invaluable area of countryside with an attractive rural landscape and other qualities that can be enjoyed by residents of and visitors to the city.

12.15.19 I turn firstly to the impact of the reserve MDA at Barton Farm in terms of its effect on the landscape character of the area and the consequential effect on Winchester and its setting. In support of its case the SBF cites a number of documents that are clearly significant in any assessment of this issue, including the Report of the Inspector on objections to the adopted Local Plan (albeit that the site then was only partially the same as the reserve MDA); the 'Future of Winchester' Study and 'Winchester City and its Setting'. The Council has explained that the previous Inspector's strong criticism of the adverse effect of residential development on what is now part of the reserve MDA site has to be considered in the entirely new circumstances of the Structure Plan Policy H4 requirement. Furthermore, that 'Winchester City and its Setting' identifies the Northern Downs (the area within which the reserve MDA site lies) as a 'supportive' landscape rather than the more important 'distinctive' landscape which is specifically recognisable to Winchester. Finally, in the Council's view, the 'Future of Winchester' Study is important to its analysis and conclusions in respect of the choice of location of the reserve MDA because of its advice that *'maintaining green wedges / corridors should be realistically balanced with the community's needs. Apart from the River Itchen and water meadows, which are of international ecological importance, the existing boundaries of the green wedges / corridors penetrating the city are not necessarily sacrosanct. It is their benefits and contributions to the city's character that are more important'*.

12.15.20 I recognise that the views of the SBF on this issue have substantial merit and that the change from a rural to an urban landscape for the wedge of land from the edge of the built up area as far north as Well House Lane would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the setting of the city. This is all the more so because the land has few, if any, of the deleterious characteristics of urban fringe and the perception of the SBF that the edge of the built up area is the boundary with 'genuine' open and unspoilt countryside is justified. Arguably this is unusual for a settlement with a population in excess of 40,000. Thus for the most part I find it difficult to disagree with the previous Inspector in his comment that the openness and rolling character of this wedge of countryside *'makes a substantial contribution to the setting and character of this side of Winchester particularly when approached from the north along Andover Road'* and that housing development *'would be intrusive in the landscape and ..... would bring the urban edge of Winchester out into the countryside in what I consider to be an unacceptable manner thereby seriously affecting the setting and character of Winchester and the visual amenities of the area'*.

12.15.21 Understandably, the SBFG would wish this to be the definitive view and that, together with the evidence on the other issues, I would thereby draw the inescapable conclusion Barton Farm should not be designated as the reserve MDA. However I do not do so because, despite my acknowledgement of the merits of the argument, the Inspector's use of the term 'unacceptable' was a judgement made in the context of the circumstances of 1997 and the then emerging Plan. The SBFG are correct in saying that there has been no change to the character of the landscape since then, but the current position is nonetheless quite different. This is because Structure Plan Policy H4 requires the designation of a reserve MDA at Winchester City (North) and the Council's further analysis for the Local Plan concluded initially that the Area of Search should be the land south of the A34 as defined in the First Deposit, and finally that within that area the land south of Well House Lane at Barton Farm would be the optimum location. Furthermore, the fact remains that any urban extension will, by definition, irrevocably change the setting of a town or city and result in a loss of countryside. And in contrast with a smaller ad hoc development confined to housing with perhaps some ancillary open space, the designation of the reserve MDA does provide a real opportunity to create a new townscape of a high quality that will make a positive contribution to the special character of Winchester.

12.15.22 The term 'urban sprawl' has been used in the objections to the selection of Barton Farm as a reserve MDA. If that description is equated to any encroachment of an urban area into the countryside it may be justified, but as a planned 'urban extension' the reserve MDA does not comprise 'sprawl'. Indeed it has distinctive and defensible boundaries in the railway to the east and Andover Road to the west. The former is the boundary to an open area of countryside separating the site from Abbots Barton and which will be retained for informal recreation and continue to form an important open aspect in views from the west, both within and across the site. The latter is characterised by its avenue of mature sycamore trees which will be retained to maintain their vital contribution to the scenic approach to the city and in views from the east. I accept that the Barton Farm ridge with its mature trees and hedgerow is a distinctive natural feature and that the containment of residential development to its south would significantly reduce the harmful effect that the reserve MDA, if implemented, would have on the landscape character of the area and the setting of and approach to the city. The fact is, however, that this area is far too small to accommodate the scale of development required and that Well House Lane is also a distinctive, logical and defensible boundary. The Council is aware of the landscape importance of the Barton Farm ridge and the need for its inclusion and enhancement as part of the reserve MDA's structural layout, as indeed is clear from the specific reference to it in Proposal NC.3.

12.15.23 Furthermore, in my view the SBFG's concern that the reserve MDA would lead to a 'domino effect' with a resulting coalescence between the edge of the city and smaller neighbouring settlements is wholly unfounded. I refer to the land north of Well House Lane in more detail in paragraphs 12.15.42 to 12.15.47 below, but the salient and indeed factual point is that the reserve MDA does not encroach into any of the Local Gaps which are the areas of countryside designated in the Plan as being of particular importance to prevent both physical and perceived coalescence. And as a single planned entity there would not be any precedent set for further development to the north. The SBFG also refers to the 'Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment' as an important strategy that should be implemented to protect Barton Farm from development. However this adds little to the debate in that it confirms, as I have already accepted, that development has the greatest visual impact on the 'open arable' landscapes of which Barton Farm is a part. The Assessment does however confirm that the area north of Well House Lane up to the A34, with its increased openness and longer distance views, is more important in landscape character terms than the area to the south, other than the effect of the latter on the setting of the built up area to its current boundary. Significantly, that qualitative element in the northern part would remain to serve as an important supportive setting to the extension to the city in the event that the reserve MDA was to proceed.

12.15.24 Added to the SBFG's evidence on landscape and the effect on the setting of Winchester were a number of issues that I shall collectively describe as 'countryside matters'. These comprise (i) the need to preserve the countryside for its own sake; (ii) the use of the area for quiet, informal recreation; (iii) the loss of footpaths (in particular the right of way along the Barton Farm ridge connecting Andover Road with Headbourne Worthy); (iv) the loss of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land; (v) the detrimental effect on bio diversity and (vi) the damaging impact on the River Itchen. In respect of (i), although preservation of the countryside is a fundamental tenet of national guidance in PPS 7, it clearly cannot preclude the release of housing land when required, especially when in the form of urban extensions. Indeed this much is acknowledged in the PPS. In (ii), I accept that the nature and quality of informal recreation that Barton Farm currently offers (albeit by permissive access on private land) will be lost. But this is an inevitable result of development and Winchester residents are fortunate in that they would continue to have access to similar countryside around the city. In (iii), the Council states that the Masterplan will ensure the retention of the ridge line footpath in a landscape setting, and in (iv) the loss of high grade agricultural is unfortunate but is not an absolute constraint in either PPS7 or the objectives of the Plan itself. As regards (v), I accept the Council's argument that as arable farmland the biodiversity of Barton Farm is currently relatively low and that in any event the Masterplan would seek to mitigate the ecological impact of the reserve MDA if developed. These would include (vi) the effect on the River Itchen as a candidate cSAC and the process has in fact already commenced with the Itchen sustainability Study.

12.15.25 I acknowledge that, although I have dealt with them briefly, items (i) to (vi) above are of particular interest to many objectors, including supporters of the SBFG. However in my view, none are matters that fall within the more limited range of issues that I refer to in paragraph 12.15.1 as actually determining my recommendation as to the principle of possible development at Barton Farm. They are issues that are either clearly outweighed by other considerations, or matters that can be dealt with in the detailed planning of the reserve MDA if, in fact, it is called on for development. I shall be similarly brief with the issue of flooding, which in the context of the SBFG objection relates to the off-site effect of run off rather than the on-site drainage. As a stakeholder itself in consultation on the selection process, the SBFG will be aware that the Environment Agency (EA) also had that status and has been closely involved in the identification of the reserve MDA. The EA published the 'Winchester MDA Strategic Flood Defence and Drainage Issues' paper in early 2002, which stated that in terms of flood defence there were no objections in principle to the development of the majority of the reserve MDA site. Constraints and mitigating measures were identified and these have been taken account of in Proposal NC.3. Furthermore, the particular concern of the SBFG that the River Itchen would be at risk, in terms of both its hydraulic capacity and ecological value, would not appear well founded. The topography of the site is such that run off would be largely contained within the site, whilst the Itchen Sustainability Study will address any ecological impacts. As the EA are supportive of Policy NC.3 as now drafted in the Revised Plan, I am satisfied that flood risk is a constraint that has been, and will continue to be, satisfactorily addressed in the Plan's proposals for the reserve MDA.

12.15.26 I now turn to the issues of sustainability and transport. As regards the former, and temporarily leaving aside travel patterns, the SBFG argues that Barton Farm is inherently unsustainable. In its view, sustainability has an ethical dimension and 'is about designing new ways of living with the land', including in this case the actual process of how an urban extension should come about. The loss of high quality agricultural land, the consumption of natural resources, and the visual and functional relationship to historic Winchester are all key factors. Again, as in the case of landscape impact, I consider that the SBFG's views have merit. But its submission in this instance is more of a philosophical debate than an acceptance of, and response to, the hard choices that the Council has had to make in preparing a Plan with both the overall housing figures and the broad location of a site to accommodate the reserve capacity already determined by the County Council. Clearly the

development of a greenfield site is less sustainable than the use of brownfield land but as I have already explained, that choice is neither within the remit of the Plan or my recommendation on it.

- 12.15.27 I now turn to transport of which the sustainability issue is the first key element. The travel patterns from a development on the Barton Farm site and the consequential effect on the local highway network were a major concern not only of the SBFG, but many other residents. At the Inquiry they were also the focus of the evidence of developers in promoting alternative reserve MDA sites. A key issue within this debate was whether Barton Farm's physical proximity to the city centre of Winchester and its range of facilities effectively belies its relatively poor accessibility.
- 12.15.28 In support of that contention, my attention was drawn to the objectives of the Winchester Movement and Access Plan (WMAp), national guidance in PPGs 1, 3 and 13 and the recommendations of the Institute for Highways and Transportation. However although evidence to the Inquiry included tables of distances between the site and a range of facilities and an evaluation in terms of 'desirable', 'acceptable' and 'preferred' maximum walking, I am not persuaded that such standardised information is necessarily helpful or reliably indicative of trips that will be made. Local circumstances count for a great deal and significantly different results can be obtained by a slight adjustment to any of the variables or assumptions included within the data. A more reliable measure is the guidance in PPG13 that distances of up to 2km have the greatest potential for walking to replace car trips, whilst 5 km or less is the yardstick for cycling. Using these figures, it is clear that large parts of the reserve MDA would be accessible to a wide range of local facilities, including those in the city centre. Indeed, St Bartholomew's Ward which forms the northern quarter of the city centre has approximately 8,000 jobs and there are a number of public sector organisations and the Winnall and Easton Lane industrial estates within 2.5km of the centre of the site. A number of schools and leisure facilities are within a similar radius or less, as is Winchester railway station at a distance of 1.6km. The gradient in Andover Road will be a deterrent to some residents but is not so severe as to dissuade those who have a propensity to use walking and cycling as an alternative to the car for short trips. The key point to be deduced from these figures is that for an urban extension, Barton Farm is unusually close to a wide range of facilities including the city centre and furthermore is much closer than any of the other sites considered in the evaluation process.
- 12.15.29 I acknowledge that a large number of objectors, including the SBFG, argue that the highway network will not have sufficient capacity to cope with the traffic volume generated by the development. That Winchester is already congested, particularly in its city centre, and that more dwellings mean more people and more people mean more traffic is patently obvious. Some of the additional traffic will also exacerbate capacity problems at local junctions. In this context I have noted the SBFG'S evidence in respect of the City Road / Andover Road junction. But a medium – high density comprehensive development on a site close to the city centre would undoubtedly also provide a genuine opportunity to achieve many of the objectives of the WMAp and bring about a significant modal shift from the car to bus travel, cycling and walking. The successful Masterplanning of the site to implement section (v) (a) of Proposal NC.3, together with off-site improvements, particularly to the footways along Andover Road and additional facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the railway will be essential, as will implementation of the identified key cycle routes to link the site with the city centre and locations including Kings Worthy, Littleton, Harestock, Weeke and Hyde.
- 12.15.30 Overall, in the event that the reserve MDA is implemented, I consider that development will be in a highly sustainable location with excellent opportunities to increase non car modes of travel. A development of 2,000 dwellings will undoubtedly create challenges in terms of movement and access, but subject to an appropriately high standard of detailed planning, I see no reason why those challenges should not be met successfully. In reaching this conclusion I have also taken account of the

evidence of the development interests for other sites. But this does not persuade me that a site in such close proximity to the city centre and key employment areas is anything other than sustainable in transport terms.

12.15.31 Overall, although I have given careful consideration to all the matters raised by the SBF, I do not consider that the Plan should be modified pursuant to their objections or those of the other organisations and individuals whose representations I have taken account of above.

#### OBJECTIONS BY CALA HOMES

12.15.32 Cala Homes have a long established ownership interest in land at Barton Farm and therefore support the designation of the reserve MDA in Proposal NC.3. Their objections to the Plan, as presented to the Inquiry, comprise an issue of principle in respect of the 'release mechanism' for the land and issues of detail in terms of whether suggested alterations to the wording of the Proposal would be appropriate.

12.15.33 Dealing firstly with the principle, the thrust of the objector's argument is that neither Structure Plan Policy H4 nor the SPG 'Implementing Policy H4' preclude factors other than those identified in (i) and (ii) of the policy (essentially the rate of housing development). Indeed the Policy's use of the word 'include' in the identification of issues to be considered in deciding to release any of the reserve provision and the SPG's statement that RPG Policies will be 'a consideration' at the stage when a decision whether to release land is made rather than the single determining factor, both suggest that other material considerations can contribute to the 'compelling justification / need'. In the objector's view these could reasonably include 'a lack of affordable housing in a particular area, sustainable development objectives, and the need to redress imbalances between employment opportunities and housing land supply'.

12.15.34 I acknowledge that as a matter of 'plain English', for example the sentence in Policy H4 that 'Issues to be considered in reaching a decision will include' rather than 'are', (my underlining), the policy can be interpreted in the manner suggested by the objector. Nonetheless I remain unconvinced that, when drafted, Policy H4 was intended to refer to anything other than the provision of a strategic housing reserve to ensure that the numeric requirements of RPG9 are met. Policy H4 is supplemental to Policy H2 and paragraphs 231 and 232 of the explanatory memorandum recognise that issues such as affordable housing and sustainability (with 'the recycling of urban land') are important parts of the strategy. But I am in no doubt that the term 'compelling justification' relates fundamentally to a quantitative assessment of housing supply at the strategic level. It does not in my view relate to the supply position in any one District (as paragraphs 239 and 240 of the explanatory memorandum make clear) and it does not relate to the 'other material considerations' suggested (other than in the form of benefits that would in any event result from an increase in housing numbers). Moreover I agree with the Council that the implication of the objector's interpretation is that a single local planning authority could unilaterally take the initiative in deciding if and when there was a 'compelling justification' and that this course of action would be in conflict with Structure Plan Policy H4 and the explanatory memorandum. This is clearly not the intention of Policy H4, but at the same time the policy does not preclude the District from making a significant contribution to the decision-making process in the collaborative manner suggested.

12.15.35 From the above it will be clear that I do not support the objector's suggested modifications to the preamble of Proposal NC.3 insofar as they relate to the release mechanism for the reserve MDA sites. Furthermore, I consider the other suggestions made in respect of the preamble to be unnecessary and over-elaborate. I acknowledge that, as drafted, paragraphs 12.84, 12.85 and RD12.50 are a hybrid version of the First Deposit Draft, as indeed is all the text in the Plan. But

nonetheless they are accurate and succinct and say what needs to be said. The modifications suggested appear to me to be doing no more than adding further justification for the selection of Barton Farm as the reserve MDA. However if, following my recommendation of support for that designation, the Plan is adopted, this is clearly superfluous as its implementation would depend only on a decision by the Council following a recommendation by the strategic planning authorities.

- 12.15.36 Turning now to the individual components of the policy, the objector seeks a number of modifications. Firstly in respect of RD12.51(i), which requires the preparation of a Masterplan, an amended wording was agreed at the Inquiry. Secondly in RD.12.51 (iii), the objectors seek to delete the reference to a sustainability statement and include a reference to the 2002 scoping opinion. However I agree with the Council's view that the former is a reasonable and useful requirement and that the latter is not consistent with the site's reserve status. In (iv), as regards employment, I consider that the Plan's wording is more consistent with the provisions of Structure Plan Policy MDA1, whilst through RD 12.62, still providing the flexibility sought by the objector. The retention of the reference to the recycling centre, at least as an option, should be retained as if considered operationally necessary and capable of being found a suitable site, it would be consistent with the sustainability objectives of the MDA.
- 12.15.37 As regards facilities and services, I agree with the objector that their suggested wording (as amended at the Inquiry to be consistent with RD12.78 in respect of shopping) would helpfully stress the need for the MDA to integrate with the existing suburbs of this part of the city. However I see no need to modify the clause on open space in (iv) to include a reference to the Masterplan. In respect of (v), physical infrastructure, I concur with the Council's view that the objector's amendments would unnecessarily weaken this part of the policy's reasonable requirements for an MDA.
- 12.15.38 In (vii), the important point is that to secure consistency with Structure Plan Policy MDA1 and to meet the needs of the new residents (as well as the existing), the provision of land east of the railway line is essential for informal recreation. The objector's proposed wording would inappropriately weaken that requirement as part of the MDA scheme. In respect of (viii), I consider that the policy's proposed wording for the retention of the main landscape features are consistent with Structure Plan Policy MDA1 and do not accept the objector's contention that it infers that the development would need to be screened from view. And in my opinion the specific reference to the Barton Farm ridgeline should be retained and the maintenance requirement is essential to ensure the integration of the development into the existing landscape, as opposed to it being an imposition on it. Finally, criterion (ix) reflects the current requirement of English Nature for an appropriate assessment on the River Itchen cSAC. I therefore consider it should be retained.
- 12.15.39 The objector has additionally suggested changes to RD12.62, RD12.71, RD12.80 and RD12.83, but I consider that the modifications suggested would unnecessarily weaken their reasonable policy requirements for the MDA. The required additional clause in respect of the MDA being brought forward if annual monitoring indicates a shortfall in baseline housing supply is inappropriate, as the reserve MDA is a strategic housing land resource with a release mechanism which already exists in the SPG of Policy H4. Furthermore, the scale of any District's individual shortfall is unlikely to require the provision of an additional 2,000 dwellings. Finally, I regard the requirement to safeguard the site for a possible post 2011 provision as also inappropriate as that would be a matter to be considered as part of the Local Development Framework to be prepared in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

## OBJECTIONS BY EAGLE STAR ESTATES LTD

12.15.40 The objector seeks the deletion of Proposal NC.3 and in so doing refers extensively to the allegedly flawed process by which Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA came to be included within Policy H4 of the Structure Plan. Furthermore the objector argues that in any event the reserve housing allocations of the Policy will only be partially needed. However as will be clear from my previous comments in this report, I consider that the assumption I must make is that the Plan must identify a reserve MDA site at Winchester City (North) to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan. Accordingly, I do not regard consideration of most of the objector's evidence to be within my remit. Firstly, it effectively invites the Council to defend a process for which it is not accountable. Secondly, the remedy sought in the 'de-allocation' of the reserve MDA would not permit the Council to adopt a plan (assuming that it could do so legally) with any legitimacy in respect of policies for the delivery of actual and potential housing land supply to meet the strategic requirements of north Hampshire. Whether or not the reserve MDA will be implemented is the subject of the Policy H4 monitoring process with the decision effectively (albeit not technically) taken by the strategic authorities in consultation with the District Council. But the identification of a site for a reserve MDA is the Council's responsibility and one which it has discharged. Despite this, I have considered the two cases of de-allocation referred to by the objector but neither are comparable because, amongst other matters, they did not involve a Structure Plan that required the specific allocation within a Local Plan of a quantum of land in a particular location. Bearing in mind the considerable resources that the Council has invested in preparing the Plan and the huge involvement by the public as part of the consultative process, in my view any failure of procedure at this late stage would be wholly unacceptable.

12.15.41 Turning briefly to those parts of the objection which I regard as having been 'duly made', in paragraph 12.15.20 above I largely concur with the 1997 Adopted Local Plan Inspector's view of the harmful effect of development on part of the MDA site, but also stated that the balance of considerations which now apply is quite different. With regard to other criticism by this objector of the Council's own selection process for the choice of Barton Farm, I do not consider that the effect of an amended criterion in respect of infrastructure and a different score as regards the archaeology evaluation to be so significant as to alter the outcome. Furthermore I give the objector's criticism only limited weight as they are not proposing an alternative location for the reserve MDA and the whole point of the exercise is to arrive at the 'least worse' site in terms of the effect of development on the various considerations. Finally I have taken account of the thrust of the objector's arguments in respect of sustainability and transport in paragraphs 12.15.27 to 12.15.30 above

## OBJECTIONS BY BOVIS HOMES LTD & HERON LAND DEVELOPMENTS LTD

12.15.42 Although the above developers submitted separate objections, they made a joint submission to the Inquiry. The essence of this was for an extension on the site shown on the Proposals Map for the reserve MDA to include land north of Well House Lane and for largely consequential amendments and additions to Proposal NC.3. The objectors agree with the Council that the reserve MDA should be sited at Barton Farm in the south of the area of Search, but consider that the use of Well House Lane as the northern boundary of its designation gives insufficient space for the proposal to properly fulfil the requirements of Structure Plan Policy MDA1. Moreover, in the objectors' view, as a man made feature Well House Lane has been given too much weight by the Council as a suitable northern boundary, with the consequence that the development and open space components of the reserve MDA, if implemented, would have to be 'shoe horned' into an unnecessarily restricted area. The approach adopted has thereby been in marked contrast with the 'maximum extent of land' method used in the West of Waterlooville MDA.

12.15.43 At the Inquiry, the objectors accepted that if Barton Farm could satisfactorily accommodate the reserve MDA, there would be no need for the inclusion of the



additional land north of Well House Lane. However bearing in mind that the purpose of the Plan is to identify the extent of only a reserve allocation, it seems to me that this can only be determined with absolute certainty by the outcome of the Masterplanning exercise. This has already been the subject of extensive discussions between the Council and CALA Homes as part of the processing of a planning application. The details of that process were not before the Local Plan Inquiry and will shortly be the subject of a further planning appeal Inquiry with a recommendation made to the First Secretary of State for his decision. In the absence of those details I consider that unless the evidence demonstrates quite clearly that the 88ha of the reserve MDA is wholly inadequate there are a number of factors which suggest that I should support the Council's position.

12.15.44 I refer to those factors in paragraph 12.15.45 below, but in my judgement the objectors have not satisfactorily demonstrated the inadequacy of the currently designated site. The various land use components would appear to aggregate to about 74ha, leaving a residue of 14ha for structural landscaping. I accept that having regard to the reference to 'tracts of countryside' in Structure Plan Policy MDA1, there is room for debate as to the adequacy of the 14ha and whether such provision should be within or outside the MDA boundaries. There are also issues relating to the optimum land requirement for various uses and facilities within the MDA, including the extent of employment, retail and community facilities and the implementation of SuDS. There are also the constraints of the limited extent to which use may be made of the dry valleys and the land within noise and odour contours. That said, the balance of evidence suggests that these can in fact be accommodated within the designated area. And unless and until the position is established to the contrary as a result of the detailed Masterplanning, I consider the northern boundary of the designation should remain unaltered.

12.15.45 My view on maintaining the present boundary is reinforced by other considerations. National guidance has long held that the countryside should be preserved for its own sake and further that when development does take place land should be used efficiently. Moreover, the compactness of the existing city strongly suggests a similarly compact development with clearly recognisable and defensible boundaries. I regard Well House Lane as having these characteristics, whereas the objectors' boundary is essentially arbitrary. Furthermore the necessity for any development to 'leapfrog' the constraints of the exclusion area around the Harestock Treatment Works and the dry valley across the site would mean an increased visual impact as development occupies the more visually exposed higher ground towards Down Farm Lane. The arbitrary nature of the northern boundary would be compounded by its failure to follow the whole length of the 70m contour and further, in the absence of any other physical feature, only about a fifth of the extent of the boundary would coincide with the tree shelter belt.

12.15.46 Finally, in respect of the Park and Ride Scheme which is referred to in Proposal NC.3 as the final bullet point of RD12.64, I share the Council's view that there is not necessarily a direct link between such a facility and the reserve MDA. Proposal W.3 allows Park and Ride sites outside the built up area to be considered and logically there is therefore no reason why an MDA boundary should be extended to accommodate their provision. As a reserve site it would in any event be inappropriate for a Park and Ride Scheme to be dependent on the other forms of development as the siting and timing of provision are more appropriately linked to further consideration as part of the Winchester Movement and Access Plan. This is not to say that a Park and Ride Scheme could not be provided as part of an MDA, particularly bearing in mind the cost implications, but I do not regard it as being material in any allocation decision.

12.15.47 Overall, I see no justification for the enlarged reserve MDA as part of the Plan, whilst the changes sought to the wording of Proposal NC.3 have not, as I understand them, been proposed independently of that enlargement.

## OBJECTIONS BY KIER LAND

- 12.15.48 The objector sought to promote the 'joint site' of the Sir John Moore Barracks and the Littleton Stud in the Littleton area of the city as an alternative to Barton Farm for the reserve MDA under Proposal NC.3 and on the Proposals Map. The basis of the objection was that the Council's evaluation process to identify a particular site within the Area of Search was flawed, in particular through an alleged failure to follow the guidance in PPG3 to give priority to the use of previously developed land in the allocation of land for housing. For this reason, together with a favourable comparison of the other merits of the joint site with those of Barton farm, the Plan would be improved by upholding the objection.
- 12.15.49 As I indicate in paragraph 12.15.12 above, there was some uncertainty during the final stages of the Council's preparation of the Revised Deposit Draft as to whether the Sir John Moore Barracks element of the joint site would be released for development. This uncertainty continued through the period of the Inquiry with the position at that time being that a decision would be made in April 2005, after its close.
- 12.15.50 During the Inquiry the objector conceded that without the Barracks, the Littleton Stud on its own is not a suitable candidate for accommodating the reserve MDA. I share that view.
- 12.15.51 During my consideration and reporting of all the objections to the Inquiry I was made aware of a letter dated 22 March 2005 from Defence Estates South West to the Council. This included that statement '*..... we have now been advised ..... that the army no longer have plans to close Sir John Moore Barracks and will continue to operate it as a training establishment for the medium term (at least 10 years +)*'. Also that '*Defence Estates would be most grateful if you would advise the local plan inspector of these revised arrangements in respect of this establishment and the Local Plan review*'.
- 12.15.52 Despite that announcement, I have not been advised of any withdrawal by Kier Land of their objection to the Plan. However the period of the Plan is to end in 2011 and my remit is to recommend to the Council modifications that would improve the Plan in the light of the objections received. Having regard to the information that the joint site would not be available until at least 2016, some five years after the Plan's scheduled end date, I am clearly unable to do so in this case. In these circumstances I do not consider it appropriate, or indeed helpful, to express any view as to the merits or otherwise of the objection or to make any recommendation.

## OBJECTIONS BY THE WINCHESTER CITY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

- 12.15.53 The Association seeks the deletion of Proposal NC.3 on the grounds that the identification of a reserve MDA is premature; that the proposed development is not required for local needs which can be met 'through a provision within the existing urban envelope', and that development is not sustainable in the context of Winchester's built environment and landscape setting. In support of its evidence, the Association referred in particular to 'Winchester City and its Setting' and the 'Future of Winchester Study'. The identification of Barton Farm as a reserve MDA is considered to be part of a flawed strategy and if PPG15 guidance is given adequate weight it will be clear that housing development on such a major scale would threaten both the importance of Winchester as an historic city and its local distinctiveness. As a consequence the development would not be sustainable in terms of its impact on the landscape, the city's infrastructure or indeed on any of the other factors which need to be taken into account if the unique character is to be respected. In the Association's view, the Plan's approach should have been to realistically assess the actual capacity of the city to accommodate any more development.
- 12.15.54 As in the case of the SBFG, I recognise the merit of the Association's arguments and, indeed, have sympathy with them. However as I have also explained

earlier in my report, I regard the Council's hands as being tied in its drafting of the Plan by the requirement for housing and the need for a reserve MDA, both of which are policies in the Structure Plan. That said, I consider that if the reserve MDA does have to be implemented, it would not have the extent of the adverse impact feared by the Association or the other objectors. The edge of the city's built up area would move north, but the supportive landscape of the Northern Downs would remain beyond Well House Lane. The tree lined approach to the city along Andover road would remain and be reinforced. Barton Farm does not have an intimate physical or visual relationship with the city's historic core and the detailed proposals within Proposal NC. 3, when implemented through the Masterplanning process, should ensure the development of a high quality townscape. As I have already stated, I recognise that this does not 'compensate' for the loss of countryside, but it does ensure that qualitative as well as quantitative aspects are at the fore in the Plan's objectives. A further point arising from the Association's evidence is the argument that the reserve MDA is not required to meet local needs. This is factually correct as Barton Farm is only part of a possible provision to meet the strategic housing needs of northern Hampshire. Nonetheless, if and when triggered, the reserve MDA would make a significant contribution to the general and affordable housing needs of residents of Winchester and its surrounding smaller settlements. To that extent at the very least, it would meet local needs.

#### OBJECTIONS BY THE CPRE

12.15.55 The thrust of the CPRE's evidence was to the effect that the designation of the reserve MDA is unnecessary as brownfield sites, including those owned by the MoD, NHS and the County Council will come forward with sufficient potential to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. Only if a shortfall actually occurs should a reserve site be put forward and then through the mechanism of a further review of the Local Plan. However, and as I have previously made clear in this report, I accept the Council's view that to be in conformity with the Structure Plan, the Local Plan Review must cater for the possibility that the land will be needed. Although it would only be released if there was a compelling justification to do so, a failure to embrace the principle and proceed with the Masterplanning at this stage would mean a considerable delay in the MDA's implementation in the event that the housing figures show the scale of shortfall in supply that amounts to that justification. Accordingly, I conclude that Proposal NC.3 is a necessary part of the Plan and that the CPRE's request for a 'de-allocation' should not, and indeed cannot, be met.

12.15.56 The further substantive point raised by the CPRE is the implication of environmental changes at Barton Farm since the adoption of the Structure Plan in 2000. Reference is made in particular to the River Itchen and generally to pollution and emissions from traffic congestion in the area. However the Council has already published a 'scoping opinion' which identifies the matters that it considers should be dealt with in an Environmental Statement. The further detail pursuant to that is a matter for a planning application for the implementation of the reserve MDA. As such it is outside the remit of the Plan and, therefore, my report.

#### OTHER MATTERS

12.15.57 In my introduction to this section of my report in paragraph 12.15.1, I explain that as the single most controversial proposal in the Plan, I have considered Proposal NC.3 largely in terms of the most important issues and the principles that they embraced. Given the level of detail involved in the Council's own schedule of issues attached as Appendix 3 below, I consider that to have done otherwise would have been entirely impractical. As a consequence of that approach, I do not in this instance propose to amend the wording of Proposal NC.3, other than to a limited extent in response to the objections by CALA Homes. Generally I regard the policy as being fit for purpose and any further amendments to its detail and supporting text would not materially improve the Plan. If and when the reserve provision does come about, the test of Proposal NC.3 will be the successful implementation of the Masterplanning

process, and I have no doubt that part of that success will be as a result of public participation in response to the consultation carried out.

12.15.58 Finally in respect of RD12.93, at the time of publication of the Revised Deposit Plan it was anticipated that SPG would soon be prepared on developer contributions, which would have been helpful in guiding and determining the provision of infrastructure and facilities not only throughout the District but also in the MDAs. However a protocol in the form of SPG has not as yet been agreed and I therefore endorse the Council's Further Proposed Change FPC.12.C which deletes the reference to it in the Plan. If and when the SPG is prepared and adopted by the District Councils in Hampshire and the County Council, I consider that it would be helpful in (i) providing the information necessary for all developers in the District as to their potential contributions towards infrastructure and facilities; (ii) informing the Masterplanning process for MDAs; and (iii) ensuring a transparent, equitable and consistent approach. This would go some way to meeting the concerns of the Hampshire County Council who in their objections to the Plan have sought more detail in respect of contributions towards the additional demand for provision of the services that they provide.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

12.15.59 That the Plan be modified by:

- a) deletion of RD12.51 (i) and its replacement by 'a comprehensive Masterplan for the development has been prepared with the opportunity for the full participation and co-operation of the local planning authority and which has received their endorsement'.
- b) deletion of the third bullet point of RD12.51 (iv) and its replacement by 'adequate facilities and services to support the new community and to help integrate the development with the adjoining northern suburbs of Winchester. Facilities should include provision for local shopping, including a small / medium sized food-store, education, healthcare and other necessary community facilities'.
- c) the partial deletion of paragraph RD12.93 as proposed in FPC.12.C.

## APPENDIX 1

### OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSAL NC.2: WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MDA

#### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
12.33	751/2	J M Syms
12.35	378/3	Salway
12.38	751/3	J M Syms
NC.02	782/1	A Baggott
NC.02	633/1	A Bradshaw
NC.02	1095/1	A Cross
NC.02	438/1	A Davis
NC.02	781/1	A Foader
NC.02	400/1	A Frampton
NC.02	772/1	A G Wall
NC.02	579/1	A J Swansborough
NC.02	804/1	A J Weston
NC.02	984/1	A M Campbell
NC.02	1108/1	A Mcgregor
NC.02	723/1	A Mees
NC.02	910/1	A Miles
NC.02	912/1	A Miles
NC.02	1079/1	A Norris
NC.02	896/1	A Pearce
NC.02	759/1	A R Hayter
NC.02	906/1	A R Watts
NC.02	1002/1	A Smith
NC.02	959/1	A Turner
NC.02	646/1	A W Fuller
NC.02	812/1	A Warner
NC.02	69/1	A. E. Harwood
NC.02	154/1	A. F. Dickson
NC.02	13/1	A. G. Crockford
NC.02	31/1	A. Gray
NC.02	730/1	Abigail Staff
NC.02	869/1	Adam Conlon
NC.02	581/1	Adam Metcalf
NC.02	762/1	Alan Blackwell
NC.02	141/1	Alan Cobb
NC.02	156/1	Alan Cooper
NC.02	1068/1	Alan Quick
NC.02	600/1	Alastair Pratt
NC.02	718/1	Alison Harding
NC.02	573/1	Amanda James
NC.02	800/1	Amy Johnson
NC.02	890/1	Andrew Finney
NC.02	692/1	Andy Little
NC.02	698/1	Angela Sturgess
NC.02	618/1	Angela Wright
NC.02	738/1	Ann Mary Williams
NC.02	399/1	Anna Coruess
NC.02	124/1	Anne Cockhead
NC.02	68/1	Anne Waring
NC.02	1040/1	Anthony De Fano
NC.02	644/1	Anthony Rex
NC.02	418/1	B Beaney
NC.02	699/1	B Cobb
NC.02	1027/1	B Dean
NC.02	403/1	B Hedgeland
NC.02	734/1	B Lincoln
NC.02	1067/1	B M Jafkins
NC.02	1054/1	B M Johnson
NC.02	809/1	B Moore
NC.02	613/1	B Ward
NC.02	1042/1	B Ward
NC.02	1055/1	B White
NC.02	507/1	B. G Chapman
NC.02	86/1	B. P. Jones
NC.02	405/1	B.J Taylor

NC.02	583/1	Baku Thaker
NC.02	817/1	Barbara Dunn-smyrl
NC.02	705/1	Barbara Walker
NC.02	826/1	Barber
NC.02	449/1	Ben Trafford
NC.02	516/1	Beverly Harrison
NC.02	227/16	Bewley HomesPlc And R C H Morgan-Giles
NC.02	227/15	Bewley HomesPlc And R C H Morgan-Giles
NC.02	608/1	Brenda Warner
NC.02	621/1	Brian Luter
NC.02	707/1	Brian Pile
NC.02	612/1	Brian Ward
NC.02	421/1	Bryan King
NC.02	219/3	Bryant Homes Ltd
NC.02	219/2	Bryant Homes Ltd
NC.02	788/1	C A Bishop
NC.02	757/1	C Bettam
NC.02	584/1	C Bex
NC.02	569/1	C Boyall
NC.02	736/1	C Burke
NC.02	566/1	C Causer
NC.02	545/1	C Hilton
NC.02	388/1	C Jamieson
NC.02	561/1	C K A Syms
NC.02	391/1	C Lidgey
NC.02	985/1	C M Ehueson
NC.02	619/1	C M Woods
NC.02	876/1	C Manson
NC.02	756/1	C Merrivale
NC.02	546/1	C Myles
NC.02	45/1	C Prince
NC.02	563/1	C R Coombs
NC.02	898/1	C White
NC.02	377/1	C White
NC.02	29/1	C. J. Gillies
NC.02	147/1	C. J. Wearn
NC.02	1448/5	C. Morgan And Sons
NC.02	859/1	Carl Rigby
NC.02	935/1	Carly Fry
NC.02	146/1	Carole Roberts
NC.02	808/1	Cath Turner
NC.02	838/1	Cecilia Hancock
NC.02	659/1	Charles Pool
NC.02	444/1	Charlotte Cleife
NC.02	844/1	Cheryl Young
NC.02	589/1	Christine Jessep
NC.02	716/1	Christine Luff
NC.02	905/1	Claire Watts
NC.02	672/1	Colin Hues
NC.02	680/1	Colin Rabone
NC.02	1387/5	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group
NC.02	398/1	D .H Kudderg
NC.02	726/1	D Barber
NC.02	944/1	D Becque
NC.02	382/1	D Bernie
NC.02	823/1	D Brightman
NC.02	822/1	D Brightman
NC.02	697/1	D Cobb
NC.02	1102/1	D Cole
NC.02	614/1	D Houlihan
NC.02	593/1	D James
NC.02	939/1	D Keable
NC.02	755/1	D L Morgan
NC.02	598/1	D Lowthion
NC.02	933/1	D Mansfield
NC.02	991/1	D Mesgrove
NC.02	955/1	D Nuthall
NC.02	18/1	D Prince
NC.02	34/1	D Rudling
NC.02	832/1	D Sandford
NC.02	802/1	D Wilson
NC.02	514/1	D. Cheife
NC.02	26/1	D. M. Gillies
NC.02	434/1	D.G Bailey
NC.02	440/1	D.J Robbins

NC.02	587/1	Danuca Kochanowska
NC.02	857/1	Darren Downing
NC.02	875/1	David Ellis
NC.02	638/1	David John Cook
NC.02	152/1	David Jones
NC.02	662/1	David Riddell
NC.02	41/1	David Streten
NC.02	765/1	David Thresher
NC.02	750/1	David White
NC.02	969/1	Debbie Heron
NC.02	664/1	Deborah Nicholas
NC.02	151/1	Debra Jones
NC.02	942/1	Denise Reid
NC.02	36/1	Denise Streten
NC.02	552/1	Denise Willamson
NC.02	661/1	Dereck Riddell
NC.02	827/1	Devlin
NC.02	1056/1	Donna Edwards
NC.02	1059/1	Doreen Netting
NC.02	114/1	Dorethy G. Williams
NC.02	597/1	Duncan Child
NC.02	1022/1	Dwayne Oneale
NC.02	777/1	E C E Goodenough
NC.02	1091/1	E Goodman
NC.02	900/1	E Green
NC.02	770/1	E Heath
NC.02	1026/1	E I Smith
NC.02	550/1	E J Bailey
NC.02	852/1	E M Newson
NC.02	825/1	E Oliver
NC.02	727/1	E P Lunt
NC.02	125/1	E Priddy
NC.02	596/1	E Shorthouse
NC.02	122/1	E Truscott
NC.02	683/1	E Tushingam
NC.02	790/1	E W Usher
NC.02	1231/1	E Wilmer
NC.02	1437/3	East Hampshire District Council
NC.02	673/1	Edith Gunston
NC.02	46/1	Edward J. Cook
NC.02	818/1	Eileen Southby
NC.02	758/1	Elaine Bettam
NC.02	445/1	Emily Cleife
NC.02	576/1	Emma Campbell
NC.02	417/1	F Binstead
NC.02	1110/1	F Brewster
NC.02	787/1	F E Corrigan
NC.02	872/1	F Sparkes
NC.02	570/1	F Treagust
NC.02	688/1	Fay Harvey
NC.02	945/1	Fewings
NC.02	1097/1	Fisher
NC.02	610/1	Frank Smith
NC.02	554/1	Frankie Wilkinson
NC.02	840/1	G Bensted
NC.02	979/1	G Brent
NC.02	643/1	G Burton
NC.02	916/1	G Findon
NC.02	1104/1	G Hawkins
NC.02	1103/1	G Hawkins
NC.02	829/1	G Johnson
NC.02	741/1	G Knight
NC.02	774/1	G M Kill
NC.02	120/1	G Shilling
NC.02	629/1	G Thomas
NC.02	32/1	G Withers
NC.02	557/1	G Woodacre
NC.02	617/1	G Wright
NC.02	30/1	G. Gray
NC.02	123/1	G. M. Clarke
NC.02	22/1	G. Saunders
NC.02	163/1	Gary Heather
NC.02	149/1	Gary Wearn
NC.02	710/1	Geoffrey A Collett
NC.02	555/1	Georgie Wilkinson

NC.02	261/73	Government Office For The South East
NC.02	605/1	Graeme Bawfield
NC.02	657/1	Graham Cooper
NC.02	719/1	Graham Roy Williams
NC.02	214/15	Grainger Trust Plc
NC.02	214/13	Grainger Trust Plc
NC.02	901/1	Green
NC.02	82/1	Gwen Blackett
NC.02	678/1	Gwen Hunt
NC.02	693/1	H C Tomlinson
NC.02	416/1	H Read
NC.02	1434/38	Hampshire County Council
NC.02	641/1	Harvey And Susan Johnson
NC.02	761/1	Hayter
NC.02	625/1	Hazel M Banes Walker
NC.02	656/1	Heather Yeomans
NC.02	1087/1	Helen Dean
NC.02	38/1	Helen Strange
NC.02	150/1	Helen Wearn
NC.02	760/1	I Hayter
NC.02	748/1	I M Giles
NC.02	525/1	I.M. Eddy
NC.02	695/1	Ian Ryall
NC.02	666/1	Ian Shaw
NC.02	115/1	Ivor Vincent Williams
NC.02	811/1	J A Jilley
NC.02	622/1	J A Partridge
NC.02	145/1	J Allen
NC.02	977/1	J Ball
NC.02	686/1	J Butcher
NC.02	624/1	J C Legg
NC.02	843/1	J Carter
NC.02	819/1	J D Gregory
NC.02	715/1	J Doe
NC.02	407/1	J Elmes
NC.02	795/1	J Essery
NC.02	559/1	J F Barker
NC.02	582/1	J Fox
NC.02	733/1	J G Griffiths
NC.02	27/1	J Grieve
NC.02	874/1	J M Ellis
NC.02	751/1	J M Syms
NC.02	387/1	J McDonnell
NC.02	627/1	J Mills
NC.02	966/1	J Paisley
NC.02	623/1	J Partridge
NC.02	675/1	J Pashley
NC.02	897/1	J Pearce
NC.02	630/1	J Quinn
NC.02	648/1	J Reene
NC.02	681/1	J Rodaway
NC.02	592/1	J T AND V J Standley
NC.02	1100/1	J T Moran
NC.02	753/1	J W Wood
NC.02	899/1	J White
NC.02	544/1	J White
NC.02	976/1	J Woolley
NC.02	24/1	J. A. Cleife
NC.02	517/1	J. Tagg
NC.02	423/1	J.P Tolliday
NC.02	709/1	Jackie Collett
NC.02	1021/1	Jacqueline Wixon
NC.02	35/1	James Collins
NC.02	745/1	Janet Thornhill
NC.02	940/1	Janice Doyle
NC.02	384/1	Jason Dugan
NC.02	791/1	Jason Symmonds
NC.02	797/1	Jay Parks
NC.02	611/1	Jeanette Pache
NC.02	749/1	Jenny Syms
NC.02	677/1	Jenny Withers
NC.02	708/1	Jill Daniels
NC.02	616/1	Jill Luter
NC.02	164/1	Jo Watts
NC.02	159/1	Joanna Osachuck



NC.02	951/1	Joanne Hyett
NC.02	1008/1	John Anthony Carney
NC.02	711/1	John Axworthy
NC.02	685/1	John Harvey
NC.02	408/1	John James
NC.02	936/1	John Lorrigan
NC.02	667/1	John Ryder
NC.02	1020/1	John Whittle
NC.02	639/1	Judith Cook
NC.02	601/1	Judith Meagher
NC.02	953/1	Julia Mourné
NC.02	609/1	June Smith
NC.02	155/1	June Tuffs
NC.02	396/1	Justin Fletcher
NC.02	1063/1	K A Jennings
NC.02	435/1	K Arman
NC.02	717/1	K Armstrong
NC.02	978/1	K Brent
NC.02	794/1	K Corrigan
NC.02	1069/1	K Davis
NC.02	835/1	K Gerrish
NC.02	799/1	K Johnson
NC.02	793/1	K Kirby
NC.02	564/1	K L Coombs
NC.02	647/1	K Palmer
NC.02	764/1	K Rigby
NC.02	628/1	K Thomas
NC.02	383/1	K Tupper
NC.02	551/1	K Waterfiled
NC.02	7/1	K Webster
NC.02	390/1	K White
NC.02	62/1	K. A. Ody
NC.02	690/1	Karen Darroch
NC.02	1093/1	Karen Whistler
NC.02	599/1	Katherine Bedford
NC.02	891/1	Kathleen Finney
NC.02	574/1	Kathleen Thompson
NC.02	789/1	Kathlyn Usher
NC.02	427/1	Kerry Collins
NC.02	820/1	Kerry Martin
NC.02	409/1	King
NC.02	289/14	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
NC.02	934/1	L Bishop
NC.02	778/1	L Cleverly
NC.02	747/1	L Farmer
NC.02	420/1	L Hogben
NC.02	746/1	L Potter
NC.02	1070/1	L Rogers
NC.02	903/1	L W R Moore
NC.02	414/1	L Willett
NC.02	389/1	L. A Southam
NC.02	783/1	Laura Baggott
NC.02	394/1	Lee Clements
NC.02	806/1	Lee Tommans-porter
NC.02	714/1	Lin Palmer
NC.02	701/1	Lindsey Fielon
NC.02	1004/1	Lisa Cadman
NC.02	997/1	Lisa Corrigan
NC.02	941/1	Lisa Doyle
NC.02	996/1	Lisa South
NC.02	895/1	Liz Hyde
NC.02	803/1	Lorraine Rutterford
NC.02	679/1	Louise Clapton
NC.02	950/1	Lynda Hyett
NC.02	1061/1	Lynda Netting
NC.02	798/1	Lynne Johnson
NC.02	663/1	M A Riddell
NC.02	1066/1	M Bettles-hall
NC.02	780/1	M Chambers
NC.02	932/1	M Coit
NC.02	831/1	M Collins
NC.02	395/1	M Douglas
NC.02	671/1	M E Hues
NC.02	815/1	M Griggs
NC.02	957/1	M Haines

NC.02	669/1	M Harvey
NC.02	615/1	M Houlihan
NC.02	743/1	M J Burrell
NC.02	694/1	M Langrish
NC.02	1077/1	M Norris
NC.02	824/1	M Oliver
NC.02	606/1	M P Toms
NC.02	1105/1	M R Hardy
NC.02	902/1	M S Moore
NC.02	773/1	M Smith
NC.02	873/1	M Sparkes
NC.02	385/1	M Taylor
NC.02	549/1	M W Bailey
NC.02	642/1	M Warburton
NC.02	739/1	M Waterfield
NC.02	728/1	M Wingfield
NC.02	40/1	M. Hart
NC.02	8/1	M. J. Hill
NC.02	143/1	M. J. Neil
NC.02	28/1	M. P. Grieve
NC.02	23/1	M. Saunders
NC.02	769/1	Mabel Redman
NC.02	1037/1	Maelor Jones
NC.02	640/1	Malcolm Howard
NC.02	162/1	Margaret Heather
NC.02	670/1	Margaret Hillerd
NC.02	982/1	Maria - Belen Triuelloni
NC.02	603/1	Martin Carter
NC.02	948/1	Martin Hyett
NC.02	577/1	Martin Long
NC.02	510/2	Martin Moyse
NC.02	847/1	Mary Neville
NC.02	1107/1	Mary Williams
NC.02	432/1	Matthew Strudwick
NC.02	1035/1	Maureen Jones
NC.02	607/1	Maurice I Warner
NC.02	846/1	Melanie Gasllin
NC.02	568/1	Michael Mills
NC.02	658/1	Mike Yeomans
NC.02	786/1	N Bishop
NC.02	632/1	N Channon
NC.02	604/1	N Elias
NC.02	968/1	N H Evans
NC.02	649/1	N H Mullen
NC.02	735/1	N Lincoln
NC.02	1101/1	N P Moran
NC.02	586/1	N Thomas
NC.02	56/1	N. C. Crooks
NC.02	702/1	Natalie Abraham
NC.02	634/1	Natalie Beasley
NC.02	722/1	Neil Offer
NC.02	450/1	Newnham
NC.02	867/1	Nick Forrester
NC.02	47/1	Nick Murphy
NC.02	602/1	Nicola Potts
NC.02	1441/1	No Name
NC.02	980/1	P Bettles-hall
NC.02	779/1	P Cleverly
NC.02	1038/1	P D Quinn
NC.02	810/1	P Griggs
NC.02	362/1	P Hill
NC.02	771/1	P J Abbott
NC.02	1096/1	P James
NC.02	44/1	P Jefferies
NC.02	792/1	P M Brown
NC.02	410/1	P Warrew
NC.02	556/1	P Woodacre
NC.02	513/1	P. A. Thomas
NC.02	520/1	P. Bigg
NC.02	144/1	P. T Neil
NC.02	527/1	P. Whale
NC.02	626/1	Pat Banes - Walker
NC.02	521/1	Pat Barber
NC.02	894/1	Paul Bennett
NC.02	689/1	Paul Carpenter

NC.02	426/1	Paul Cleife
NC.02	588/1	Paul Longman
NC.02	1058/1	Paul Netting
NC.02	655/1	Paul Roux
NC.02	651/1	Paul Ryder
NC.02	994/1	Paul Simmonds
NC.02	807/1	Paula Corrigan
NC.02	988/1	Peter Bernard Cole
NC.02	952/1	Peter Mourne
NC.02	393/1	Philip Buttle
NC.02	725/1	Phillipa Gordon
NC.02	821/1	Q J Moore
NC.02	828/1	R Ashcroft
NC.02	1023/1	R Card
NC.02	842/1	R I Cameron
NC.02	931/1	R J Elkingtow
NC.02	999/1	R J North
NC.02	585/1	R James
NC.02	742/1	R Knight
NC.02	862/1	R Noyce
NC.02	954/1	R Nuthall
NC.02	650/1	R S Pettet
NC.02	864/1	R Stanley
NC.02	776/1	R Weston
NC.02	91/1	R. A. Smith
NC.02	42/1	R. Magee
NC.02	422/1	R.B Shaw
NC.02	424/1	R.G Tolliday
NC.02	441/1	R.P King
NC.02	406/1	R.W Taylor
NC.02	724/1	Rachael Creamer
NC.02	572/1	Rebecca Havill
NC.02	801/1	Rebecca Johnson
NC.02	474/15	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
NC.02	653/1	Richard Martin
NC.02	635/1	Ricky Beasley
NC.02	1094/1	Rita Cross
NC.02	161/1	Robert D. Osachuk
NC.02	1099/1	Robert Hawley
NC.02	706/1	Robert Main
NC.02	160/1	Robert Osachuk
NC.02	117/1	Robin McIntosh
NC.02	1092/1	Ronald Wesley
NC.02	19/1	Ronnie Armstrong
NC.02	737/1	Rosalie May Cuthbert
NC.02	904/1	Roselie Wareham
NC.02	1025/1	Rosemary Chapman
NC.02	740/1	Rosemary Jones
NC.02	33/1	Ross Withers
NC.02	1081/1	Roy Grayson
NC.02	768/1	Ruth Ives
NC.02	558/1	S A Barker
NC.02	1106/1	S A Hardy
NC.02	1043/1	S A Wood
NC.02	841/1	S Bensted
NC.02	763/1	S Blackwell
NC.02	20/1	S Bowles
NC.02	732/1	S C Griffiths
NC.02	57/1	S Crooks
NC.02	983/1	S Davis
NC.02	153/1	S Dickson
NC.02	1024/1	S E Duckett
NC.02	814/1	S Edwards
NC.02	703/1	S Enefer
NC.02	676/1	S F Hunt
NC.02	590/1	S J Cowling
NC.02	1000/1	S M Smith
NC.02	861/1	S Merrivale
NC.02	48/1	S Morry
NC.02	425/1	S Taylor
NC.02	571/1	S Treagust
NC.02	848/1	S W B Neville
NC.02	591/1	S W Johnson
NC.02	1039/1	S Walsh
NC.02	375/1	S Woods

NC.02	119/1	S. Burns
NC.02	511/1	S. Kemp
NC.02	139/1	S. N. Allen
NC.02	419/1	S.M Connolly
NC.02	43/1	Sam Hitch
NC.02	1090/1	Sandra Carter
NC.02	654/1	Sandra Mahoney
NC.02	652/1	Sarah Cooper
NC.02	1005/1	Sarah Cotton
NC.02	893/1	Sarah Lewis
NC.02	631/1	Sarah Long
NC.02	854/1	Sarah Vere
NC.02	1065/1	Scott Child
NC.02	856/1	Sharon Downing
NC.02	116/1	Sheila McIntosh
NC.02	704/1	Shelley Pattenden
NC.02	379/1	Simon Deakin
NC.02	412/1	Simon Hunt
NC.02	376/1	Stephen Kaye
NC.02	575/1	Stephen Moss
NC.02	165/2	Steven P. Watts
NC.02	165/1	Steven P. Watts
NC.02	853/1	Steven Vere
NC.02	67/1	Stuart Waring
NC.02	986/1	Sue Bashford
NC.02	684/1	Susan Harvey
NC.02	567/1	Susan Mills
NC.02	865/1	Suzanne Stanley
NC.02	660/1	Sylvia Pool
NC.02	562/1	T J Gore
NC.02	565/1	T M Bradbeer
NC.02	946/1	T R A Richards
NC.02	871/1	T Sawyer
NC.02	578/1	T W H Jefferson
NC.02	700/1	T Warwicker
NC.02	519/1	T. F. Whale
NC.02	962/1	Tamara Bargery
NC.02	1060/1	Terence F R Netting
NC.02	1098/1	Teresa Fullarton
NC.02	221/4	The Executors Of E. S. Edwards (deceased)
NC.02	330/9	The Wildlife Trusts
NC.02	553/1	Tim Wilkinson
NC.02	620/1	Tommy Woods
NC.02	766/1	Toni Thresher
NC.02	775/1	Tony Walters
NC.02	834/1	Tracy Scutts
NC.02	744/1	Trevor Thornhill
NC.02	1041/1	V A Pheasant
NC.02	1034/1	V C Legg
NC.02	645/1	V C Petherick
NC.02	998/1	V J North
NC.02	1064/1	V Kendrick
NC.02	1088/1	V Kirby
NC.02	754/1	V Wood
NC.02	37/1	V. Foley
NC.02	25/1	V. W. Cleife
NC.02	696/1	Vickey Allen
NC.02	39/1	Vicky Strange
NC.02	436/1	Victor Byatt
NC.02	964/1	Victor Hounsom
NC.02	668/1	Victor Junasko
NC.02	917/1	Victoria Findon
NC.02	691/1	W Bain
NC.02	816/1	W Bell
NC.02	870/1	W E Sawyer
NC.02	943/1	W J Bennett
NC.02	981/1	Wayne Mitchins
NC.02	148/1	Wearn
NC.02	665/1	Wendy Leng
NC.02	729/1	William Staff
NC.02	334/2	WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc
NC.02	595/1	Woowen
NC.02	158/1	Yvonne Osachuk

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
RD1203	2274/1&2	J R G Cobbett
RD1213	1079/1	A Norris
RD1213	2262/1	D W Lock
RD1213	2090/1	Donald Wright
RD1213	1437/2	East Hampshire District Council
RD1213	1437/1	East Hampshire District Council
RD1213	2081/1	F Harrison
RD1213	2117/4	Havant Borough Council
RD1213	2117/3	Havant Borough Council
RD1213	214/3	Grainger Trust Plc
RD1213	2107/3	Grainger Trust PLC
RD1213	82/1	Gwen Blackett
RD1213	1434/8	Hampshire County Council
RD1213	2082/1	J Harrison
RD1213	289/1	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
RD1213	2106/1	Kris Mitra Associattes
RD1213	1077/1	M Norris
RD1213	362/1	P Hill
RD1213	2311/1	The Rowans

## APPENDIX 2

### OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSAL NC.3: WINCHESTER CITY (NORTH) RESERVE MDA

#### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
12.084	176/2	Chris Slattery
12.084	967/9	D. W Briggs
12.084	1222/2	J Guerrier
12.084	1184/3	M. J Maidens
12.084	175/10	Save Barton Farm Group
12.086	1062/4	J Ingleson
12.087	1303/3	Alexander Garfath
12.087	1302/1	Barbara Garfath
12.087	1301/2	Henry Garfath
12.087	1062/5	J Ingleson
12.089	1062/3	J Ingleson
NC.03	1396/1	A Balfour
NC.03	1166/1	A Jones
NC.03	137/1	A. E. R. Dodds
NC.03	342/2	A. J. Waldegrave
NC.03	1239/1	A. M Stilwell
NC.03	75/1	A. R. Hunter-Craig
NC.03	1271/1	A. S Dunn
NC.03	1155/1	Alan Sydney
NC.03	1115/1	Alex Trimmer
NC.03	1303/4	Alexander Garfath
NC.03	1388/2	Amanda Sutton
NC.03	1442/1	Andrew Tibbits
NC.03	1262/1	Angela Stewart
NC.03	174/1	Ann Gossling
NC.03	174/3	Ann Gossling
NC.03	1221/1	B Jones
NC.03	1416/3	B R And E A Bull
NC.03	64/1	B. D. Porter
NC.03	70/1	B. M. Eames
NC.03	131/1	B. Smedley
NC.03	1302/2	Barbara Garfath
NC.03	227/17	Bewley HomesPlc And R C H Morgan-Giles
NC.03	213/4	Bovis Homes LTD
NC.03	1151/1	Brian Parnell
NC.03	1167/1	C Balfour
NC.03	1224/1	C Bradshaw
NC.03	1224/2	C Bradshaw
NC.03	1395/1	C Burrell
NC.03	1405/3	C Butterworth
NC.03	1164/2	C Robert Bradshaw
NC.03	1448/6	C. Morgan And Sons
NC.03	348/2	C. Sealey
NC.03	1412/3	C. W Eames
NC.03	468/73	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
NC.03	468/80	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
NC.03	1281/1	Caroline Dennis
NC.03	12/1	Carolyn Beasley
NC.03	1296/1	Chris Hutchings
NC.03	176/1	Chris Slattery
NC.03	95/1	Christine Job
NC.03	1258/1	Clare Allen
NC.03	15/1	Conway
NC.03	1030/2	Crawford McKinlay
NC.03	229/2	Crown Cattle UK Ltd
NC.03	1232/1	D J Barfield
NC.03	1161/1	D J Hilder
NC.03	4/1	D Lebbem
NC.03	1287/1	D Loftees
NC.03	1389/1	D. J Tellod Beasley
NC.03	135/1	D. W. R. Clarke
NC.03	1255/1	David Fox
NC.03	1120/1	David Harris

NC.03	1141/1	David R Taylor
NC.03	1305/1	David Thomas
NC.03	1263/1	David Trussler
NC.03	1279/1	David Williams
NC.03	1256/1	Diana Kirkby
NC.03	94/1	E Lear
NC.03	1241/1	E R B Little
NC.03	1266/1	E. A Neale
NC.03	1187/2	E. W Lee
NC.03	352/3	Eagle Star Estates Ltd
NC.03	1275/1	Elizabeth Ash
NC.03	1273/1	Embrey
NC.03	1419/3	English
NC.03	1218/1	Eve Christie
NC.03	1143/1	Ewan Craig
NC.03	1304/1	F Fallon
NC.03	1154/1	F Woodwark
NC.03	136/1	Fiona Clarke
NC.03	89/1	Fyfe
NC.03	205/3	G Humphrey
NC.03	109/1	G. C. W. Mason
NC.03	1391/1	G. E And R. M Rose
NC.03	995/2	G. R. E Pope
NC.03	1260/1	G. W Bruty
NC.03	100/1	Gary Swan
NC.03	1414/3	Geoff And Liz Cox
NC.03	1415/3	Geoffrey Wickes
NC.03	1237/1	Gillian M Bauer
NC.03	268/2	Gordon Honey
NC.03	261/100	Government Office For The South East
NC.03	261/77	Government Office For The South East
NC.03	1284/1	Graham
NC.03	1139/1	Grant Johnston
NC.03	77/1	Helen Bonnor
NC.03	1257/1	Helen Jex
NC.03	1301/1	Henry Garfath
NC.03	1278/1	Holden
NC.03	1307/1	I Loverseed
NC.03	93/1	Iain Dulle
NC.03	98/1	Ian Hemingway
NC.03	349/9	Ian White
NC.03	1293/1	Isabella Block
NC.03	1411/3	J Barnett
NC.03	1246/3	J Burrows
NC.03	914/2	J Day
NC.03	1222/1	J Guerrier
NC.03	1062/1	J Ingleson
NC.03	1062/2	J Ingleson
NC.03	1267/1	J Nattey
NC.03	1401/3	J P English
NC.03	1268/1	J. A Foreman
NC.03	1406/3	J. A Foreman
NC.03	102/1	J. C. C. Schute
NC.03	340/2	J. McKinley
NC.03	1290/1	J. N. H Tyacke
NC.03	1297/1	Jackson
NC.03	1219/1	James C. McGrand
NC.03	1413/3	James Cullen
NC.03	1451/1	Jan Chandler
NC.03	1294/1	Jane Balfour
NC.03	1227/1	Janet E Wilson
NC.03	1168/2	Jean Bradshaw
NC.03	113/1	Jennifer Baxter
NC.03	107/1	Jennifer Edwards
NC.03	1114/1	Jeremy Bruty
NC.03	1421/3	Joan Foreman
NC.03	1247/3	John Burrows
NC.03	1298/1	John Higgins
NC.03	1283/1	John Taylor
NC.03	989/2	John. E Gumbel
NC.03	1404/3	Josianne Wong
NC.03	1272/1	Judd
NC.03	1242/1	Julia Wainwright
NC.03	1308/1	K Honeybul
NC.03	204/3	K Larkin

NC.03	975/2	K Learney
NC.03	877/15	Kier Land
NC.03	288/8	Kings Worthy Parish Council
NC.03	1285/1	L. A Groves
NC.03	1269/1	L. E Hart
NC.03	1292/1	Lee
NC.03	1142/1	Louise Jones
NC.03	1300/4	Lydia Garfath
NC.03	1129/1	M A Waldegrave
NC.03	1159/1	M Alder
NC.03	1276/1	M Bendix
NC.03	1119/1	M Broad
NC.03	1369/2	M E Moore
NC.03	1288/1	M. C Keen
NC.03	76/1	M. C. Staton
NC.03	1157/2	M. F Walton
NC.03	60/1	M. Golden
NC.03	1184/2	M. J Maidens
NC.03	104/1	M. J. E. Adams
NC.03	1235/1	Maggie Knuston
NC.03	133/1	Margaret Kingdon
NC.03	1403/3	Margaret Raw
NC.03	1233/1	Mark Mathias
NC.03	1252/6	Mark Miller
NC.03	110/1	Mary Ackworth
NC.03	1265/1	Mary Cross
NC.03	1402/3	Mary E Butterworth
NC.03	134/1	Michael Pomeroy
NC.03	1280/1	Michael Wigley
NC.03	71/1	Mr And Mrs Campbell
NC.03	223/5	Mrs P Edwards City Of Winchester Trust
NC.03	1226/1	Myra Hart
NC.03	1409/3	N A McPherson
NC.03	1282/1	N Dennis
NC.03	1306/1	N P Stilwell
NC.03	106/1	N. D. Cox
NC.03	322/7	North Whiteley Consortium
NC.03	1243/1	P A Anker
NC.03	1144/1	P A James
NC.03	1410/3	P G Stubbs
NC.03	1418/3	P S And S J Early
NC.03	1240/1	P. A Rose
NC.03	97/1	P. B. Sparke
NC.03	1236/1	P. D Baker
NC.03	1236/2	P. D Baker
NC.03	1236/3	P. D Baker
NC.03	130/1	P. M. Montgomery
NC.03	78/1	P. V. Adams
NC.03	1286/1	P.M Robinson
NC.03	1393/1	Pamela Downes
NC.03	907/3	Paul Roderick
NC.03	337/2	Paula Sydney
NC.03	1270/1	Peacock
NC.03	1112/1	Peter And Margaret Mc Manus
NC.03	99/1	Peter Wilkes
NC.03	1447/1	Ptol Slattery
NC.03	359/3	R Hammond
NC.03	1113/1	R I L Howland
NC.03	1122/1	R J Smith
NC.03	96/1	R Mason
NC.03	1217/2	R Pope
NC.03	1217/1	R Pope
NC.03	1261/1	R. S Cross
NC.03	72/1	R. V. Adamson
NC.03	1238/1	R. W Stilwell
NC.03	1254/7	Ramblers Association - Winchester Group
NC.03	474/16	Redrow Homes (Southern) Ltd
NC.03	112/1	Richard E. Watts
NC.03	1123/1	Robert Fox
NC.03	132/1	Roger A. Holtby
NC.03	108/1	Rose
NC.03	1234/1	Roy And Christine Faithful
NC.03	1420/3	S J Keigher
NC.03	1156/1	S Pearcey
NC.03	1228/1	S Reeves



NC.03	1111/2	Sarah Burrows
NC.03	175/1	Save Barton Farm Group
NC.03	175/7	Save Barton Farm Group
NC.03	1274/1	Sheila And Keith Honess
NC.03	103/1	Simon. N Robinson
NC.03	1295/1	Steve Aiken
NC.03	105/1	Stuart D. Hull
NC.03	1229/1	Susan Butterfield
NC.03	1150/1	T S Brown
NC.03	1223/1	T. H Guerrier
NC.03	947/3	Tessa Robertson
NC.03	306/10	The Ministry Of Defence
NC.03	330/10	The Wildlife Trusts
NC.03	1116/1	Tina Carling
NC.03	1121/1	Toni West
NC.03	324/1	Town Planning Consultancy Ltd
NC.03	1225/1	Tracey Mathias
NC.03	1417/3	V J And G M Denham
NC.03	1259/1	V. E Bruty
NC.03	1244/1	Vivien Long
NC.03	1138/1	W J M Huntley
NC.03	355/1	Welch
NC.03	469/13	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd
NC.03	74/1	Wilson
NC.03	331/1	Winchester City Residents Association
NC.03	333/14	Winchester Landscape Alliance
NC.03	334/3	WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
RD1250	373/12	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
RD1250	468/1	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1250	2263/3	J A Porter
RD1250	1401/4	J P English
RD1250	1184/1	M. J Maidens
RD1250	175/23	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	64/1	B. D. Porter
RD1251	2271/1	C A Berry
RD1251	468/2	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1251	1/4	City of Winchester Trust
RD1251	135/1	D. W. R. Clarke
RD1251	2280/3	Defence Estates
RD1251	2114/3	E Loverseed
RD1251	2114/1	E Loverseed
RD1251	2114/2	E Loverseed
RD1251	352/3	Eagle Star Estates Ltd
RD1251	250/3	English Heritage South East Region
RD1251	205/3	G Humphrey
RD1251	995/1	G. R. E Pope
RD1251	1434/9	Hampshire County Council
RD1251	2250/3	I G Embrey
RD1251	2250/1	I G Embrey
RD1251	2250/2	I G Embrey
RD1251	2270/1	Ian Berry
RD1251	2268/1	J A Denny
RD1251	1413/3	James Cullen
RD1251	1294/1	Jane Balfour
RD1251	2249/1	John Balfour
RD1251	204/3	K Larkin
RD1251	975/1	K Learney
RD1251	2273/3	Kier Land
RD1251	2273/4	Kier Land
RD1251	2269/1	M Squire
RD1251	1184/2	M. J Maidens
RD1251	2110/1	Maureen Lucas
RD1251	71/1	Mr And Mrs Campbell
RD1251	223/4	Mrs P Edwards City Of Winchester Trust
RD1251	2305/1	Peter McManus
RD1251	1122/1	R J Smith
RD1251	2302/1	Raymond V Marsh
RD1251	2287/2	Robert Roves
RD1251	2275/2	Roger Secker

RD1251	2313/1	Roger Sutcliffe
RD1251	2303/1	Sarah Marsh
RD1251	175/24	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/25	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/26	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/27	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/28	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/30	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/29	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	175/44	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1251	333/1	Winchester Landscape Alliance
RD1252	1184/3	M. J Maidens
RD1256	205/4	G Humphrey
RD1256	204/4	K Larkin
RD1256	1184/4	M. J Maidens
RD1260	468/15	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1260	205/5	G Humphrey
RD1260	204/5	K Larkin
RD1260	175/31	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1262	468/16	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1262	1413/4	James Cullen
RD1262	1184/5	M. J Maidens
RD1262	175/32	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1264	1115/1	Alex Trimmer
RD1264	468/17	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1264	2114/4	E Loveseed
RD1264	205/7	G Humphrey
RD1264	205/6	G Humphrey
RD1264	204/7	K Larkin
RD1264	204/6	K Larkin
RD1264	1184/6	M. J Maidens
RD1264	175/33	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1264	1259/1	V. E Bruty
RD1265	1115/2	Alex Trimmer
RD1265	2251/1	C Embrey
RD1265	468/18	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1265	2247/1	David Hurrell
RD1265	205/8	G Humphrey
RD1265	204/8	K Larkin
RD1265	71/2	Mr And Mrs Campbell
RD1265	2318/1	R K Pack
RD1265	2275/3	Roger Secker
RD1265	175/34	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1267	1115/3	Alex Trimmer
RD1267	468/19	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1267	205/9	G Humphrey
RD1267	204/9	K Larkin
RD1267	1184/7	M. J Maidens
RD1267	175/35	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1268	2293/3	A J Mason
RD1271	468/20	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1272	175/36	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1273	468/4	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1273	2247/2	David Hurrell
RD1273	2250/4	I G Embrey
RD1273	175/37	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1274	468/5	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1276	2251/2	C Embrey
RD1276	468/21	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1276	175/38	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1278	468/22	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1278	2277/2	WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC
RD1280	468/23	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1280	205/10	G Humphrey
RD1280	204/10	K Larkin
RD1282	2250/5	I G Embrey
RD1282	175/39	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1285	205/11	G Humphrey
RD1285	204/11	K Larkin
RD1285	175/40	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1287	468/24	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD1287	1307/1	I Loveseed
RD1287	1184/8	M. J Maidens
RD1287	175/41	Save Barton Farm Group
RD1289	1184/9	M. J Maidens

RD1289  
RD1293

175/42  
1434/10

Save Barton Farm Group  
Hampshire County Council

## APPENDIX 3

### PROPOSAL NC.3: WINCHESTER CITY (NORTH) RESERVE MDA: ISSUES

#### General Issues

1. Has the need for a reserve site at Winchester City north been fully justified? (60/1) ( 76/1) ( 100/1) (102/2) ( 105/1) ( 106/1) ( 107/1) ( 110/1) ( 111/1) ( 113/1) ( 132/1) ( 133/1) ( 223/5) ( 331/1) (333/14) ( 349/8) ( 967/4) ( 1119/1) ( 1120/1) ( 1129/1) ( 1138/1) ( 1142/1) ( 1154/1) ( 1164/2) (1168/1) ( 1224/2) ( 1225/1) ( 1227/1) ( 1232/1) ( 1233/1) ( 1240/1) ( 1259/1) ( 1261/1) ( 1265/1) (1267/1) ( 1270/1) ( 1271/1) ( 1272/1) ( 1276/1) ( 1281/1) ( 1307/1) ( 1308/1) ( 1393/1) (75/1REVDEP) (1413/4)
2. Is the scale of the development too great, and in excess of the needs of Winchester? Is the proposed development therefore out of scale with the sustainable needs of the city and incompatible with other planning objectives? (72/1) ( 74/1) ( 75/1) ( 89/1) ( 93/1) ( 95/1) (96/1) ( 99/1) ( 102/1) ( 105/1) ( 110/1) ( 166/1) ( 268/2) ( 337/2) ( 340/2) ( 342/2) ( 349/8) ( 1112/1) ( 1116/1) ( 1120/1) ( 1129/1) ( 1166/1) ( 1221/1) ( 1239/1) ( 1260/1) ( 1262/1) ( 1264/1) ( 1268/1) (1269/1) ( 1271/1) ( 1273/1) ( 1283/1) ( 1297/1) ( 1389/1) ( 71/1REVDEP) ( 1141/1) ( 1164/2) (1401/3-1421/3 inc) (1401/4REVDEP)
3. Is the principle of a locating a MDA at Winchester City north sound or should development of this scale be located elsewhere either within the sub region, or outside of the region where there is greater capacity to accommodate it? (58/1)( 59/1) ( 64/1) ( 98/1) ( 322/7) ( 342/2) ( 1150/1) (1255/1) ( 1258/1) ( 2247/2REVDEP) (349/9), (1246/3), (1284/1), (967/9).
4. Is the term “approximately 2,000 dwellings” in the policy sufficiently clear? (223/4REVDEP) (175/24REVDEP)
5. Was the principle of allocating the MDA at Winchester City north properly tested through the Structure Plan Review Examination in Public? (175/9) (97/1) (333/14) (337/2) (1112/1) (1123/1) (1155/1) (1164/2) (1184/3) (1401/3-1421/3 inc) (1184/1REVDEP)
6. Would development be contained within the proposed MDA or would there be pressure for further housing to be built in the future? (76/1) (93/1) (105/1) ( 131/1) (349/8) ( 1129/1) ( 1270/1) (1273/1) ( 1297/1) ( 1305/1) ( 1389/1) ( 1401/3-1421/3 inc)
7. Is what comprises a ‘compelling justification’ for the release of this land sufficiently clear or does this require further clarification? (210/24) ( 223/5) ( 333/14) ( 1129/1) ( 2263/3REVDEP) (175/24REVDEP)
8. Does the boundary of the MDA need to be drawn at this stage of the process, and background work undertaken, when the need for the reserve site might never be triggered? (1062/1) ( 2303/1)
9. Is there is adequate brownfield land to meet Winchesters housing allocation) ( without needing to allocate Barton Farm? (4/1) ( 71/1) ( 73/1) ( 76/1) ( 88/1) ( 90/1 WDN) ( 94/1) ( 95/1) ( 98/1) ( 99/1) (100/1) ( 102/2) ( 103/1) ( 105/1) ( 106/1) ( 110/1) ( 112/1) ( 133/1) ( 171/1) ( 173/1) ( 175/2) ( 176/1) (331/1) ( 975/2) ( 1138/1) ( 1143/1) ( 1154/1) ( 1159/1) ( 1161/1) ( 1184/2) ( 1219/1) ( 1221/1) (1222/1) ( 1224/2) ( 1225/1) ( 1226/1) ( 1227/1) ( 1233/1) ( 1234/1) ( 1238/1) ( 1240/1) ( 1241/1) (1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 1259/1) ( 1260/1) ( 1264/1) ( 1267/1) ( 1268/1) ( 1270/1) ( 1271/1) ( 1273/1) (1275/1) ( 1276/1) ( 1280/1) ( 1281/1) ( 1283/1) ( 1293/1) ( 1295/1) ( 1297/1) ( 1305/1) ( 1307/1) (308/1) ( 1391/1) ( 1396/1) ( 1443/1) ( 1447/1) ( 2302/1REVDEP) (4/1, 2114/3/REDEV, (1287/1 (1451/1)

10. Does the urban capacity study support the allocation of a green field site for the MDA; could the housing target be met on a number of smaller sites? (175/2) ( 176/2) ( 331/1) ( 333/14) 469/13, 2303/1/REVDEP
11. The site has previously been rejected for development, what has changed to justify putting aside the previous Inspector's conclusions? (175/9) ( 1122/1) ( 1123/1) (1122/1REVDEP)
12. Did the site selection process follow PPG3? (331/1) ( 1294/1REVDEP) ( 2249/1REVDEP)
13. Could surplus Ministry of Defence Land be used in preference to a green field site. Should the allocation have been delayed to await the outcome of any decisions on the future of these MOD sites? (137/1) ( 135/1) ( 136/1) ( 174/4) ( 1119/1) ( 1120/1) ( 1151/1) ( 1167/1) ( 1260/1) (135/1REVDEP) ( 2305/1REVDEP)
14. Was the area of search and range of sites considered too limited? Should Micheldever have been included within the area of search and would it have provided a better location for the MDA? (995/2) ( 1119/1) ( 1120/1) ( 1123/1) ( 1166/1) ( 1237/1) (2301/3/REVDEP, (352/3)
15. Should Bushfield Camp to the south of the city have been considered? (64/1) ( 173/1) ( 1187/2) (1218/1) ( 1219/1) ( 1224/1) ( 1234/1) ( 1260/1)
16. Were the evaluation criteria balanced and logical. Was the data used complete, accurate, and up to date? (98/1) (174/1) ( 175/1) ( 176/2) ( 331/1) ( 348/2) ( 989/2) ( 1120/1) ( 1122/1) ( 1123/1) (1129/1) ( 1151/1) ( 1255/1) ( 1300/3) ( 1301/2) ( 1302/1) ( 1303/3) ( 2110/1REVDEP) ( 2114/1REVDEP) (1184/6REVDEP) (175/35REVDEP) (1113/1), (373/12/REVDEP)
17. Were the various criteria appropriately weighted? (1300/3) ( 1301/2) ( 1302/1) ( 1303/3) (1184/1REVDEP) (355/1), (359/3)
18. Should the survey work have included English Nature, English Heritage and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and taken into account the Itchen Sustainability Study? (1184/1REVDEP) (175/41REVDEP) ( 175/23REVDEP)
19. To what extent will it be possible to mitigate against the environmental impacts of a MDA? (64/1REVDEP) ( 2250/1)
20. Would the MDA increase air, noise, and light pollution? (112/1) ( 1062/2) ( 1221/1) (1275/1)
21. To what extent would development impact on the ecology of the river Itchen and the SSSI/cSAC? Should there be reference to the potential need for an Appropriate Assessment? (95/1) (1184/8REVDEP) ( 1307/1REVDEP)
22. Would development impact on the ridge and ancient hedgerows, affecting the trees and wildlife (including mammals and birds)? (1062/2) ( 1142/1) ( 1144/1) ( 1221/1)
23. Has the impact on the area's considerable archaeological interest been properly considered? (135/1) ( 1144/1) (250/3/REVDEP)
24. Would the development of a MDA at Barton Farm be contrary to Government advice not to build on land likely to flood? (70/1) ( 71/1) ( 72/1) ( 73/1) ( 74/1) ( 76/1) ( 78/1) ( 93/1) ( 94/1) ( 96/1) (99/1) ( 100/1) ( 101/1) ( 104/1) ( 105/1) ( 107/1) ( 109/1) (110/1) ( 112/1) ( 130/1) ( 134/1) ( 137/1) ( 174/1) ( 230/1) ( 288/8) ( 340/2) ( 907/3) (914/2) ( 1062/2) ( 111/2) ( 1115/1) ( 1121/1) ( 1138/1) (1142/1) ( 1156/1) ( 1164/2) (1168/1) ( 1184/2) ( 1221/1) ( 1222/2) ( 1225/1) ( 1235/1) (1236/2) (1238/1) ( 1239/1) (1243/1) ( 1244/1) ( 1246/1) ( 1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 1257/1) ( 1262/1) ( 1267/1) (1270/1) ( 1271/1) ( 1273/1) ( 1275/1) ( 1276/1) ( 1277/1) ( 1278/1) ( 1279/1) ( 1281/1) (

- 1283/1) (1293/1) ( 1305/1) ( 1306/1) ( 1308/1) ( 1389/1) ( 1395/1) ( 1396/1) ( 1442/1)  
( 175/8REVDEP) (1115/3REVDEP) (1246/3), (1247/3), (1286/1), (175/28/REVDEP)
25. Would building on this land heighten the risk of flooding in surrounding areas? (135/1)  
( 136/1) (175/1) ( 75/2) ( 1161/1) ( 1164/2) ( 1293/1) ( 1184/7REVDEP)  
(1122/1REVDEP) (175/28/REVDEP), (1168/2)
26. Does the proposal ensure that no development would be permitted before a full  
assessment had been undertaken of the capacity of the local sewerage and drainage  
systems to cope with potential conditions? (174/3) ( 1156/1) ( 1277/1)
27. Would the unique character and setting of Winchester be lost through the  
development of a MDA with 2000 houses? Does the character of the historic city of  
Winchester merit special protection? (12/1) ( 74/1) ( 76/1) ( 77/1) ( 88/1) ( 90/1 WDN)  
( 95/1) ( 97/1) ( 98/1) ( 99/1) ( 100/1) ( 101/1) ( 102/1) (103/1) ( 104/1) ( 105/1) ( 107/1)  
( 112/1) ( 130/1) ( 131/1) ( 135/1) ( 137/1) ( 174/3) ( 175/1) (175/2) ( 175/9) ( 175/10)  
( 176/2) ( 331/1) ( 349/8) ( 907/3) ( 975/2) ( 1030/2) ( 1111/2) ( 1121/1)  
(1123/1) ( 1142/1) ( 1144/1) ( 1154/1) ( 1157/2) ( 1161/1) ( 1164/2) ( 1167/1) ( 1168/1)  
( 1184/2) (187/2) ( 1219/1) ( 1224/2) ( 1225/1) ( 1226/1) ( 1227/1) ( 1228/1) ( 1229/1)  
( 1230/1) ( 1235/1) (1238/1) ( 1242/1) ( 1244/1) ( 1246/1) ( 1252/6) ( 1258/1)  
( 1259/1) ( 1265/1) ( 1266/1) ( 1268/1) (1270/1) ( 1271/1) ( 1273/1) ( 1275/1) ( 1276/1)  
( 1282/1) ( 1283/1) ( 1293/1) ( 1295/1) ( 1298/1) (1305/1) ( 1308/1) ( 1388/2)  
( 1389/1) ( 1396/1) ( 1401/3-1421/3 inc) ( 1294/1REVDEP) (1401/4REVDEP) ( 2302/1REVDEP)  
(1246/3), (1247/3), (1288/1), (1184/2/REVDEP)
28. Would development at Barton Farm result in the loss of important views and damage  
skylines? (175/2) ( 175/10) ( 176/2) ( 1062/1) ( 1257/1) ( 2271/1REVDEP) ( 2275/2REVDEP)
29. Would the development destroy the green approach to the city? (12/1) ( 99/1) ( 175/9)  
( 176/2) (230/1) ( 1062/2) ( 1122/1) ( 1139/1) ( 1224/2) ( 1230/1) ( 1236/1) ( 1262/1) ( 1275/1)  
( 1281/1) (175/25REVDEP) ( 175/29REVDEP) (333/1REVDEP) ( 2250/2REVDEP) ( 64/1REVDEP)  
(1236/3), (1285/1), (1292/1)
30. Does the proposal take sufficient account of the 'Future of Winchester Study' or the  
Winchester and it's Setting Study? (175/9) ( 331/1) ( 349/8) ( 1401/3-1421/3 inc) ( 1184/1REVDEP)  
(1140/4REVDEP)
31. Will the loss of countryside around Winchester lead to urban sprawl, and the  
coalescence of settlements throughout southern Hampshire? (15/1) ( 74/1) ( 230/1) ( 1240/1)  
( 1242/1) ( 1252/6) (1259/1)
32. To what extent is the presence of countryside, and uninterrupted views across  
farmland, unique to the setting and character of the City, should countryside be  
preserved for its own sake? 15/1) (64/1) ( 94/1) ( 100/1) (101/1) (107/1) ( 136/1) ( 137/1)  
( 175/9) ( 176/2) ( 331/1) ( 1030/2) (1120/1) (1123/1) ( 1139/1) ( 1140/1 WDN)  
( 1141/1) ( 1143/1) ( 1144/1) ( 1159/1) ( 1184/2) ( 1187/2) (1221/1) ( 1222/2) ( 1238/1)  
(1254/7) ( 1257/1) ( 1267/1) ( 1296/1) ( 1297/1) ( 1306/1) ( 1447/1) (1448/6) ( 175/30REVDEP)  
( 175/40REVDEP) ( 2268/1) (1286/1), (175/7), (2303/1/REVDEP), (1292/1)
33. The development of the MDA would lead to a loss of high grade agricultural land. If  
the development is required should it be located on poorer grade farmland? (135/1) ( 136/1)  
( 174/3) (175/1) ( 175/2) ( 175/9) ( 1062/4) ( 1122/1) ( 1123/1) ( 1159/1) ( 1184/2)  
( 1187/2) ( 1224/1) (1243/1) ( 1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 1257/1) ( 1395/1) ( 1122/1REVDEP)  
( 2114/3REVDEP) ( 2250/3)
34. To what extent is it important to retain this piece of countryside close to the urban  
area as a recreational and educational facility? Would it mean having to drive to gain  
access to similar facilities? (72/1) ( 78/1) ( 104/1) ( 136/1) ( 175/1) ( 175/2) (

- 175/39REVDEP) ( 176/2) ( 330/9) (331/1) ( 337/2) ( 348/2) ( 1187/2) ( 1227/1) ( 1239/1) ( 1396/1) ( 2271/1REVDEP)
35. Would existing footpaths and rights of way be lost? (74/1) ( 175/2) ( 176/2) ( 1062/1) ( 1144/1) (1187/2) ( 1254/7)
36. Is the development of Barton Farm contrary to the requirement to protect strategic gaps, including the gap between Winchester and Headbourne Worthy and Littleton? (104/1) ( 134/1) ( 175/9 & 10) (337/2) ( 907/3) ( 1246/1) ( 1283/1) ( 995/1REVDEP) ( 175/42REVDEP)
37. Should the land at Barton Farm be designated a local gap? (175/10) ( 1257/1) ( 1184/9REVDEP)
38. Is the requirement to develop the MDA to 'a high quality of design' too vague and would the MDA damage the setting of Winchester regardless of how good the design was? (175/44REVDEP) (64/1REVDEP) ( 2270/1REVDEP) ( 2271/1) (250/1REVDEP)
39. Would the development of the MDA at densities of over 40 dwellings per hectare adversely affect the character of Winchester and create a poor quality of environment? (1276/1) (1294/1REVDEP) (2249/1REVDEP)
40. Given the scale of the development have the transport implications of an MDA been properly assessed. (12/1) ( 58/1) ( 59/1) ( 71/1) ( 76/1) ( 90/1 WDN) ( 99/1) ( 103/1) ( 175/9) ( 288/8) ( 348/2) (1156/1) ( 1157/2) ( 1277/1) ( 1280/1) ( 175/27REVDEP) ( 1413/3REVDEP) ( 2114/2REVDEP) (2313/1REVDEP) ( 2251/1REVDEP) ( 2247/1REVDEP)
41. Does the highways network have sufficient capacity, or will the MDA exacerbate congestion in the locality, and the city centre. (59/1) ( 64/1) ( 72/1) ( 74/1) ( 78/1) ( 89/1) ( 93/1) ( 94/1) ( 100/1) (101/1) ( 102/1) ( 104/1) ( 105/1) ( 106/1) ( 107/1) ( 110/1) ( 111/1) ( 112/1) ( 131/1) ( 133/1) ( 134/1) (136/1) ( 173/1) ( 175/9) ( 230/1) ( 288/8) ( 331/1) ( 337/2) ( 349/8) ( 914/2) ( 975/2) ( 995/2) (1062/1 & 2) ( 1112/1) ( 1114/1) ( 1120/1) ( 1122/1) ( 1123/1) ( 1139/1) ( 1140/1) ( 1142/1) ( 143/1) ( 1150/1) ( 1154/1) ( 1161/1) ( 1168/1) ( 1184/2) ( 1218/1) ( 1217/2) ( 1221/1) ( 1222/1) (1224/1) ( 1225/1) ( 1227/1) ( 1229/1) ( 1232/1) ( 1233/1) ( 1234/1) ( 1235/1) ( 1238/1) ( 1239/1) (1241/1) ( 1243/1) ( 1244/1) ( 1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 1258/1) ( 1259/1) ( 1260/1) ( 1262/1) ( 1263/1) (1267/1) ( 1268/1) ( 1270/1) ( 1271/1) (1273/1) ( 1275/1) ( 1276/1) ( 1279/1) ( 1281/1) ( 1295/1) (1299/1) ( 1300/1) ( 1301/1) ( 1302/3) ( 1303/1) ( 1305/1) ( 1306/1) ( 1308/1) ( 1389/1) ( 1394/1) (1395/1) ( 1396/1) ( 1401/3-1421/3 inc) ( 1447/1) ( 995/1REVDEP) ( 1122/1REVDEP) (64/1REVDEP) ( 2271/1REVDEP) ( 2305/1REVDEP) ( 71/2REVDEP) ( 2275/3REVDEP) (1300/4), (1286/1), (1223/1), (1168/2), (1290/1), (64/1/REVDEP), (2303/1/REVDEP), (1413/4/REVDEP), (175/34/REVDEP)
42. Will the MDA create severe congestion leading to more accidents. (175/9) ( 1224/1)
43. Will the proposals create traffic problems on local residential roads. (64/1) ( 288/8) ( 1112/1) (1156/1) ( 1218/1) ( 1224/1) ( 1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 1277/1) ( 1300/2) ( 1301/3) ( 1302/2) ( 1303/4) (1115/2REVDEP) ( 2318/1REVDEP) (1300/4), (64/1/REVDEP)
44. Will the MDA create problems on the junction with the A34, which cannot reasonably be mitigated. (1255/1) ( 1256/1) ( 2276/2REVDEP)
45. What parking standards should be adopted to encourage, walking, cycling and public transport. (1258/2) ( 1184/4REVDEP)
46. Will the location and scale of development discourage walking. (175/9) ( 1123/1) ( 1222/1) (1259/2, 1413/3/REVDEP)

47. Are the provisions for walking and cycling adequate. (1115/1REVDEP) (175/35REVDEP)
48. Are bus services in the area adequate to serve the development. (94/1) (1221/1)
49. Are the railway station, station car park and rail system already over capacity. (93/1) (111/1) (13/1) (348/2) (1062/1) (1112/1) (1120/1) (1139/1) (1142/1) (1221/1) (1222/1) (1233/1) (1234/1) (1261/1) (1262/1) (1300/1) (1301/4) (1302/4) (1303/2) (1413/4/REVDEP), (1223/1)
50. Would air quality be adversely affected by the increased pollution caused by congestion. (171/1) (175/2) (1143/1) (1225/1) (1240/1) (1293/1) (1300/1) (1301/3) (1401/4REVDEP) (975/1/REVDEP), (1413/4/REVDEP)
51. Would the lack of employment opportunities in the area lead to out-commuting and put pressure on the transport system. (113/1) (1168/1) (1229/1) (1232/1) (64/1REVDEP) (1413/4/REVDEP), (1184/5), (1168/2)
52. Should the provision of a Park and Ride facility form part of the proposals. (134/1) (1142/1) (1229/1) (1258/1 & 2) (2114/4REVDEP) (175/35REVDEP)
53. Will the MDA put additional pressure on existing car parks. (100/1) (175/9) (1222/1) (1258/2) (1263/1) (1271/1) (1277/1)
54. Has the impact on local facilities and services been properly assessed? (12/1) (64/1) (72/1) (74/1) (76/1) (77/1) (88/1) (89/1) (90/1 WDN) (93/1) (98/1) (99/1) (100/1) (101/1) (102/1) (103/1) (105/1) (108/1) (109/1) (110/1) (111/1) (112/1) (131/1) (132/1) (134/1) (175/9) (334/3) (914/2) (1112/1) (1122/1) (1123/1) (1140/1) (1141/1) (1143/1) (1150/1) (1168/1) (1184/2) (1217/1) (1219/1) (1221/1) (1227/1) (1233/1) (1234/1) (1235/1) (1236/1) (1238/1) (1239/1) (1240/1) (1244/1) (1258/1) (1259/1) (1265/1) (1267/1) (1268/1) (1270/1) (1271/1) (1273/1) (1274/1) (1275/1) (1276/1) (1278/1) (1279/1) (1283/1) (1294/1) (1295/1) (1299/1) (1304/1) (1305/1) (1308/1) (1389/1) (1395/1) (1396/1) (1122/1) (1294/1) (1434/9REVDEP) (2269/1REVDEP) (302/1REVDEP)
55. Will the citizens of Winchester have to make a financial contribution through the council tax to provide the necessary infrastructure? (72/1) (77/1) (110/1) (171/1) (1273/1) (1274/1) (1275/1) (1276/1) (1305/1) (1389/1)
56. Would the development place an excessive strain on local schools? (64/1) (71/1) (94/1) (107/1) (112/1) (175/36/37) (914/2) (175/36/37) (1262/1) (1281/1) (1396/1) (1184/1REVDEP) (2250/4/REVDEP), (175/37/REVDEP), (1168/2)
57. Would the development place an unacceptable strain on health, and care facilities? (64/1) (71/1) (133/1) (914/2) (975/2) (1217/1) (1396/1) (2251/2REVDEP) (175/38REVDEP) (2293/3/REVDEP), (1168/2)
58. Will the housing be affordable and meet local needs? Is a level of 35-40% affordable housing adequate or justified? (112/1) (137/1) (975/2) (1155/1) (1259/1) (1297/1) (175/31REVDEP) (2287/2REVDEP) (2305/1REVDEP) (1294/1REVDEP)
59. Would the MDA have an adverse economic impact on Winchester's tourist trade? (58/1) (75/1) (97/1) (130/1) (230/1) (349/8) (1184/2) (1234/1) (1252/6) (1276/1) (1299/1) (1401/3-1423/3 inc) (1413/4/REVDEP)
60. Does Winchester need more employment opportunities or will it put pressure on out commuting? (337/2) (1276/1) (175/26/32REVDEP) (1401/1REVDEP)



61. Was the Council's evaluation process that identified Barton Farm as the preferred site for the reserve Major Development Area at Winchester City (north) flawed?
62. Did the evaluation process follow guidance contained in PPG3?
63. Was it correct to identify Barton Farm as the location for a reserve MDA at Winchester City (north)? (353/3/REVDEP), (353/3)
64. Should reference be made to a Masterplan? (261/77), (1062/3)
65. Should the reference to the County Structure Plan in NC.3 be deleted as unnecessary as the Structure Plan already forms part of the development plan for the area? (261/10)
66. Should it be mentioned in the Plan that local residents will be worked with, as local residents also deserve a voice? (1062/5)
67. Should the strategic planning authority be clearly identified so that representations can be made to them to remove the designation? 1184/3

**Save Barton Farm Group (SBFG) (175/23/32REVDEP):**

1. Is there sufficient brown field land to negate the need to identify a reserve Major Development Area?
2. Has sufficient account been taken of the potential flood risk?
3. Is the proposed reserve MDA at Barton Farm inherently unsustainable?

SBFG Countryside and Landscape

1. Would the development of the reserve MDA contribute to urban sprawl? (175/7)
2. Does the proposal take sufficient account of the Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment?
3. Would Proposal NC3 have an unacceptable impact on Winchester City and its setting?
4. Would the development of the Reserve MDA have detrimental effects on biodiversity?
5. Would the development of the Reserve MDA have a damaging impact on the River Itchen?
6. Should the Reserve MDA site be proposed on an area of prime farmland subject to countryside policies?(175/7)
7. Would the MDA result in the loss of informal recreation? (2250/5/REVDEP)

SBFG Transport (75/34)

1. Does the highway network have sufficient capacity to cope with the traffic volume generated by the development?
2. Will the development create traffic problems on local residential roads?
3. Will adequate walking provision be provided to encourage residents to walk?
4. Are the provisions for cycling adequate?
5. Will the topography of the development area hinder walking and cycling possibilities?

**CALA Homes** (86/ 15 - 24REVDEP) (68/ 73 & 80):(268/1/REVDEP) (68/2/REVDEP)  
(88/5/REVDEP) (68/4/REVDEP)

1. Should the preamble to the Policy be altered to reflect the changes proposed by the objectors in respect of Structure Plan Requirements for a reserve MDA and the site selection process?
2. Is there a need to elaborate on what constitutes a 'compelling justification' for the release of the MDA?
3. Should Policy NC3 be amended in respect of:-
  - (i) The requirement to adopt a comprehensive Masterplan (RD12.51 (i))
  - (ii) The requirement to submit a sustainability statement (RD12.51 (iii))
  - (iii) Employment provision (including the resource centre) (RD12.51 (iv))
  - (iv) The facilities required to support the new community (RD12.51 (iv))
  - (v) Open space provision (RD12.51 (iv))
  - (vi) The physical infrastructure necessary to serve the needs of the new community (RD12.51 (v));
  - (vii) The provision of informal recreation on land east of the railway line (RD12.51 (vii))
  - (viii) The retention of the main landscape features (RD12.51 (viii))
  - (ix) Protection of important nature conservation interests (RD12.51 (ix))
4. Is there a need to elaborate on what constitutes a 'compelling justification' for the release of the MDA?
5. Should the Policy be amended to allow the site to be triggered if there is a shortfall in the Council's baseline housing provision?
6. Is there a requirement to identify the site as part of a 10 year supply of housing land which extends beyond the Plan Period?

**Eagle Star Estates Ltd** (352/3/WDLPR)

1. Was the Structure Plan Review process flawed?
2. Is there a need to identify a reserve site for 2,000 dwellings during the Plan Period, or will this lead to an over-provision of housing land during the Plan Period?
3. Was the evaluation of alternative sites flawed?
4. Was it correct to identify Barton farm as the location for a reserve MDA at Winchester City (north)?

**Bovis Homes and Heron Land** (04/1-4) (05/1-5) (04/1-11/REVDEP) (05/1-11/REVDEP):

1. Is there sufficient land to develop a MDA of two thousand dwellings, or should the boundary of the MDA be extended to include land north of Well House Lane. (213/4)
2. Will the scale of the land identified at Barton Farm lead to a development of unacceptably high densities?
3. Should the provision of a site for a Park and Ride Facility be identified in association with the MDA at Winchester City (north)?
4. Is there sufficient land to meet the Requirement in Policy MDA1 in the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 1996-2011, for the boundary to be drawn to 'include tracts of countryside, within and around the area proposed for built development'?
5. Is there sufficient land allocated to meet open space/ recreational requirements? (30/10)
6. Should the avenue of trees along Andover road be specifically referred to in paragraph 12.85 of Policy NC3?
7. Is there a shortfall of dwelling completions in the county which would warrant the early release of the Winchester City (North) MDA?
8. Is there sufficient land to meet any future requirements for flood alleviation and sustainable drainage?
9. Has sufficient land been identified to meet employment land requirements?
10. Is there sufficient land at Barton Farm to meet the retail needs of the area, or should the Policy be promoting a District Centre at Barton Farm? (2277/2) (24/1)

**Kier Land** (877/6/14/15), (2273/3/4 REVDEP):

1. Was the Council's evaluation process that identified Barton Farm as the preferred site for the reserve Major Development Area at Winchester City (north) flawed?
2. Did the evaluation process follow guidance contained in PPG3?
  - a. In particular did it take into sufficient account of the potential availability of previously developed land, or
  - b. Follow the criteria set out in paragraph 31?
3. Does the site at Barton Farm offer the best opportunity to create an urban extension, or would this be more likely achieved at the site of the Sir John Moore Barracks/ Littleton Stud, otherwise known as the joint site (JS)? (355/1/REVDEP), (2280/3/REVDEP), (306/10)

**Winchester City Residents Association** (31/1)

1. Was the identification of a confined area of search premature? (947/3) (75/1/REVDEP) (369/2)
2. Does the proposed development meet local needs?
3. Is the development sustainable in the context of Winchester's built environment and landscape setting?

**CPRE** (1387/6)

1. Is there sufficient brown field land to negate the need to identify a reserve Major Development Area?
2. Should the reserve provision be omitted from the Local Plan review until such time as a compelling need is identified by the strategic authorities?
3. Given the time scale required to bring forward reserve MDAs for development, how realistic is it to expect the reserve MDA at Barton Farm to contribute to the County's housing needs during the Plan Period, even if the reserve site were to be triggered?
4. Should a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment be carried out prior to identifying the site in the Local Plan Review?
5. Is there a need for a 'review or de-allocation' policy in the Local Plan Review?