

Winchester District Development Framework

# **Infrastructure Study**

Evidence Base Document

June 2011



**Winchester**  
City Council



# Index

<b>Glossary .....</b>	4
<b>1 Executive Summary.....</b>	6
<b>2 Introduction.....</b>	8
2.2 Structure of report.....	8
2.3 Policy Background .....	9
2.4 Potential sources of funding for infrastructure.....	12
<b>3 Key Infrastructure Areas .....</b>	13
3.1 Transport .....	13
3.2 Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space .....	36
3.3 Housing - Affordable Housing .....	51
3.4 Education provision .....	65
3.5 Health facilities and social services .....	76
3.6 Social Infrastructure: Creative Industries, Arts and Culture .....	85
3.7 Emergency Services - Police Service .....	92
3.8 Emergency Services - Ambulance Service .....	94
3.9 Emergency Services - Fire Service.....	95
3.10 Utility services: General .....	97
3.11 Utilities Services - Gas and Electricity Provision.....	97
3.12 Renewable Energy .....	103
3.13 Utility services – Waste and Resource Management.....	108
3.14 Utility services - Water Management - Fresh Water and Foul Water .....	112
3.15 Utility services - Water Management - Flood defences.....	121
3.16 Utilities Service: Communications.....	125
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	128
<b>Appendix 1: Current level of open space and built facilities provision within Winchester District .....</b>	134
<b>Appendix 2: Service Providers who were asked to provide information to inform this study .....</b>	136

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Transport aspirations and projects identified within Parish/Community Plans .....	20
<b>Table 2:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Transport requirements for the Non-PUSH area of Winchester and on proposed Strategic Allocation Sites in PUSH and.....	23
<b>Table 3:</b> Standards. Open space standards (quantity and access) .....	38
<b>Table 4:</b> Standards. Built facilities standards (quantity and access).....	38
<b>Table 5:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Deficit in formal and informal provision for the strategic allocations and identified in the Sports facilities study and Parish Plans.....	40
<b>Table 6:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. ....	44

<b>Table 7:</b> Funding. Children's Play.....	50
<b>Table 8:</b> Funding. Sports Grounds .....	50
<b>Table 9:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Affordable housing stock in each rural parish. ....	55
<b>Table10:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Number of Households on Housing Register with a local connection to each rural parish.....	58
<b>Table 11:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Affordable Housing proposed within Winchester District for new development.....	61
<b>Table 12:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Extra Care Housing proposed within Winchester District.....	62
<b>Table 13:</b> The total estimated costs of affordable housing provision calculated based on the 2005 Roger Tym Report.....	64
<b>Table 14:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Education provision planned/required to accommodate future growth.....	69
<b>Table 15:</b> Funding. Guide costs of school places resulting from new development .....	74
<b>Table 16:</b> Standards. Facilities provided for different population scales and access standards for primary care provision within Hampshire .....	77
<b>Table 17:</b> Standards. Proposed distance standards for primary care provision within Hampshire .....	78
<b>Table 18:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Primary Health Care requirements.....	80
<b>Table 19:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Community and Cultural Facilities.....	89
<b>Table 20:</b> Current level of Infrastructure. Energy requirements of the proposed Strategic Development Areas .....	101
<b>Table 21:</b> Standards. Renewable Energy Targets.....	105
<b>Table 22:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Renewable Energy Targets.....	107
<b>Table 23:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Waste and Resource Management.....	111
<b>Table 24:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered, Water.....	116
<b>Table 25:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered, Flood Mitigation .....	124
<b>Table 26:</b> Infrastructure measures being considered. Communication.....	127
<b>Table 27:</b> The following table sets out the current provision and deficit throughout Winchester District in formal open space provision as identified through the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (2008). .....	134
<b>Table 28:</b> Informal greenspace provision as defined by the ANGSt standards as identified through Winchester's Green Infrastructure Study .....	135

# Glossary

<b>CIL</b>	Community Infrastructure Levy.
<b>Code for Sustainable Homes</b>	A framework which measures the environmental sustainability performance of new homes against a range of criteria and standards.
<b>Core Strategy</b>	A Development Plan Document which will set out the spatial vision and objectives for the future of Winchester District up to 2026, with the strategic policies necessary to deliver that vision.
<b>DNO</b>	Distribution Network Operator – energy supplies
<b>Exception Sites</b>	Sites outside defined settlement boundaries, where an exception to policy is allowed to enable 100% affordable housing to be developed.
<b>HCC</b>	Hampshire County Council
<b>HWRC</b>	Household Waste Recycling Centre
<b>IGT</b>	Independent Gas Transporter - Maintain and own local gas transportation networks which connect into the Gas Distribution Network
<b>Intermediate affordable housing</b>	PPS3 definition: - “Housing at prices and rents above those of social rent, but below market price or rents, and which meet the criteria set out above. These can include shared equity products, other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent”.
<b>LAP</b>	Local Area for Play
<b>LDF</b>	Local Development Framework
<b>LDZ</b>	Local Distribution Zone – Zones for gas provision to suppliers
<b>LEAP</b>	Local Equipped Area for Play
<b>LRN</b>	Local Road Network
<b>MUGA</b>	Multi Use Games Area
<b>NEAP</b>	Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play
<b>PCT</b>	Primary Care Trust
<b>PPS</b>	Planning Policy Statement
<b>PUSH</b>	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire. A sub-regional Partnership of 11 local authorities from the New Forest in the west to Havant in the east, set up to co-ordinate economic development, transport, housing and environmental policy within South Hampshire.
<b>Renewable Energy</b>	Energy that occur naturally and repeatedly in the environment, such as wind and solar power. Combustible or digestible materials are also regarded as renewable sources of energy.

<b>RSL</b>	Registered Social Landlords
<b>S106</b>	Legally binding agreement between the developers and local authorities which sets what infrastructure is required, when it is required and who/how it will be delivered. It will also set out the financial contributions required from the developer to provide the necessary infrastructure.
<b>S38</b>	This is the process by which roads are adopted by the highways authority (HCC), and become public highways.
<b>SDA</b>	Strategic Development Area
<b>Social rented housing</b>	PPS3 definition: - “Rented housing owned and managed by local authorities and registered social landlords, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. ....it may also include rented housing owned or managed by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Housing Corporation as a condition of grant”.
<b>SHMA</b>	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
<b>Sustainable Community Strategy</b>	The high level visioning document for an area, dealing with wide social, economic and environmental issues that affect the District. The LDF is a key delivery mechanism of the Sustainable Community Strategy
<b>SRN</b>	Strategic Road Network
<b>UIP</b>	Utility Infrastructure Providers - Construct gas infrastructure on behalf of their customer which are then adopted by IGTs.
<b>WCC</b>	Winchester City Council
<b>WWTW</b>	Waste Water Treatment Works

# **1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1.1 The Infrastructure Study sets out in broad terms the range of social and physical infrastructure that might be required to support development proposals contained within the Core Strategy of the emerging Winchester District Local Development Framework (LDF). It is important piece of supporting evidence for dialogue with the local community and service providers to identify what social and physical infrastructure the district may require over the next 15 years.
- 1.1.2 The study collates the plans and proposals of relevant organisations and service providers which have a bearing on the social and physical infrastructure across the district.
- 1.1.3 This study provides a summary of current and future infrastructure requirements assessed by infrastructure providers during research carried out between July and September 2010.
- 1.1.4 The need to provide the necessary social and physical infrastructure identified in this study in a timely manner will inform the process of determining the District's development requirements, in order that where development is permitted it is supported by the delivery of the necessary infrastructure.
- 1.1.5 The conclusion of this Study is that there are a number of geographic areas where current infrastructure provision is deficient, and further development will worsen the situation if the appropriate infrastructure is not put in place at an early stage of the development process.
- 1.1.6 Although it may be expected that economic conditions will move through more than one cycle over the next 15 years, infrastructure provision will prove particularly challenging over the first few years of the LDF as developers will be expected to fund the majority of infrastructure requirements directly related to their development with limited public sector support even for strategic infrastructure.
- 1.1.7 Therefore innovative ways of securing the required levels of infrastructure will need to be explored to ensure that development is possible.
- 1.1.8 The main deficiencies are not surprisingly around highways and transport infrastructure. The strategic road network is particularly stressed at times. Although it will be possible to put in place various mitigation measures, for example junction improvements and traffic management, it will not be possible to build our way out of the problems currently facing the District, and 'smarter choices' will be required to reduce the demand for travel by the private car.
- 1.1.9 The capacity of education facilities, especially primary education, is currently an issue in certain parts of the District, particularly in the Winchester town area. New development will be expected to meet its own requirements in this respect, but significant improvements in areas which are not facing development pressures are unlikely.
- 1.1.10 Where secondary education capacity is limited particularly around the Whiteley area, development will be expected to contribute towards infrastructure to ensure that the situation is not worsened. Public funding for new and improved

school buildings to address existing problems is likely to be scarce for some time to come.

- 1.1.11 The networks of open space, countryside and outdoor recreation provision known as 'green infrastructure' is increasingly recognised for its role in improving the quality of life of communities, and also for its role in mitigating any adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive sites caused through development pressure. Many areas forming part of the green infrastructure network are protected for their nature conservation interest and the impact of increasing recreation pressure on these sites will need to be considered through the assessment appropriate to their scale of designation.
- 1.1.12 There are issues for the City Council to address in securing appropriate 'cutting edge' infrastructure to adapt to the challenges of climate change, and ensure that the District remains competitive into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This again will require the Council to implement new policies in the areas of renewable energy and communications technology.
- 1.1.13 The Council is an active and support member of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) and the Council's agreed strategy is to look to meet economic growth targets and housing needs in the PUSH part of the district through two strategic sites at West of Waterlooville and North Whiteley. A key requirement of these developments (and therefore partly a determinant of their scale) is that they do not create unsustainable pressure on existing infrastructure and that they form cohesive and sustainable communities, integrated with the existing development.
- 1.1.14 Although viability will need to be assessed as masterplanning proceeds and site proposals may need to be assessed through the Habitats Regulations and through the Environmental Impact Assessment processes, there would not appear to be any significant items of infrastructure required to bring forward the strategic sites that cannot be funded and provided in a timely fashion. This includes a new primary and secondary school at North Whiteley, and the completion of Whiteley Way.
- 1.1.15 This study will inevitably need to be up-dated and revised as a consequence of the consultations and community engagement which will be undertaken as the Core Strategy is developed, and new opportunities and deficiencies are identified.

## **2 Introduction**

- 2.1.1 This infrastructure study identifies in broad terms the range of social and physical infrastructure required to implement the spatial development strategy of the Winchester District Core Strategy. It refers to the relevant plans and proposals of other organisations and service providers, where these are required to deliver elements of social and physical infrastructure across the Winchester District.
- 2.1.2 The Government has indicated that it intends to revoke the South East Plan through the Localism Bill and recent guidance from government sets out that this intention should be a material consideration in planning decisions on housing supply. The Council is therefore currently considering the housing needs and requirements for the parts of the District currently defined as Winchester Town, Market Towns and Rural Areas (including the rural parts within the PUSH area) in the emerging Core Strategy. In the meantime, the Council has resolved to continue with the development strategy for the remainder of the PUSH area that was in the former SE Plan.
- 2.1.3 This Study will inform the process of engaging with the local communities and service providers to help determine housing requirements, and to match potential housing sites with infrastructure provision in the District. It will inevitably need to be up-dated and revised as a consequence of those consultations. It therefore seeks to provide a 'snapshot' of the range of infrastructure needed to support the Core Strategy at the present time and identify any current shortfalls.
- 2.1.4 The infrastructure study mainly looks at the infrastructure needed to provide housing within the District. The proposed Development Management and Allocations DPD will include other forms of development or a mix of uses which will also need infrastructure provision.

### **2.2 Structure of report**

- 2.2.1 Sections 1 and 2 of this Study summarise briefly the relevant policy background to the provision of infrastructure, at national and local levels, including the information provided in the Hampshire Community Infrastructure document, to identify where possible the specific requirements for the District.
- 2.2.2 Section 3 defines the types of infrastructure and responsibilities for the provision of such to ensure that the development identified in the Core Strategy can be delivered.
- 2.2.3 Infrastructure is broken down into the following:
- Transport covering Strategic and Local Road Networks, Parking, Public Transport, and Footpaths/Bridleways and Cycle Tracks.
  - Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space
  - Housing - Affordable Housing including Extra Care housing
  - Education provision covering from nursery to higher and further education

- Health facilities and social services including primary and acute care
- Social Infrastructure including creative Industries, Arts and Culture including Community Halls
- Emergency Services - Police Service
- Emergency Services - Fire Service
- Emergency Services - Ambulance Service
- Utilities Services - Gas and Electricity Provision
- Renewable Energy
- Utility services - Waste and Resource Management
- Utility services - Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge
- Utility services - Water Management - Flood defences
- Utilities Service: Communications

## **2.3 Policy Background**

### **Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12: Local Spatial Planning**

- 2.3.1 PPS 12 provides the national policy on local spatial planning, and emphasises the importance of infrastructure delivery in the spatial planning process.
- 2.3.2 The City Council is required to produce a delivery strategy which sets out how the objectives of the Core Strategy will be achieved, by setting out “how much development is intended to happen, where, when and by what means it will be delivered”. This is described as being “central” to the spatial planning process. It is meant to remove uncertainties as to whether the provision of infrastructure will match the rate of development.
- 2.3.3 As background to the delivery strategy, the Core Strategy is to be “supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed for the area, taking account of its type and distribution”. It is to specify who will provide the infrastructure and when it will be provided, drawing on the strategies or investment plans of the local authorities and other organisations.
- 2.3.4 The infrastructure planning process is expected to “identify, as far as possible:
- infrastructure needs and costs;
  - phasing of development;
  - funding sources; and
  - responsibilities for delivery.”
- 2.3.5 The infrastructure requirements of any strategic sites allocated within the Core Strategy are to be specified, with a broad assessment of their viability, to give confidence that there are no ‘showstoppers’ which would hold back the delivery of the development.

- 2.3.6 The Infrastructure Study is expected to form part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, and therefore it will require “timely, effective and conclusive discussion with key infrastructure providers” during its preparation. To achieve this, “key infrastructure stakeholders are encouraged to engage in such discussions and to reflect the Core Strategy within their own future planning”. However, the Government recognises that there may be some uncertainty and considers that contingency planning may be required where provision is uncertain.

### **The South East Plan**

- 2.3.7 The South East Plan, adopted in May 2009, is the regional spatial strategy for the area. The Plan contains a number of ‘cross-cutting policies’, including Policy CC7 on infrastructure and implementation. This seeks to link the scale and pace of development to the capacity of existing and new infrastructure. Concerns over the perceived inadequacy of infrastructure for new development means that the need for adequate and timely infrastructure to be provided in conjunction with development is a key theme of the Plan.
- 2.3.8 The need to link the phasing of development with infrastructure provision is a specific requirement of Policy H2 (housing). Other policies of the Plan relate to the need to manage or invest in non-transport infrastructure, such as NRM1-NRM2 (water resources), NRM11-NRM16 (renewable energy), W16-W17 (waste), and S4-S6 (‘social infrastructure’). For the proposed growth area of South Hampshire, Policy SH9 proposes an implementation agency to deliver the proposed development and associated infrastructure.
- 2.3.9 The Government has indicated its intention to revoke the South East Plan through the Localism Bill. Recent guidance from government sets out that the intention to revoke the South East Plan should be a material consideration in planning decisions on housing supply.

### **The South East Plan Implementation Plan**

- 2.3.10 The South East Plan is accompanied by an Implementation Plan, submitted to the Examination in Public in October 2006. This includes a definition and classification of infrastructure and estimates the costs of infrastructure needed in association with the South East Plan as being in the range £37bn - £47bn. Subsequently, further work by the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) and the Environment Agency has estimated the additional cost of flood defences, water resources, maintaining water quality, waste treatment and countryside protection to be a further £42bn, giving a total of up to £89bn.

### **The PUSH Infrastructure Study**

- 2.3.11 A report on “Critical Other Infrastructure Requirements”, covering all types of infrastructure except transport, was produced for the growth area of South Hampshire (the PUSH area) in November 2006 for the 2006 Examination in Public. The southern part of Winchester District lies within this area. The report sets out the responsibilities and broad requirements for each type of infrastructure, although some of the information was incomplete. Even with the

level of information presented, the report concluded that existing funding sources would be insufficient to meet infrastructure needs and that it was doubtful whether new sources of funding would be able to bridge the gap. It therefore highlighted a need for significant additional Government funding. The Government therefore allocated additional funding as part of the New Growth Points programme to support work on infrastructure needs.

### **The Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study**

- 2.3.12 Hampshire County Council has now extended and developed the information in the above report to apply to the whole of Hampshire, to provide more complete information for LDF preparation. The Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study was published in April 2009 with an update supplement published in 2010, and the intention is to update it annually to feed into the Districts' Annual Monitoring Reports. The County Council has worked with the service providers to provide more information than that included in the PUSH study, but it is recognised that there are still gaps in the information provided.

### **Infrastructure in the Winchester Development Framework: The Core Strategy**

- 2.3.13 Government advice in PPS 12 places significant emphasis on the need for this Study to support the development proposed in the Core Strategy, setting out how, where, and when the necessary infrastructure is to be provided. This Infrastructure Study has therefore been developed to accord with this advice, and to complement Policy CP23 of the Preferred Option version of the Core Strategy. This requires all development proposals to provide or contribute towards the infrastructure needed to support them, in accordance with the details and required timing of provision set out in this Study.
- 2.3.14 In 2009, the Council received advice from the Planning Inspectorate on the level of detail needed on infrastructure delivery to progress the Core Strategy. The Council is expected to demonstrate that infrastructure requirements for strategic allocations which are to come forward early on in the Plan period can be resolved. This applies to requirements which affect the wider environment: issues affecting the site itself do not need to be detailed at this stage. The Council must also demonstrate that infrastructure requirements that may have an impact on the rest of the District have also been resolved. This includes setting out what is to be delivered by when and evidence of cost and funding sources, particularly for the early years of the plan.
- 2.3.15 The PUSH and Hampshire County Council Studies referred to above have considered non-transport infrastructure only, with transport being considered separately. This Study includes transport, and therefore gives details of all the types of infrastructure necessary to deliver development in a single document. It aims to identify all the infrastructure requirements for the specific development proposed in the District over the next 20 years.
- 2.3.16 The Core Strategy will be the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessments to test emerging policies, the outcome of which is the likely identification of various items of infrastructure to avoid or mitigate potential impacts on sites protected for their nature conservation importance.

## **Sustainable Community Strategy**

- 2.3.17 The updated Winchester Sustainable Community Strategy (2010) focuses on 3 objectives for the District; to achieve:-
- High Quality Environment
  - Active Communities
  - Prosperous Economy

## **2.4 Potential sources of funding for infrastructure**

- 2.4.1 Government and sub-regional funding for major infrastructure projects remains uncertain at the present time. The Council together with its partners will need to look for innovative ways to fund and provide the necessary infrastructure.
- 2.4.2 Although some types of infrastructure will be provided on-site as part of each development, particularly within the strategic sites, a significant part of the infrastructure required in the District is likely to be provided or supported by developer contributions. Initially, contributions will be sought through agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as substituted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991), with standard charges or formulae being set where it would simplify the process. The process for seeking contributions and the contribution levels may be set out in a future Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2.4.3 The previous Government introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the City Council will consider whether its use would be a simpler and better option for securing certain types of infrastructure. Any introduction of a CIL in the District would require the preparation of an infrastructure charging schedule for those elements subject to the Levy.
- 2.4.4 The new Coalition Government has announced its intention to provide funding to 'incentivise' those communities facing new development. Again once the details of this scheme become clearer, the Council and key partners will need to collaborate on how this funding might in the future assist in meeting local infrastructure requirements

### **3 Key Infrastructure Areas**

#### **3.1 Transport**

##### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies:**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities
- Prosperous Economy

##### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [2<sup>nd</sup> Hampshire Local Transport Plan \(LTP 2\) 2006-2011](#), HCC
- [3<sup>rd</sup> Hampshire Local Transport Plan \(LTP 3\) 2011-2031](#), HCC
- [Car Parking Standards SPD 2010 WCC](#)
- [Control Period 4 Delivery Plan update 2010](#), Network Rail
- [Countryside Access Plans \(Forest of Bere, South Downs, Hampshire Downs and Test and Itchen\)](#), HCC
- [Delivering a Sustainable Transport System Study Department for Transport \(DAST\)](#)
- [Funding transport infrastructure for strategically significant developments, 2009. Department for Transport](#)
- [Great Western Route Utilisation Strategy March 2010](#), Network Rail
- [Groundwater protection: policy and practice \(GP3\)](#) Environment Agency
- [HCC Transport Contributions Policy September 2007](#), HCC
- [Highways Agency's \(HA\) Regional Network Report \(RNR\) for the South East 2008](#) (2010 version due out later this year).
- [Highways Agency Business Plan](#), 2010-2011
- [Local Transport Scheme List, 2010. Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council](#)
- [London and South East RUS Draft for Consultation](#)
- M27 Corridor Study, Transport for South Hampshire 2010
- M27 Corridor Parallel Study, TfSH 2010
- [Road Transport Forecasts, 2009. Results from the Department for Transport's National Transport Model](#)
- [South West Mainline Route Utilisation Strategy](#)
- [Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report November 2009](#)
- [Winchester Town Access Plan, Consultation Draft 2010](#)

## **Definition of Transport Infrastructure**

- 3.1.1 The Highways Agency manages the majority of the Strategic Road Network (Trunk Roads and Motorways) in Winchester which includes the M3, M27, A34, A303 and A3 (M) (indirect impacts on the A3M) and A32 (County road).
- 3.1.2 Hampshire County Council is the Highway Authority for all other roads in the district with the exception of military and other private roads.
- 3.1.3 Transport for South Hampshire has been set up primarily to consider strategic transport interventions with the South Hampshire sub-region. It is effectively the 'sister' organisation to the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH). It comprises HCC and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils as the Highways Authorities for the area.
- 3.1.4 A key component in transport infrastructure is the provision and management of off-street parking: this will strongly influence travel patterns and car use both at the origin and destination of many potential car trips. The Council has recently adopted a Car Parking Standards SPD to address parking in new residential development. Existing parking in Winchester Town is shaped mostly by the dense network of terraced streets which allow for little or no parking on-site resulting in on-street parking. Resident parking zones are used in some areas of Winchester Town to manage parking, although some are oversubscribed. The [Winchester Town Access Plan](#) sets out the Council's approach to off-street car parking within the town over the next 20 years. Car parking in the rural areas is less constrained, but more essential than within larger settlements as alternatives such as public transport are lacking.
- 3.1.5 Public transport is an important part of transport infrastructure. For the purposes of this study, bus service companies have been contacted, but as this study looks at a strategic scale this information has not been forthcoming. Further work is being carried out on rural bus services to inform the Settlement Hierarchy. As part of this on-going work, it will be important to identify supporting infrastructure to help improve bus services, such as better information on services and timetables, and accessible bus shelters.

## **Lead Organisations involved**

- Highways Agency (HA)
- Hampshire County Council (HCC)
- Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH)
- Department for Transport (DfT)
- Winchester City Council
- Network Rail
- South West Trains
- Bus operators including Stagecoach and Solent Blue Line.

## **Standards/triggers**

- 3.1.6 Circular 02/2007 sets out the general presumption that the capacity on routes of strategic national importance will not be enhanced and there will be no additional accesses to motorways and other routes of strategic national

importance purely to accommodate new developments. Modifications to existing junctions will be carried out only where traffic flows and safety will not be adversely affected. Connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted.

- 3.1.7 New developments which may have an impact on the local and strategic road networks will be required to provide transport assessments which show that operating capacity will not be exceeded through the review period. If capacity on the strategic network is likely to be exceeded, then any improvements will be subject to environmental and deliverability considerations which will need to be agreed with the Highways Agency and will be carried out at the expense of the developer via the provisions of a S278 agreement. For all development, the circular expects that demand management will be employed, mainly through travel plans.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

#### **Strategic Road Network (SRN)**

- 3.1.8 Winchester District has high levels of commuting into and out of the District which contributes to the overall pressure on the SRN. Some communities have higher commuter rates than others. For example, Whiteley has one of the highest out-commuting rates in the PUSH area<sup>1</sup> despite the high level of employment in the immediate area. The commuter journeys from the District are also further than any other district in Hampshire, this is in part due to the access to the motorway network and good rail links to London and the south coast.
- 3.1.9 The SRN within Winchester District suffers from congestion around the M3 and A34 near junction 9 particularly with tourist traffic at weekends<sup>2</sup>. High daily stress<sup>3</sup> levels have been recorded at junctions 13-14 of the M3 and Junction 9 of the M27<sup>2</sup>. Stress indicates that the network is not working efficiently and can result in economic costs.
- 3.1.10 Other sections of the SRN in the South East which are stressed and which may affect the SRN in the District include the M3 junctions 8 and 10-14 and M27 junctions 3-4 and 5-9 with stretches of the SRN along the M3 (J2-3), A3, A27 and A31 being the most inefficient in the South East SRN<sup>2</sup>. Figure 3.51 of the draft Hampshire Local Transport Plan shows the pattern of traffic flows on the SRN in Hampshire in 2004.
- 3.1.11 Traffic growth on the SRN in Hampshire is increasing by around 2% per year; much of the growth includes short-trips<sup>4</sup>. Subsequently additional traffic on the SRN Junctions and links would require careful consideration of mitigation measures including demand management measures<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report Final Report, 2009. MVA Consultancy](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Highways Agency's \(HA\) Regional Network Report \(RNR\) for the South East 2008](#) and LTP3

<sup>3</sup> Stress describes where the flow of traffic surpasses the capacity of the road and is congested for longer than just the morning and evening peak hours

<sup>4</sup> [Hampshire's 2<sup>nd</sup> Local Transport Plan, 2006. Hampshire County Council](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Circular 2/07: Planning and the Strategic Road Network, 2007. Department for Transport](#)

## Local Road Network (LRN)

- 3.1.12 The LRN in Winchester Town and the surrounding wards is in some locations above capacity and suffers congestion during am and pm peak periods. Winchester Town is recognised as a congestion 'hot spot'<sup>4</sup> although there has been no significant increase in traffic levels within the Town since 1990<sup>6</sup>. Across Hampshire in general, traffic has only increased by an average of 1% per year over the last five years<sup>4</sup>(prior to 2006), mainly because the LRN is at/near capacity and more short journeys moved across to the SRN which had a greater capacity.
- 3.1.13 HCC is commissioning a Road Network and Traffic Management Stage 2 Study for the urban area of Winchester in conjunction with the Winchester Town Access Plan to identify how these existing capacity issues could be resolved. It is anticipated that the results of this study will be available in 2011.
- 3.1.14 HCC and Winchester City Council have agreed and published a list of [Local Transport Schemes](#). These lists detail local road infrastructure improvements and cycle schemes for which it is considered reasonable to seek contributions from development proposals if mitigation for the impact of the development is needed. There may be other schemes the County would like to carry out, but for which it is not suitable to seek developer contributions. The contribution will be calculated using the HCC Transport Contributions Policy September 2007.

## Rail Network

- 3.1.15 There are four stations located in Winchester District. The main station is Winchester which provides direct links to the Midlands and the North, but mainly centres on commuter travel to London. Winchester is the second busiest station in the Solent and Hampshire area with almost 4 million journeys starting or finishing in Winchester between 2008 and 2009. Shawford and Micheldever Station are smaller, local service stations on the same line. Botley station is on the East-West route between Eastleigh and Portsmouth.
- 3.1.16 The London route is better served than the East-West routes. Improvements are being considered to double track the Botley line and create an Eastleigh Rail Chord so that the East-West line can link directly to Southampton and to provide a new service between Portsmouth and Southampton. Pinch points have been identified between Shawford and Winchester, although there are no short-term proposals to fund improvement works for this section.
- 3.1.17 The Great Western Route Utilisation Strategy sets out options and recommendations for future rail management. For the routes running through Winchester, the recommended options to address the connectivity and capacity issues affecting the south coast lines are to<sup>7</sup>:-
- Extend the Newcastle-Reading service down to Southampton adding six additional trains a day in each direction, many of which stop at Winchester. This option does not compromise the forecast growth in freight movement to 2030. This proposal was implemented in December 2010.
  - Increase the number of carriages on the Manchester-Bournemouth route.

---

<sup>6</sup> HCC response to questionnaire

<sup>7</sup> these options are not committed

- 3.1.18 The routes running from the South Coast through Winchester are part of the second busiest freight corridor to London. Recent works have been carried out to enhance the Southampton to West Coast gauge which has modified the line to allow taller shipping containers to now be carried by rail. These taller containers are increasingly being used in the ports as a more efficient transportation container.
- 3.1.19 The [Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy \(RUS\)](#) is currently out for consultation, but looks at options for improvement to rail services through works including redoubling Botley Lane and developing the an Eastleigh Chord.

#### Bus Services

- 3.1.20 The ‘Blueprint’ consultation exercise carried out at the end of 2010 highlighted the issues around bus service provision particularly in the rural areas of the District. Many rural communities want to see improved bus services which run earlier and later in the day and which link in with other transport modes to provide a good interchange with trains and fast direct bus services to larger towns.
- 3.1.21 The central bus station is located within Winchester Town. Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the bus station (owned by Stagecoach) as part of the Silver Hill development, but there is a desire for better bus infrastructure across the District including the provision of real time information, especially outside the city area, and the provision of cycle parking hoops / shelters by out-of-city bus stops. [Community transport schemes](#) are also available in Winchester.

#### Footpaths, bridleways and byways

- 3.1.22 The pedestrian network includes footpaths and pedestrian crossings in rural and urban areas. There are c.800km of public rights of way in the District which are predominantly footpaths, but also include bridleways and byways. These are maintained by HCC. Some of the routes have become fragmented or do not lead to desired destinations. The [Local Transport Schemes](#) lists pedestrian and cycle projects for which it would be reasonable to seek developer contributions.
- 3.1.23 Further opportunities to create links back into the network of footpaths, bridleways and byways are set out in the [Winchester Green Infrastructure Study](#) and [HCC Countryside Access Plans](#). The [PUSH Green Infrastructure Study](#) also sets out potential sub-regional routes such as those through the Forest of Bere. Establishing new footpath, etc links can also contribute to the enhancement of the green infrastructure network by the creation of green corridors.

#### Cycle ways and routes

- 3.1.24 There are numerous [cycle routes mapped within Winchester Town](#) (note, traffic flow on Parchment Street now runs South to North); most of these are on roads, but contra flows have been provided along some routes. However, there is not a comprehensive network of cycle routes through the Town and there are gaps in existing routes particularly direct / attractive routes through Winchester Town. A network of safe cycling routes (NSCR) is therefore needed which also

provides for commuter cycling. A NSCR would include routes in which speed limits have been reduced, particularly in residential areas, cycle lanes on stretches of major roads, contraflow systems, joint pedestrian routes and cycle paths, other shared spaces, as well as – wherever appropriate and possible – dedicated cycle routes.

- 3.1.25 The City Council and County Council have agreed a [list of local Cycling Schemes](#) for which it would be reasonable to seek developer contributions. These include proposals for contra-flows along Jewry Street, Cossack Lane, the upper High Street as well as proposals for improvements for cyclists along North Walls and St George's Street.
- 3.1.26 Medium distance routes have been established around the District. There is a 26 mile [Winchester Cycle Trail](#) (17 miles of which is off road) which starts at Cheesefoot Head and runs through Winchester Town, Crawley and Micheldever Woods and back through New Alresford. There is also the [Sparsholt Cycle Trail](#) which is 26 mile (16 miles off road) around Winchester running through Sutton Scotney and Littleton and another shorter 14mile [Farley Mount route](#) also available. These routes are established and maintained by HCC.
- 3.1.27 Winchester also benefits from longer distance cycle routes with a [National Cycle Route](#) running from Reading down to Winchester mainly on-road. It is planned to extend this route along the Itchen to link up with routes through Eastleigh. National Cycle routes are set up by Sustrans, a registered charity. There is also an important [National Byway route](#) set up by the registered charity which starts and finishes in Winchester and loops to Shaftesbury, forming part of a 170mile route through South West England.

#### Future Highways Capacity

- 3.1.28 In 2009 the Government forecast that in the South East there will be a 26% rise in traffic volume by 2025 and a 44% rise in traffic volume by 2035 based on a 2003 baseline<sup>8</sup>. Such a rise in traffic growth would increase congestion on the M3 and increase traffic within the City.
- 3.1.29 Land use planning policy and demographic modelling were the most influential factors affecting the forecasts as increased housing and employment will put extra pressure on the local road network as well as the motorways and trunk roads. However, it is important to note that the forecast used the housing and employment targets set out in the South East Plan and it is the Governments intention to revoke the South East Plan through the Localism Bill. The forecast figures may subsequently differ from the District's new housing aspirations.
- 3.1.30 The County Council aims to reduce and manage car trips in order to facilitate modal shift away from the private car and uses various techniques (such as requiring development-related travel plans) to carry this out. This will be more effective in larger developments, and should help reduce the rate of increase in traffic volumes and congestion, but is unlikely to solve the underlying problems in the short term.
- 3.1.31 A number of schemes have recently been carried out to address existing traffic issues. On the SRN, there have been recent improvements to junctions 3-4 and 11-12 on the M27 (2009). Following on from these projects, the DfT/HA will

---

<sup>8</sup> [Road Transport Forecasts, 2009. Results from the Department for Transport's National Transport Model](#)

reassess the feasibility of using the hard shoulder south of J9 of the M3 and along the M27 though ‘Delivering a Sustainable Transport System’. However, any future works would not take place until after 2014.

- 3.1.32 On the LRN a new South Winchester Park and Ride has been built to alleviate pressure on Romsey Road and Winchester town centre. A traffic signal ‘gating’ on Chilbolton Avenue has also been introduced to help alleviate pressure on the Romsey Road by proving gaps for outbound traffic in the PM peak period.
- 3.1.33 Future possible changes on the LRN include<sup>9</sup>:-
- the construction of another Park and Ride site to the North of Winchester;
  - widening a section of Easton Lane near the M3;
  - introducing 2 way traffic along North Walls and Friarsgate;
  - improved bus networks linking Winchester with major centres;
  - rail improvements including Botley Line double tracking and Eastleigh Rail Chord; and
  - development of the Botley Bypass and Chickenhall link road.
  - These proposals are all subject to funding being available in future.
- 3.1.34 Opportunities to improve the Rights of Way network will also be considered. Upgrading footpaths would allow cyclists and horse riders to also use them and there may also be opportunities to re-link footpaths. New development, especially any allowed on a green field site or adjacent to the urban area, will be expected to provide new or improved footpath and cycle routes linking with the surrounding area.
- 3.1.35 The following Table 1 sets out the transport aspirations in local communities and projects identified within Parish/Community Plans. Table 2 sets out the infrastructure measures being considered for Strategic Allocations (based on the Preferred Option).

---

<sup>9</sup> [Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report 2009](#)

Table 1: Current level of Infrastructure. Transport aspirations and projects identified within Parish/Community Plans

Area	Origin of information	Aspirations
<b>Bishops Waltham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Council letter to WCC re projects they would like to see S106 monies put towards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New sites/improvement to parking provision, including cost subsidies.</li> <li>• New/improved pedestrian crossings.</li> <li>• Pedestrianisation and environmental improvements to St George's square and upper High Street.</li> <li>• Relocation of St Georges Square bus stop to Winchester Road and improvements to bus shelters.</li> <li>• General highway improvements for pedestrians/cars/cyclists.</li> <li>• Public car parking/public ownership and improvements to Abbey Field.</li> <li>• Provision of roundabout at Claylands/Winchester Road.</li> </ul>
<b>New Alresford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Health Check</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review, extend and promote the CANGO scheme.</li> <li>• Improve bus transport and establish a Quality Bus Partnership.</li> <li>• Create cycle tracks.</li> </ul>
<b>Otterbourne</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a strategic road / traffic policy for the village.</li> </ul>

Area	Origin of information	Aspirations
<b>Wickham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve public transport to allow children to access after-school activities.</li> <li>• Improve public transport to leisure sites outside the parish.</li> <li>• Traffic calming in Winchester Road.</li> <li>• Traffic calming in School Road.</li> <li>• Traffic calming and gritting on Knowle Road.</li> </ul>
<b>South Wonston</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New bus route via the railway station and hospital.</li> <li>• Create a cycle path between Sutton Scotney, South Wonston and Winchester.</li> </ul>
<b>Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved public transport - especially bus services to Southampton &amp; Fareham.</li> <li>• Improve poor road access.</li> <li>• Address traffic congestion.</li> </ul>
<b>Stanmore</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Action Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase level of bus service after 7PM.</li> <li>• Investigate the feasibility of improving traffic flow and access.</li> </ul>
<b>Compton and Shawford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lobby for 'quiet tarmac' to be used when M3 resurfacing occurs.</li> <li>• Pursue the possibility of noise reduction methods for example on the back of the Mountain Ash development</li> <li>• Identify an agreed solution to the congestion caused by commuter parking and overflow parking from the Village Hall.</li> </ul>

Area	Origin of information	Aspirations
<b>West Meon</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce further traffic calming measures to effectively reduce speeds within the parish boundaries.</li> <li>• Investigate if “pinch points” or “central island” could be installed to improve safety of crossing A32</li> </ul>
<b>Curbridge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curbridge Preservation Society response to draft Infrastructure Study and comments on North Whiteley proposal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridle paths are needed across the parish.</li> <li>• Traffic calming/ offset proposals for the centre of Curbridge should be considered as part of the proposal to redevelop North Whiteley.</li> </ul>

Table 2: Infrastructure measures being considered. Transport requirements for the Non-PUSH area of Winchester and on proposed Strategic Allocation Sites in PUSH.

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
Non-PUSH area of Winchester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off-site highway improvements to mitigate traffic impacts of development around Winchester City may require improvements on the SRN such as the revision of existing road markings to provide a third lane along the southern over bridge of Junction 9.</li> <li>• The current LRN is at capacity and development around Winchester will need to demonstrate that it will offset any impact to the LRN.</li> <li>• Future possible changes on the LRN include :-           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- widening a section of Easton Lane near the M3;</li> <li>- introducing 2 way traffic along North Walls and Friarsgate;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be funded by the developer with the cost to be agreed subject to full transport assessment and S106 agreement if required as a result of a major development.</li> <li>• HCC will require the submission of further information on the impact to the existing LRN and the phasing of development with current road junctions. The developer would need to enter into a S106 agreement with HCC to secure off-site highway works and financial contributions if required as a result of a major development.</li> <li>• Developer funded if required as a result of new development.</li> <li>• Funding unknown – likely to be Local Authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HA would be concerned with any major development around Winchester which would increase traffic on the M3 J9 and J11 and A34/A272 junction. There are no current proposals to increase capacity at these junctions. Development proposed in Winchester town could therefore have a material impact on the M3 Junctions 9 and 11 and motorway flows to the south of Winchester at peak times and a marginal impact on A34/Andover Road Junction if not mitigated<sup>10</sup>.</li> <li>• The LDF Transport Assessment considered that sites in Winchester Town were only likely to have a</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> WCC Green Infrastructure Study

<sup>11</sup> [Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report](#)  
[Final Report, 2009. MVA Consultancy](#)

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– improved bus networks linking Winchester with major centres</li> <li>– the construction of another Park and Ride site to the North of Winchester;</li>   <li>• Preparation and monitoring of travel plans for residential, employment, schools</li>   <li>• Non residential development may also need a Transport Assessment (and Travel Plan) to support a planning application</li>   <li>• HCC (working with communities) has suggested the following green infrastructure links should be considered<sup>10</sup>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Improved walking/cycling routes to Farley Mount Country Park</li> <li>– Improve routes from Winchester to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded if required as a result of a new development.</li> <li>• Developer funded if required as a result of a new development. The MVA Study<sup>11</sup> estimated this may cost £0.25m for a major development to the North of Winchester (See Appendix 1).</li>   <li>• Developer funded. The MVA Study<sup>10</sup> estimated this may cost between £0.8m to £1.35m capital and between £0.06m and £0.08m revenue funding for a major development to the North of Winchester (See Appendix 1)</li>   <li>• Based on HCC transport contributions policy a 40-60,000m<sup>2</sup> non residential development may be expected to provide a transport contribution of £1.7m - £2.6m, depending on the eventual proposed floor space.</li> </ul>	<p>marginal impact on the A34, but would add to existing congestion on the M3 (11) and higher traffic levels in the city centre and B3420 Andover Road if a transport improvement package was not implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand management schemes will be required to prevent potential increases, funded by developers such as those set out in Appendix 1 of this report.</li>   <li>• The Delivering a Sustainable Transport System will assess the feasibility of using the hard shoulder south of J9 of the M3 and along the M27. However, any future works would not take place until after 2014.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<p>the North linking up to the rights of way network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extend the permissive footpath to Woodhams Farm Lane</li> <li>- Circular walking/cycling routes within development.</li> <li>- Link to Itchen Way</li> </ul>		
North Whiteley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off-site highway improvements to mitigate traffic impacts of the development</li> <li>• Plans to extend and complete Whiteley Way (7) and works to junction 9 of the M27 (1) are being considered; this would have to be delivered as part of a major development at North Whiteley.</li> <li>• (1) Junction 9 Corridor (Whiteley Roundabout/ J9/ Segensworth Roundabout) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highway improvements</li> <li>- HOV lane</li> <li>- Bus priority measures</li> <li>- Signalise Whiteley Way Roundabout</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded</li> <li>• Developer/ HCC/ Regional Funding<sup>13</sup>. Cost estimated at £2m - £5m. This is to be implemented during Phase 2 of development (1<sup>st</sup> phase accommodated by Smarter Choices/ Public Transport 'Trip Credits')</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whiteley is a car dominated settlement and further development would add traffic to an already congested junction 9 of the M27<sup>14</sup>. The majority of car journeys from Whiteley cross the M27 and through Segensworth, impacting on J9 of the M27<sup>15</sup>. Development at Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) would intensify impacts on junctions 10 and 11 of the M27, but a direct impact from the development at North Fareham on junction 9 is not expected.</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup> WCC Green Infrastructure Study

<sup>13</sup> Funding from the Highways Agency is under review. No future commitment to any scheme not yet in construction will be made until the impact of the spending review on the Agency's spending is considered.

<sup>14</sup> [Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report](#)

<sup>15</sup> [Final Report, 2009. MVA Consultancy](#)

<sup>15</sup> M27 Corridor Study, Transport for South Hampshire 2010

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (2) A3051 Botley Road Improvement (between North Whiteley and A334 Station Hill)</li> <li>• (3) A3051 Botley Road/ A334 Station Hill Junction Improvement</li> <li>• (4) Botley Village Traffic Management Proposals</li> <li>• (5) Cycle improvements on A3051 (North Whiteley to Botley Station)</li> <li>• (6) Pedestrian/ cycle link beside Whiteley Way/ M27 J9/ A3051</li> <li>• (7) Completion of Whiteley Way and secondary access streets</li> <li>• (8) Whiteley Way Extension - Bus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer/ Regional Funding<sup>13</sup> (if incorporating strategic PT priority). Cost estimated at £1m to be delivered upon connection of Whiteley Way to Botley Road. See (8)</li> <li>• Developer/ Regional Funding<sup>13</sup> (if incorporating strategic PT priority). Cost estimated at £0.25m to be delivered upon connection of Whiteley Way to Botley Road. See (8)</li> <li>• Developer (Proportional contribution to total cost). Cost estimated at £0.1m to be delivered upon completion of (8), (2) and (3)</li> <li>• Developer to fund. Cost estimated at £0.3m to be delivered inline with (2).</li> <li>• Developer/ HCC to fund. Cost estimated at £1m to be delivered during phase 2 of the development. HA involvement needed.</li> <li>• Developer funded. Cost estimated at £5m to be delivered during phase 2 of the development.</li> <li>• Regionally Funded. Cost estimated at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The transport requirements are all subject to the outcome of a full transport assessment.</li> <li>• The developer will need to carry out a Transport Assessment for the North Whiteley development which will include demand management measures. Mitigation is being looked at through a feasibility study and modelling.</li> <li>• Land has been reserved for a Botley Bypass which could link with the extension to Whiteley Way. But this is not required as a consequence of the North Whiteley development and is not justified on transport grounds, although it may have some environmental justification. Given that the Hedge End SDA is no longer being promoted, other sources of funding would need to be identified.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<p>priority infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced public transport services – local services and contribution towards strategic services</li> <li>• Improved Bus Stop Infrastructure (including RTPI) –within development and existing residential and employment areas.</li> <li>• Travel Plans (Including personalised Travel Planning within existing local residential and employment areas to achieve required Trip Credits) Monitoring of travel plans for residential, employment, schools.</li> <li>• HCC (working with communities) has suggested the following green infrastructure links should be considered<sup>12</sup>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Route to link Botley to Whiteley Pastures/Botley Woods.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>£2m to be delivered either in line with (7) or later with land safeguarded by developer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer contributions/ HCC/ regional funding. Cost estimated at £6.6m. Local services will be delivered from start of development. Strategic services dependent upon wider growth timescales.</li> <li>• Developer funded. Cost estimated at £0.5m to be delivered during phase 1 of the development and then commensurate with build-out.</li> <li>• Developer funded. Cost estimated at £1m – 1.5m to be delivered during phase 1 of the development and then continued PTP throughout development build-out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This (6) is one of two options identified in the M27 parallel study for possible progression.</li> <li>• Curbridge Preservation Society consider that traffic calming/ offset proposals for the centre of Curbridge should be considered as part of the proposal to redevelop North Whiteley.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Botley to Wickham – there is a huge gap in access network in Curdridge.</li> <li>- Route to Meon Valley Trail</li> <li>- Formalising/improving routes within Whiteley Pastures/Botley Woods to create circular walks/ cycle rides.</li> <li>- Crossing over railway line to link to woodlands if potential for more access.</li> <li>- Bridleway improvements may be needed as there are stables in the area.</li> </ul>		
West of Waterlooville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unspecified off-site highway junction improvements to mitigate traffic impacts of the development</li> <li>• Grainger Site Access Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milk Lane Construction Access</li> <li>- Southern Access</li> <li>- Main Access to Grainger site</li> <li>- Purchase of additional land to secure Southern Access</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey Infrastructure Works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hambledon Road (Primary Access)</li> <li>- Hambledon Road (Secondary Access) Hulbert Road/</li> <li>- Tempest Avenue Junction A3(M)</li> <li>- Junction 3 Improvements to A3M</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Off site highways works</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost estimated at £1.1m.</li> <li>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost estimated at £10.26m.</li> <li>• Developer (Taylor Wimpey) funded.</li> <li>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The information in this section is provided for guidance; work on transport requirements and contributions is on-going and will be updated through the Delivery Plan which will follow this study.</li> <li>• Whilst the MDA site is in the Winchester City Council area, the majority of the off-site highway works fall within Havant Borough.</li> <li>• A full package of mitigation measures in the Havant district is being negotiated between the developers and Highways Authority.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other off site highways contribution</li> <li>- Purbrook Way/ Stakes Road/ Stakes Hill Road/ Crookhorn Lane</li> <li>- Safe Routes to School – Crookhorn College to Southdowns College</li> <li>- 2 x Toucan Crossings along London Road Maurepas Way Toucan Crossing</li> <li>- South Link to Brambles Business Park on and off site</li>   <li>• On site spine roads</li>   <li>• Link between Taylor Wimpey Site and Grainger within the MDA</li>   <li>• Provide a pedestrian and cycle link between the development and the Town Centre. The scope of this project needs to be agreed with WCC &amp; HBC. How the MDA will integrate with Waterlooville town centre is still to be resolved. There is a minimum infrastructure requirement for an at grade crossing point on Maurepas Way but other options for new infrastructure are being investigated by HCC.</li>   <li>• Enhanced public transport services. No specific infrastructure (on-site or off-site)</li> </ul>	<p>estimated at £3.6m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded. Cost estimated at £15.5m.</li> <li>• Developer funded (Taylor Wimpey and Grainger). Cost estimated at £0.5m.</li> <li>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost to be agreed.</li> </ul> <p>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost estimated at £1.125m. The A3 bus</p>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<p>has been detailed for the new bus services. A bus strategy for the new development is being negotiated with HCC and the developers. The proposed Havant cross-borough BRT route will serve the new development from the east.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation and monitoring of travel plans for residential, employment, schools</li> <li>• HCC working with communities have suggested the following green infrastructure links should be considered<sup>12</sup>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Off site routes to Creech Wood to the north and Portsdown Hill to the south to link with north-south multiuser route and network in development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>rapid transport corridor has been provided to accommodate current and future needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded (Grainger). Cost estimated at £1.1m. Residential Travel Plan to be implemented prior to occupation. Work place travel plan prior to occupation of traffic generating units. School travel plan prior to occupation</li> </ul>	
<b>Fareham SDA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to the rail line between Fareham to Eastleigh are considered. These improvements do not form part of the emerging transport strategy, and remain a long term aspiration.</li> <li>• A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) network is being developed for south Hampshire with the first phase between Gosport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redoubling the line Botley - ca. £60m.</li> <li>• Eastleigh chord – ca. £55m<sup>16</sup>.</li> <li>• Phase 1 of the scheme is estimated to cost £20m funded by central government<sup>17</sup>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<sup>16</sup> [2<sup>nd</sup> Hampshire Local Transport Plan \(LTP 2\) 2006-2011](#)

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	Current Deficits in provision and General Comments:
	<p>and Fareham funded by DCLG (through CIF) and proposed phases to link in with Fareham SDA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to J10 and/or J11 of the M27 will be required, with access arrangement to be designed to minimise impacts to rural areas to the north, particularly Wickham and Knowle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded - Funding from the Highways Agency is under review. No future commitment to any scheme not yet in construction will be made until the impact of the spending review on the Agency's spending is considered.</li> </ul>	

---

<sup>17</sup> [Transport for South Hampshire Bus-Rapid-Transit information](#)

## **Time Line**

- 3.1.36 The next round of central Government funding to be allocated to projects on the SRN will be through the Highways Agency (HA) investment plan. The HA funding for any scheme not yet underway is no longer committed and is now under review following the Comprehensive Spending Review.
- 3.1.37 Funding for the LRN will be agreed through the Hampshire Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) informed by the DASTS process. A DASTS report on planning for transport in the South East for 2014 and beyond was published in July 2010 and submitted to the Secretary of State. This report identifies investment opportunities across different transport funding streams thereby helping local authorities to align their investment programmes in LTP3 with Highways Agency and Network Rail investment programmes. The Office for Rail Regulation will make a final determination on Network Rail's investment programmes in 2012.
- 3.1.38 The LTP3 has been finalised in light of the Comprehensive Spending review. The key part of the plan for this document will be the LTP3 implementation plan which will set out the priority projects for Winchester for a rolling 3 year period (*et al.*).

## **Risks**

- 3.1.39 Development can only be expected to fund transport initiatives related to their development. There is a high risk that funding will not be available from government to support new proposals and therefore parts of the transport infrastructure may only be built at later phases in the development when funding is available.
- 3.1.40 A lack of bus services may not necessarily be a reason for resisting development, despite the importance of such provision for larger schemes in particular.
- 3.1.41 Existing issues will have to be funded by the relevant highways authorities and again, this funding may not be forthcoming or significantly reduced in the near future.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

### SRN

- 3.1.42 The HA sets out funding for their part of the SRN through a major schemes programme for routes of national/international importance. However, HA schemes which have not yet begun are no longer considered as committed and are under review. The HA are not using DASTS to assess investment post 2014, but the scheme is feeding into the LTP3 which can help to coordinate funding allocations by linking major LTP schemes with SRN major schemes. The LTP3 sets out managed motorway schemes (e.g. electronic traffic control, use of hard-shoulder) as the approach for addressing congestion on the M27.
- 3.1.43 The development process is expected to fund the majority of transport improvements which are required to support major new developments within the

District. The DfT will only consider co-funding schemes if they are strategically significant<sup>18</sup>. The HA have already stated that they will not fund any capacity improvements on the SRN required purely as a result of new development. This approach is set out in the DfT Circular 02/2007. The Agency will also not be able to address any existing issues at that location unless it is already committed to do so; there are no HA schemes in Winchester that have committed priority funding for the 2010/11 year so there will be no junction improvements on the SRN in the District funded by central Government in the near future.

### LRN

- 3.1.44 Local Transport Authorities (LTA) currently receive revenue funding for the LRN via the wider local government financial settlement allocated on a formula basis taking into account road length, road condition and other factors. Capital funding (major scheme allocations, integrated transport block allocations and maintenance allocations) is distributed in line with the latest Local Transport Plans agreed by HCC and DfT. A third Local Transport Plan is currently out for consultation, however this document no longer sets out specific funding.
- 3.1.45 Given recent cuts to local government budgets as well as to the transport budget specifically, all proposals already put forward by HCC are under review. Investment in future transport schemes is therefore likely to be significantly reduced resulting in a stricter prioritisation of schemes.
- 3.1.46 A new funding mechanism has been proposed to address the negative impacts of transport on urban areas. The Local Sustainable Transport Fund will be used to finance a wide range transport initiatives that support economic growth and address climate change and will build on Local Transport Plans initiatives agreed by HCC and DfT working in partnership with communities. Short-term funding may also be available for Government priorities, such as low-carbon transport infrastructure.
- 3.1.47 For transport initiatives resulting from new development Winchester City Council has signed up to the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy whereby developer contributions are sought through Section 106 and Section 278 agreements. The second Local Transport Plan for Hampshire (running to 2011) predicted that ca. £6million would be provided through developer contributions to supplement government funding across the county. The third Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 has now been published and sets out potential options for transport projects.
- 3.1.48 The [Local Transport Schemes](#) agreed by WCC and HCC provides a list of projects which it considers reasonable to seek developer contributions towards if impacts resulting from the development need to be mitigated. For Winchester Town, this should be viewed alongside the [emerging Winchester Town Access Plan](#).
- 3.1.49 If funding is not forthcoming, re-phasing of development may be necessary to address shortfalls.

---

<sup>18</sup> [Funding transport infrastructure for strategically significant developments, 2009. Department for Transport](#)

## Rail Network

- 3.1.50 Investment in the rail network has been agreed to 2014 as part of a 5-year periodic review with the investment cycle following a 30-year strategy for the rail network. The next periodic review will determine the next round of works to 2019 and will consider the recommended options discussed above for increasing the length of trains and increasing services on the local rail network. The [Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy \(RUS\)](#) was recently published for consultation and sets out schemes for which funding could be sought through the next Control Period (5). The schemes under consideration include The Southampton – Brighton line to be diverted rerouted through Botley (instead of Netley); four freight paths per hour between Basingstoke and Southampton Central and further investigations into redoubling of the Botley Line.
- 3.1.51 It is estimated that works on redoubling the Botley line would cost between £38.5m to over £128m depending on the option chosen to redouble the line<sup>19</sup>. Work to provide an Eastleigh chord would cost between £89 m to £256 m depending on the option chosen<sup>20</sup>. This is not in any current programme and is unlikely to come forward in the short term, the costs are estimated using 2003 or 2008 data and are therefore now likely to be significantly higher.
- 3.1.52 Third party investment in the rail network can be agreed with Network Rail and there is a Discretionary Fund which may be available for minor schemes which will benefit the wider operational network. For new stations being served by existing services the promoter may have to provide some pump-priming funding until the station becomes established. However, DfT would expect that fare income would cover additional operating costs and that no additional subsidy would be required after 3 years.

## Bus Network

- 3.1.53 Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. Major developments will be expected to contribute towards improving bus services. The major investment expected in the southern part of the district is the proposal by TfSH to provide a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system across the sub-region. Initially it will link Fareham to Gosport, but will be rolled out to connect with the SDA north of Fareham, which will be of benefit to Knowle, and eventually to Segensworth and Whiteley.
- 3.1.54 Improvements to the local bus service will be expected as part of both the North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville major developments which will link with the A3 ZIP Corridor and BRT.

## Cycle Routes

- 3.1.55 Funding to create a network of safer cycle routes could be funded through the Governments' Local Sustainable Transport Fund or from developer contributions where appropriate.

---

<sup>19</sup> [2<sup>nd</sup> Hampshire Local Transport Plan \(LTP 2\) 2006-2011](#), HCC

<sup>20</sup> Table 10.3 in [Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy \(RUS\)](#)

### Footpaths, bridleways and byways

- 3.1.56 The County's Countryside Access Plan sets out potential projects and estimated costs and timescales for countryside access and rights of way. If funding is agreed through the HCC Capital Programme 2009/10 to 2011/12, the projects are then delivered through the Local Transport Plan. New development will be expected to improve linkages both through the site and with the adjoining areas, this will be particularly important where the development is near or adjoins the countryside or a major open space. In the PUSH area development will be expected to contribute towards implementing the PUSH GI strategy, by where appropriate improving links to the adjoining countryside to create a linked network of open space.

### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Highways Agency
  - Hampshire County Council
  - Developers
-

## **3.2 Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies:**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- ['Nature Nearby' - Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance](#), 2010, Natural England
- [New Forest Recreation Management Strategy](#)
- [Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study also known as Winchester City Council PPG17 Study March 2008 – 2026](#)
- [Open Space Strategy 2010-2011 Winchester City Council](#)
- [PUSH GI Strategy](#)
- PUSH Recreational Pressure Study on impacts to HRA sites
- [Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project](#)
- [South Downs Management Plan 2008 – 2013](#)
- [South East Green Infrastructure Framework 2009](#)
- Sports Facility Report - Winchester District. May 2009. Sport Hampshire and IOW
- [Winchester City Council Green Infrastructure \(GI\) Study 2010](#)
- [Winchester District Play Strategy 2007 – 2012 Winchester City Council](#)
- [Winchester District Sport and Physical Activity Strategy. 2006 – 2012 Winchester District Sport and Physical Activity Alliance](#)

### **Definition of Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space Infrastructure**

- 3.2.1 Green Infrastructure (GI) is used to describe all the different types of green spaces and features that make up a network of open spaces across rural and urban areas. They are sites which may be on private or public land and which provide various or multiple functions/benefits, including (but not exclusively) for wildlife, recreation, natural material production etc. and are available to people. Green Infrastructure has many functions, summed up in the South East Green Infrastructure Framework to include the following:-
- biodiversity conservation and enhancement,
  - creating a sense of place and opportunities for a greater appreciation of the countryside, valuable habitats and cultural heritage,
  - increasing recreational opportunities and supporting healthy living,

- improving water resource and flood management and sustainable design,
- helping to combat climate change by providing space for biodiversity to adapt and by mitigating impacts,
- providing opportunities for sustainable transport, education and crime reduction, and
- production of food, fibre and fuel.
- Tourism is another important function provided by Green Infrastructure.

- 3.2.2 For the purposes of this Infrastructure Study, the definition of GI includes both private and public land with the exceptions of private gardens and private land used for agriculture, although it is recognised that both can make significant contributions towards the GI of an area.
- 3.2.3 The network of sites protected for their nature conservation interest form part of the green network. These sites are protected through a hierarchy of policy and legislation, from those protected for their local interest and protected by policy (SINCs) to sites protected by European Directives (SPAs and SACs).

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- Winchester City Council manages the [Open Space Fund](#) and through the [Play Strategy](#), the Council invests in, and promotes opportunities (particularly for natural play) in the District.
- Hampshire County Council Countryside Service manages 388ha of countryside sites within the District.
- Parish Councils own and manage a significant amount of Green Infrastructure in the rural parishes.
- Other organisations such as the Forestry Commission provide formal and informal greenspace.

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.2.4 The Winchester PPG 17 Study March 2008 and Natural England's Access to Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt) set out standards for residential areas as set out in Tables 3 and 4. Winchester City Council has not officially signed up to the ANGSt standards, but the Winchester GI Study recommends that, until local standards are developed, ANGSt standards are adopted to enable access to the wider countryside and more informal green spaces. Additionally the inclusion of linear access routes (i.e. Public Rights of Way and permissive access) that provide connectivity between green infrastructure, but are not part of ANGSt would be supported.
- 3.2.5 Issues such as the sensitivity, quality, cost and accessibility of the sites will provide an indication of capacity as a greenspace. It is important to note that these standards do not recognise the value of the links/connectivity between larger sites. In order for green spaces and open spaces to function as a network (and thereby provide more beneficial, robust spaces), green links between places are essential.

Table 3: Standards. Open space standards (quantity and access)

	<b>Proposed standard per 1000 pop</b>	<b>Access standard</b>
Parks, Sports & Recreation Grounds	1.5 ha (0.75 ha for outdoor sport) <sup>22</sup>	650m
Natural Green Space	1ha of Local Nature Reserve <sup>21</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.0 ha site per 1000 pop within 400m<sup>22</sup></li> <li>• 2.0 ha site within 300m<sup>21</sup></li> <li>• 20 ha site within 2km<sup>21</sup></li> <li>• 100 ha site within 5km<sup>21</sup></li> <li>• 500 ha site within 10km<sup>21</sup></li> </ul>
Informal Green Space	0.8 ha <sup>22</sup>	700m
Equipped Children's & Young People's Space	0.50 ha <sup>22</sup>	480m: Toddler & Junior 650m: Youth
Allotments	0.20 ha <sup>22</sup>	480m
Overall Open Space Standard	4.00 ha /1000 people <sup>22</sup>	

Table 4: Standards. Built facilities standards (quantity and access) – from the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study also known as Winchester City Council PPG17 Study March 2008 – 2026

	<b>Proposed standard per 1000 pop</b>	<b>Proposed facility per no. population</b>	<b>Access standard (walking)</b>	<b>Driving catchment</b>
Sports halls with community access	54.5m <sup>2</sup> (0.1 hall)	1 per 11,000	20 mins	15 mins
Swimming pools with community access	13m <sup>2</sup> (0.04 pool)	1 per 25,000	20 mins	15 - 20 mins
Fitness Gyms (All provision)	4 stations -16m <sup>2</sup> gym space	1 station per 250	10 mins	10 - 15 mins
Synthetic turf pitches (All provision)	330m <sup>2</sup> (0.05 pitch)	1 per 20,000	20 - 30 mins	20 - 30 mins

<sup>21</sup> The ANGSt standard is targeted at urban areas such as the proposed strategic allocations.

<sup>22</sup> [Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study also known as Winchester City Council PPG17 Study March 2008 – 2026](#)

	<b>Proposed standard</b> per 1000 pop	<b>Proposed facility</b> per no. population	<b>Access standard</b> (walking)	<b>Driving catchment</b>
O/D Tennis Courts Club and public	0.8 courts	2 per 2,500	20 mins	15 - 20 mins
Indoor Bowls	0.05 rink	1 rink per 20,000	15-20 mins	15 - 20 mins

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

3.2.6 The current deficits in green infrastructure provision and aspiration for additional facilities within Winchester District is set out by area in Table 5. Table 6 sets out the projects under consideration to address green infrastructure need arising from major new development.

**Table 5: Current level of Infrastructure. Deficit in formal and informal provision for the strategic allocations and identified in the Sports facilities study and Parish Plans**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Current Deficits in land for play and sports</b>
<b>Winchester Town and surrounding area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Winchester Town has deficiencies in accessible children's play areas (11.8ha) and sports grounds (&gt;25.4ha).</li><li>• If schools sign up to community use agreements, the town should be able to provide enough play pitch sites to meet future demand if suitable ancillary facilities are provided. Some schools could improve community access to their facilities such as Westgate Schools, Sparsholt College and Henry Beaufort School which is looking into providing synthetic turf pitches (STP)<sup>23</sup>.</li><li>• There is an opportunity to provide joint STPs for Winchester Rugby Club, Winchester Football Club and for the local community.</li><li>• There is also a need for another indoor netball court in Winchester and a 2 court basketball venue in the sub-region which was looking towards the Building Schools for the Future programme which has now been axed, to deliver this.</li><li>• Indoor courts are planned for Winchester Tennis and Squash Club.</li></ul>

---

• <sup>23</sup> Sports Facility Report - Winchester District. May 2009. Sport Hampshire and IOW

Area	Current Deficits in land for play and sports
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an aim to provide at least one NEAP per main segment of the city and provide at least one multi sports area per major housing area of the city. Some additional facilities have already been provided.<sup>24</sup></li> <li>• Land at North Winchester and Bushfield Camp has been proposed for additional sports provision in the Adopted Local Plan Review (2006).</li> <li>• North Winchester has deficits in the ANGSt natural green space standards; the Strategic Allocation therefore included land east of the railway for green infrastructure.</li> <li>• There are opportunities to create links with Forestry Commission land at West Wood, Micheldever Wood and Black Wood and at HCC land at Farley Mount. HCC is working with FC to produce a landscape scale improvement plan for Farley Mount Country Park.</li> </ul>
North Whiteley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Whiteley Parish Plan states that local residents would like to see improved access to outside leisure activities through better bus services. They would also like to see their open space and woodlands protected from development.</li> <li>• The <a href="#">Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study</a> recommends that a 25m x 6 lane swimming pool and 4 court sports hall is needed at the proposed new strategic development area at Whiteley to serve the south of the District.</li> <li>• The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study - Built Facilities Study also identified that the quality of outdoor football pitches in Whiteley needs to be improved or additional facilities provided.</li> <li>• North Whiteley is not within 10km of an accessible natural green space site of at least 500 ha (which is one of the ANGSt standards), although there is a country park within close proximity of the site. There is also extensive woodland managed by the FC and HCC immediately adjoining the site. The South Downs National Park is not considered an accessible green space, but it is within 10km of the site.</li> </ul>

<sup>24</sup> [Open Space Strategy 2010-2011 Winchester City Council](#)

Area	Current Deficits in land for play and sports
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West of Waterlooville is not within 10km of an accessible natural green space site of at least 500 ha (which is one of the ANGSt standards). The South Downs National Park is not considered an accessible green space but it is within 10km of the site. The Forestry Commission owns and manages the nearby Creech Wood (which forms part of the Forest of Bere), where there are opportunities to enhance the site for further recreation, wood fuel and wildlife benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Fareham SDA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fareham SDA is not within 10km of an accessible natural green space site of at least 500 ha (which is one of the ANGST standards). The South Downs National Park is not considered an accessible green space but it is within 10km of the site. The Forestry Commission has a total of 550ha of woodland in Winchester District (which form the largest area of woodland in the Forest of Bere), some of which may link via linear access routes with the Fareham SDA.</li> </ul>
<b>Stanmore</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Stanmore Community Action Plan identifies a need to improve recreational facilities for young people.</li> </ul>
<b>Olivers Battery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an undersupply of hockey pitches in Olivers Battery which does have teams playing within the ward.</li> </ul>
<b>New Alresford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Alresford has deficiencies in both children's play areas (-1.6ha) and sports grounds (-1.5ha).</li> <li>• There are improvements proposed at Alrebury Park to provide additional play space and a new Local Area for Play (LAP) is proposed. In addition, a new rugby pitch is proposed near Alrebury Park and improvements to the tennis courts and clubhouse are proposed.</li> <li>• Within their Town Health Check, residents also identify a need for more recreational green space and a range of activities. They would also like to identify a site for allotments and a swimming pool, however the pool at River Park, Winchester meets the strategic requirement for the catchment including New Alresford and the Council would therefore not support a new pool at Alresford.</li> <li>• New Alresford has deficits in all accessible Natural Green Space under the ANGSt standards.</li> </ul>

<b>Area</b>	<b>Current Deficits in land for play and sports</b>
<b>Sparsholt</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an undersupply of hockey pitches in Sparsholt which does have teams playing within the ward and also a shortfall in junior rugby pitches.</li> </ul>
<b>South Wonston</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The South Wonston Village Plan sets out that residents would like to have an allotment site within their settlement.</li> </ul>
<b>Otterbourne</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sports facilities study reports that public tennis courts are needed at Otterbourne.</li> </ul>
<b>Old Alresford, Warnford and Southwick &amp; Widley, Twyford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have an undersupply of cricket pitches available.</li> </ul>
<b>Itchen Valley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sports facilities study reports that public tennis courts are needed in the Itchen Valley.</li> </ul>
<b>Compton and Shawford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sports facilities study reports that additional tennis courts and floodlights are needed on one of its courts to allow for increased demand.</li> </ul>
<b>Bighton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an undersupply of adult football pitches at peak times.</li> </ul>
<b>Bishops Waltham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, Bishops Waltham has sufficient land available for play and sports as assessed against the Adopted Local Plan Standards. However, the northern area of the town has poor access to these facilities and the eastern area of the town has poor access to Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAP).</li> <li>• Improvements to play and sports facilities are proposed such as additional tennis courts with a new LEAP at Jubilee Hall and Priory Park (and NEAP) and at Pondside.</li> <li>• The Parish Council would also like to see improvements/maintenance and public ownership of North and South Ponds.</li> </ul>

<b>Area</b>	<b>Current Deficits in land for play and sports</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bishops Waltham Healthcheck identified a desire for indoor sports facilities, however the facilities at Swanmore College meet the strategic demand for a catchment that includes Bishops Waltham.</li> <li>Bishops Waltham has deficits in all accessible natural green space under the ANGSt standards. However it is a main gateway to the South Downs National Park.</li> </ul>
<b>Wickham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Open Space Strategy 2010/11 identifies a shortfall of land for children's play and sports grounds in Wickham.</li> <li>The Wickham Parish Plan 2004 identifies an objective to maintain and upgrade children's play areas, the Parish Council are funding this work and some of the improvements have now been carried out.</li> <li>The Sports facilities study reports that additional public tennis courts are needed in the Wickham sub-area. The Parish Council are considering the proposal for the installation of two tennis courts to be run by Wickham Tennis Club.</li> </ul>
<b>Denmead</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sports facilities study reports that the tennis facilities in Denmead need to be increased. The Forestry Commission owns and manages Creech Wood adjacent to the settlement (which forms part of the Forest of Bere), where there are opportunities to enhance the site for further recreation, wood fuel and wildlife benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Rural communities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general there is a need for accessible community and village halls suitable to accommodate a range of sporting activities in key rural settlements (The Sport Facility Report).</li> </ul>

Table 6: Infrastructure measures being considered.

<b>Area</b>	<b>Measures under consideration</b>	<b>Funding mechanism</b>	<b>General Comments:</b>
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of public open space in accordance with categories in the standard in Tables 3 and 4 above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer contribution. Developers to layout and equip open space provision.</li> </ul>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<p>would be required, including provision of children's and young people's play equipment and sports facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancement of environmentally sensitive areas within and around sites. Provision of foot and cycle routes within greenspace to integrate with adjoining areas</li> <li>• Management of open areas on/off site for biodiversity enhancement</li> <li>• Increasing the carrying capacity of existing open space by design or land procurement to provide improved recreation and biodiversity benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land given freely by developer.</li> <li>• Developer /voluntary organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals should look at options to avoid impacts to designated sites before looking at mitigation measures which may be required to remove or reduce impacts on designated sites.</li> </ul>
North Whiteley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public open space will be provided in accordance with categories in the standards given in Tables 3 and 4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.3 ha Sports Pitches</li> <li>- LEAPS x8</li> <li>- NEAPS x2</li> <li>- LAPS x12</li> <li>- MUGA x11</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Off-site, there will be enhancement of environmentally sensitive areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be funded through developer contributions. Costs yet to be determined. Revenue/maintenance costs estimated at £2.1m. Local facilities to be provided at phase 1 and strategic facilities at Phase 3.</li> <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions and possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for sports pitches may be reduced depending on the nature/ extent of the community element of the schools.</li> <li>• Proposals should look at options to avoid impacts to</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<p>within and around the site, including recreation and biodiversity enhancement. Provision of natural play facilities, foot and cycle routes within greenspace to integrate with adjoining parts of the area will be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of improved access and management arrangements for adjoining woodland and other mitigation measures.</li> </ul>	<p>grants from NE. Costs to be established. May include things such as on/off site ranger walks/ natural play in Whiteley Pastures and enhanced biodiversity. Will be delivered throughout development.</p>	<p>designated sites before looking at mitigation measures which may be required to remove or reduce impacts on designated sites. Target linked to viability testing and other essential infrastructure costs.</p>
West of Waterlooville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of public open space in accordance with categories in the standard in Tables 3 and 4 including provision of informal pitches (estimated to be 73ha which excludes built facilities, allotments and play areas).</li> <li>• Commuted sum (£9/ha with an estimate to be 73ha which excludes built facilities, allotments and play areas).</li> <li>• Sports facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– cricket pitch</li> <li>– MUGA</li> <li>– MUSA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions at an estimated cost of <b>£2.2m</b> in a phased approach.</li> <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions at an estimated cost of <b>£6.57m</b> in a phased payment approach when adopted.</li> <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£3.125m</b> in a phased approach.</li> </ul>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– youth shelter</li> <li>– skateboard park</li> <li>– ancillary facilities such as changing rooms, toilets</li> <li>– children's and young people's play equipment</li> <li>– Allotments</li>   <li>• Commuted sum (50% the capital costs)</li>   <li>• Contribution to existing leisure centre</li>   <li>• Contribution to artificial sports pitches off site</li>   <li>• Provide a Multi Use Greenway link from Taylor Wimpey site to Purbrook Heath</li>   <li>• Contribution for off site green links</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£1.563m</b> upon completion of each facility.</li>   <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£0.736m</b></li>   <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£0.124m</b></li>   <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£0.160m</b></li>   <li>• Will be funded by developer contributions (Grainger) at an estimated cost of <b>£0.083m</b></li> </ul>	

- 3.2.7 Winchester District currently has a deficiency in all built facilities when measured against the standards. By 2026, it is predicted that 3 Sports Halls, more than 2 swimming pools, 528 Gym stations, 2 synthetic turf pitches, 34 outdoor tennis courts and 6 indoor bowls rinks are needed across the District to meet the predicted shortfall<sup>25</sup>. The data showing the extent of the deficiencies can be found in Appendix 2 of [The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study - Built Facilities Study](#)
- 3.2.8 However this has to be balanced against the fact that in some instances adequate facilities are available nearby in adjoining districts. There are opportunities to improve the usage of existing facilities, to provide better access and introduce more shared facility use between schools and communities. The Sport Facility Report recommends that the quality and suitability of facilities also needs improving in many of the existing facilities. There also needs to be better provision for young people as there is a lack of facilities for teenagers compared with younger children, facilities like combined wheel parks and basketball courts and more adventurous play facilities could be provided.
- 3.2.9 The Council produce an Open Space Strategy annually which sets out the deficiencies in recreational space where developer contributions will be targeted. The Council are looking to adopt the built facilities standards through the Core Strategy. The ANGSt standards provide useful initial guidance for identifying deficits in natural greenspace, however characteristics of the site such as capacity, sensitivity and accessibility of sites is a way of identifying available greenspace. Some smaller sites may be more robust and be able to take a greater degree of usage than some more sensitive or less accessible sites, however sites will need to be appropriate in scale, quality and accessibility if they are to effectively attract visitors and to divert pressure away from more sensitive sites<sup>26</sup>.
- 3.2.10 Currently there is no general deficit in informal greenspace for the District, but there is an issue with quality (especially to the south of the district) and more robust greenspace is needed particularly around the larger urban areas. Predicted population and visitor growth is expected to increase visits to country parks by 16% which will put additional pressure on existing sites. HCC has raised concerns that the sites it owns and manages which have valuable wildlife habitats are more sensitive to recreation and access pressures and therefore do not have the capacity to take increasing visitor numbers. There are nine Local Nature Reserve in the district totalling 108.7ha all in HCC ownership (ANGSt standards aim for one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population).
- 3.2.11 The Forestry Commission's actively managed woodland provides a robust model for biodiversity protection and contributions toward new infrastructure would increase their recreation potential. Concepts like the Forestry Commissions 'Natural Play' facilities and 'Woodland Parks' provide benefits for family and individual recreation as well as tourism opportunities for the wider economy.

---

<sup>25</sup> [Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study also known as Winchester City Council PPG17 Study March 2008 – 2026 - Built Facilities Study](#)

<sup>26</sup> More information is available in Natural England's 'Nature Nearby' publication.

- 3.2.12 With this in mind, there are opportunities to link in with Green Infrastructure sites managed by organisations such as the Forestry Commission who own and manage over 4,000 hectares of woodland in Winchester District and another 420 hectares in neighbouring Districts which could also be used to provide Green Infrastructure. To the West of Winchester is West Wood (over 250ha which forms part of HCC Farley Mount Country Park), to the North the Forestry Commission also has landholdings at Micheldever and Black Wood (720ha), and to the south Whitely Pastures (Whiteley), Creech (near Denmead) and West Walk (near the proposed Fareham SDA). A number of these sites are designated for the nature conservation interest (SSSI, SINC) and their capability to accommodate additional recreational pressure, without affecting their biodiversity interest, will need to be assessed when considering any plan or project which may have an impact on these sites. The creation of a country park covering the woodlands that form the Forest of Bere would assist in alleviating additional pressure from new development on other sites such as the New Forest.
- 3.2.13 Locally, there is a lack of greenspace close to settlements for casual walking and there are significant gaps in the Rights of Way (RoW) network (particularly to the West of Winchester and between the disused rail line and the A34) with major roads separating routes and a lack of circular walks. HCC has suggested areas of potential for improving linkages to RoW; there is also a suggestion of a 'green bridge' link at Twyford Down.
- 3.2.14 The economic benefits of Green Infrastructure are manifold and must be taken into consideration when looking at cost effective management and delivery of multifunctional green spaces. Tourism, the production of natural resources (food, timber and woodfuel) or other market based solutions are just some of the economic benefits of Green Infrastructure that can help offset the cost of recreation and biodiversity enhancements. Projects which can demonstrate more cost-effective delivery are more likely to be prioritised for implementation.

### **Time Line**

- 3.2.15 Large scale facilities especially built facilities are long term projects. Short term gains in GI will be secured through development and contributions to the Open Space fund.
- 3.2.16 Significant areas of open space will be delivered in the near future to help mitigate and avoid the impacts of the strategic sites. These will have to link with other GI in the area.

### **Risks**

- 3.2.17 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of possible increased recreation pressure from the scale of development proposed on European sites of nature conservation value (SACs and SPAs) including the New Forest National Park, and important landscapes of the South Downs National Park. Proposed mitigation measures such as providing sufficient green space on site or within close proximity of the site (through working with the Council's partners) may not be sufficient to determine that the plan or project is not likely to have a significant effect on the suite of SPAs and SACs. In these cases an Appropriate

Assessment under the Habitats (& Cons) Regulations will be required. Impacts on the nationally important landscape of the South Downs National Park will also need to be assessed. This could reduce the amount of potential developable land that is available in the south of the District and place more pressure on sites in other areas of the District.

### **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.2.18 The existing Open Space Strategy enables the Council to require developer contributions for outdoor and play facilities, but currently not for built facilities. Funding expected to be provided through developer contributions is set out in the Open Space Strategy Contribution Scales 2010-2011 as shown in tables 7 and 8 below.

Table 7: Funding. Children's Play

DWELLING SIZE	AREA REQUIRED M <sup>2</sup>	SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS A (high) <sup>27</sup>	SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS B (low)
One Bed	12	£ 582	£ 528
Two Bed	20	971	875
Three Bed	24	1165	1044
Four+ Bed	32	1554	1398

Table 8: Funding. Sports Grounds

DWELLING SIZE	AREA REQUIRED M <sup>2</sup>	SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS A (high)	SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS B (low)
One Bed	24	£ 582	£ 528
Two Bed	40	971	875
Three Bed	48	1165	1044
Four+ Bed	64	1554	1398

- 3.2.19 Funding for Green Infrastructure is expected through developer contributions where appropriate, and includes contributions towards creating new and managing existing woodlands to further increase Green Infrastructure capacity which can be used to connect networks and enhance assets: the Forestry

---

<sup>27</sup> See the [Open Space Strategy Contribution Scales](#) for information on which settlements fit into the different scale categories.

Commission may also be able to get some funding towards this. They can also use their England Woodland Grant Scheme to help private landowners improve environmental and social aspects of their future or existing woodlands and forests. Their capital programme will therefore depend upon the development strategy adopted by Winchester, and where the deficiencies in GI are identified. The Forestry Commission have an annual programme of incremental capacity growth based in visitor numbers and funded by the BIG Lottery Fund and Site Revenue.

### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Developer Contributions
  - Natural England
  - Forestry Commission
  - Hampshire County Council
  - Wildlife Trust
  - Local Planning Authorities
- 

## **3.3 Housing - Affordable Housing**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document \(2008\) Winchester City Council](#)
- [Central Hampshire Sub-Region Housing Viability Study \(2008\)](#) Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council, Winchester City Council
- The current [Housing Strategy for 2008/9 – 2012/13](#) sets out the Council's vision and priorities for the five year period; this is reviewed annually. These have been used to inform the development of affordable housing policies in the Core Strategy.
- [Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing 2010 DCLG](#)
- [Providing a Context and setting Priorities in Accommodation and Care for Older People in Hampshire \(2007\) Nigel Appleton / Contact Consulting](#)
- [Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 \(2009\) Winchester Housing Board](#)
- [Statement on Affordable homes and Extra Care Housing \(January 2011\) Hampshire County Council](#)

- The Housing Green Paper 2008
- [The Partnership for Extra Care Housing in Hampshire \(2008\)](#) Hampshire County Council and District and Borough Councils and Hampshire PCT.
- [Winchester City Council Affordable Housing Viability Study \(2010\)](#) Adams Integra
- [Winchester City Council Local Connections Study \(2010\)](#) Adams Integra

### **Definition of Affordable Housing Infrastructure**

- 3.3.1 Planning Policy Statement 3 provides the following definition for affordable housing.  
*“Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.*  
*Affordable housing should:*
- *Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices.*
  - *Include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.”*
- 3.3.2 Extra care is a specialist housing provision for older people who wish to retain their independence in their own flats with shared private/public communal space and where accessible care is provided at all times. Ideally new build Extra Care homes should be of a 2 bed minimum size and should have shared community space. The communal space may contribute to the community infrastructure.
- 3.3.3 Provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites will need to be the subject of a separate study.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- 3.3.4 The Winchester Housing Board, which comes under the umbrella of the Winchester District Local Strategic Partnership, is responsible for developing the Winchester Housing Strategy.
- 3.3.5 WCC is a lead organisation for affordable housing. Under various legislative duties, the Council is responsible for assessing the current and future affordable and market housing needs for the District (Housing Acts 1985 and 2004 amongst others) and identifying land for housing as well as setting policies for the development of new housing. The Council is also responsible for assessing the quality of the housing stock in the private and social sector and commission housing support services. In addition, under the Housing Act 1996 and Homeless Act 2002, the Council has a duty to accommodate priority need homeless households.
- 3.3.6 At the local level, Housing Associations are the main providers of affordable housing, primarily new homes for rent but they also run shared ownership schemes. They are funded by the Homes and Communities Agency and regulated by the Tenant Services Authority. The majority of affordable housing

units recently built in the District have been provided in conjunction with market housing development.

- 3.3.7 Hampshire County Council Adult Services works with Local Authorities and RSLs on Extra Care housing developments and ancillary community facilities supported by Government grant funding.

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.3.8 The [Homes and Community Agency](#) sets the standards for affordable housing, which includes minimum internal floorspace standards and standards for the space around the home. The Agency is currently in the process of consulting on new standards.
- 3.3.9 The Hampshire Alliance for Affordable Rural Housing (HARAH) has a target of 100 completed homes per annum within rural Hampshire. There is no specific target for Winchester District.
- 3.3.10 All Homes and Communities Agency grant aided affordable housing should adopt Building for Life Principles and apply for the 'silver' award achieving a score of at least 14<sup>28</sup> (out of 20). They should achieve at least Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 (level 4 from 2011) and where appropriate should be built to Lifetime Homes Standards.
- 3.3.11 It is estimated that there should be 12.5 Extra Care units available for rent and 12.5 leasehold Extra Care units per 1,000 population.
- 3.3.12 There are no adopted standards for market housing at this time, although all new housing developments should be assessed against level 3 (level 4 from 2011) of the Code for Sustainable Homes which will be partly driven by the requirements of the new Building Regulations which came into force in 2010. It is also strongly encouraged that new market housing is assessed against the Building for Life standards. New government policy is to encourage local communities to develop their own standards to ensure that new housing has a positive impact on the local area.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

#### Affordable Housing

- 3.3.13 There are currently 5,076 affordable homes for rent by the Council and 2197<sup>29</sup> under RSL management. Most are 1, 2 or 3 bed properties ([data March 2009](#)). On average, empty properties are re-let within 42 days. There are in total over 2,800 people on the housing waiting list who are seeking social rented accommodation with 500 seeking intermediate affordable housing. It is thought that many more may be in need of affordable housing, but have not made contact with housing and advice agencies<sup>30</sup>. Of the 2800, 950 were current tenants wishing to move into alternative social housing and around 400 were 60 years of age or over (2008 data). The largest numbers of applicants registered

---

<sup>28</sup> [Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document \(2008\) Winchester City Council](#)

<sup>29</sup> [Regulatory and Statistical Return Data, 2009.Tenant Services Authority](#)

<sup>30</sup> [Housing Strategy for 2008/9 – 2012/13](#)

were within the range of 25– 34 years of age. The current level of affordable housing stock by parish is set out in tables 9 and 10 below.

- 3.3.14 The number of households on the Council's Housing Register has increased by over 50% since 2001. In 2009, WCC launched a choice based letting system which allows households on the register to choose their preferred properties; this is likely to have increased the number of registered households, as the area from which potential residents can express an interest has been greatly widened. The greatest affordable housing need is within Winchester Town.
- 3.3.15 The [Strategic Housing Market Assessment](#) (SHMA) was updated in 2010 and estimates that there will be an annualised shortfall of 375 new affordable homes per year to meet the existing backlog and the forecasted new arising needs. The report noted that there was a particular requirement for 3 bedroom rented properties. In addition, the Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study also highlights the need for social housing to be available for vulnerable working age adults to be supported within communities. This would include adults with learning difficulties or with mental health problems for example.
- 3.3.16 The proposed approach is therefore to maximise affordable housing supported by the SHMA which recommends that the amount and range of affordable housing provision should be increased. The emerging Core Strategy (CS) proposes that this will be achieved by the removal of thresholds, so that all new residential development contributes to new affordable housing supply, and the introduction of a district-wide 40% quota for provision. The SHMA also identifies a particular need for affordable homes for social rent and affordable family homes which is reflected in the emerging CS and which proposes that normally 70% of affordable homes should be for social rent.
- 3.3.17 Within the PUSH area, the majority of new affordable housing will be provided as part of new market housing sites within the strategic allocations. There will, however, be a need for some provision within the market towns and rural area, with the scale of affordable housing appropriate to the level of the settlement. In the rest of the District, sites for affordable housing may need to be identified. The Core Strategy Preferred Option proposes that where there is a need for affordable homes to meet the needs of a particular community, there may sometimes be a need to allow Local Connection Homes on land that would not otherwise be released for housing (within or adjoining a settlement), through Policy CP20.

Table 9: Current level of Infrastructure. Affordable housing stock in each rural parish from the Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 (2009) Winchester Housing Board<sup>31</sup>.

Affordable housing stock in each rural parish												
Parish	Bedrooms					RSL Stock	WCC Stock	Total affordable housing stock	No. of affordable vacancies forecast per annum (8% turnover)	No. of dwellings in parish	% of affordable housing in parish	Housing need in relation to number of affordable vacancies <sup>32</sup>
	1	2	3	4	5							
Bighton	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	0.24	133	2.26	19.83
Bishops Sutton	7	4	2	0	0	5	8	13	1.04	182	7.14	7.31
Bishops Waltham	116	104	160	1	0	87	294	381	30.48	2704	14.09	0.16
Boarhunt	4	7	13	0	0	9	15	24	1.92	208	11.54	2.84
Bramdean	4	8	5	0	0	1	16	17	1.36	204	8.33	6.41
Cheriton	3	5	9	3	0	2	18	20	1.6	263	7.6	5.93
Colden Common	67	99	57	2	0	75	150	225	18	1620	13.89	0.28
Compton & Shawford	17	37	13	0	0	20	47	67	5.36	553	12.12	0.76
C'hampton & M'stoke	22	10	7	0	0	18	21	39	3.12	290	13.45	1.36
Crawley	1	3	3	0	0	0	7	7	0.56	175	4	7.76
Curdridge	16	6	11	0	0	0	33	33	2.64	493	6.69	1.2
Denmead	105	35	73	1	0	48	166	214	17.12	2462	8.69	0.18
Droxford	8	10	16	0	0	14	20	34	2.72	263	12.93	3.81
Durley	9	12	11	0	0	14	18	32	2.56	368	8.7	1.9

<sup>31</sup> This information is taken from the [Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 \(2009\) Winchester Housing Board](#) and is not available for the Winchester Town wards as the project was to substantiate the need for exceptions housing in the rural areas.

<sup>32</sup> Calculation is the Housing need as % of households in the parish / number of affordable vacancies per annum for that parish

Affordable housing stock in each rural parish												
Parish	Bedrooms					RSL Stock	WCC Stock	Total affordable housing stock	No. of affordable vacancies forecast per annum (8% turnover)	No. of dwellings in parish	% of affordable housing in parish	Housing need in relation to number of affordable vacancies <sup>32</sup>
	1	2	3	4	5							
<b>Exton</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0.08	104	0.96	38.66
<b>Hambledon</b>	12	9	20	0	0	12	29	41	3.28	429	9.56	2.57
<b>Headbourne Worthy</b>	3	3	7	0	0	0	13	13	1.04	207	6.28	8.69
<b>Hursley</b>	13	13	1	0	0	0	27	27	2.16	358	7.54	3.07
<b>Itchen Stoke &amp; O'ton</b>		2	1	0	0	0	3	3	0.24	102	2.94	41.21
<b>Itchen Valley</b>	17	21	17	1	0	9	47	56	4.48	597	9.38	0.9
<b>Kilmeston</b>	2	2	3	0	0	0	7	7	0.56	105	6.67	10.93
<b>Kingsworthy</b>	77	172	85	1	1	69	267	336	26.88	1665	20.18	0.37
<b>Littleton &amp; Harestock</b>	28	5	21	0	0	58	13	71	5.68	1413	5.02	1.78
<b>Harestock</b>	0	0	0	0	0	54	0	54	4.32			
<b>Littleton</b>	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	17	1.36			
<b>Micheldever</b>	10	30	43	0	0	44	39	83	6.64	520	15.96	1.16
<b>New Alresford</b>	99	115	94	1	0	47	262	309	24.72	2282	13.54	0.21
<b>Old Alresford</b>	5	12	13	0	0	8	22	30	2.4	223	13.45	9.45
<b>Otterbourne</b>	7	16	9	0	0	4	28	32	2.56	586	5.46	2.25
<b>Owslebury</b>	13	19	11	1	0	0	44	44	3.52	307	14.33	1.6
<b>Shedfield</b>	31	23	26	0	0	28	52	80	6.4	1498	5.34	0.86
<b>Shedfield</b>	20	11	22	0	0	17	36	53	4.24			
<b>Shirrell Heath</b>	1	6	4	0	0	7	4	11	0.88			
<b>Waltham Chase</b>	10	6		0	0	4	12	16	1.28			
<b>Soberton</b>		6	8	0	0	8	6	14	1.12	623	2.25	2.19
<b>South Wonston</b>	4	7	8	0	0	10	9	19	1.52	1088	1.75	1.86

Affordable housing stock in each rural parish												
Parish	Bedrooms					RSL Stock	WCC Stock	Total affordable housing stock	No. of affordable vacancies forecast per annum (8% turnover)	No. of dwellings in parish	% of affordable housing in parish	Housing need in relation to number of affordable vacancies <sup>32</sup>
	1	2	3	4	5							
<b>Southwick &amp; Widley</b>	2	8	12	0	0	0	22	22	1.76	304	7.24	2.84
<b>Sparsholt</b>	8	13	50	0	0	30	41	71	5.68	274	25.91	1.91
<b>Swanmore</b>	24	25	47	0	0	10	86	96	7.68	1073	8.95	0.68
<b>Twyford</b>	24	33	24	1	0	6	76	82	6.56	629	13.04	1.39
<b>Upham</b>	2	4	4	0	0	0	10	10	0.8	256	3.91	5.95
<b>Warnford</b>	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	5	0.4	92	5.43	11.49
<b>West Meon</b>	11	16	21	0	0	9	39	48	3.84	302	15.89	1.75
<b>Whiteley</b>	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	5	0.4			2.96
<b>Wickham</b>	107	150	123	6	0	162	224	386	30.88	2090	18.47	0.15
<b>Wonston</b>	28	53	30	1	0	62	50	112	8.96	580	19.31	1.41
<b>Wonston</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
<b>Sutton Scotney</b>	28	53	30	1	0	62	50	112	8.96			
<b>Total for Rural Area</b>						<b>874</b>	<b>2238</b>	<b>3112</b>				

Table10: Current level of Infrastructure. Number of Households on Housing Register with a local connection to each rural parish from the Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 (2009) Winchester Housing Board<sup>33</sup>.

Number of Households on Housing Register with a local connection to each rural parish									
Parish	Bedrooms					Number on Housing Register			
	1	2	3	4	Total <sup>34</sup>	Total with local connection wishing to live elsewhere	Grand Total	Households in Parish <sup>35</sup>	Housing need as % of households in the parish <sup>36</sup>
Bighton	3	1	2	0	6	10	16	126	4.76
Bishops Sutton	8	1	3	1	13	6	19	171	7.6
Bishops Waltham	68	42	19	0	129	20	149	2649	4.87
Boarhunt	7	1	3	0	11	3	14	202	5.45
Bramdean	6	6	4	1	17	7	24	195	8.72
Cheriton	11	5	7	1	24	12	36	253	9.49
Colden Common	45	28	5	1	79	26	105	1589	4.97
Compton	13	8	1	0	22	3	25	539	4.08
Corhampton & Meonstoke	4	3	4	1	12	1	13	282	4.26
Crawley	4	1	1	1	7	9	16	161	4.35
Curdridge	8	6	1	0	15	5	20	473	3.17
Denmead	38	16	19	0	73	7	80	2427	3.01
Droxford	13	7	5	1	26	8	34	251	10.36
Durley	5	8	4	0	17	8	25	349	4.87
Exton	0	1	2	0	3	3	6	97	3.09
Hambledon	16	8	11	0	35	7	42	416	8.41
Headbourne Worthy	10	2	4	1	17	7	24	188	9.04

<sup>33</sup> This information is taken from the [Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 \(2009\) Winchester Housing Board](#) and is not available for the Winchester Town wards as the project was to substantiate the need for exceptions housing in the rural areas.

<sup>34</sup> Total applications to housing register with a local connection who also wish to live in that parish

<sup>35</sup> Source: Office for National Statistics using 2001 Census

<sup>36</sup> The total number of applications to the housing register with a local connection as a percentage of households in parish

Number of Households on Housing Register with a local connection to each rural parish									
Parish	Bedrooms					Number on Housing Register			
	1	2	3	4	Total <sup>34</sup>	Total with local connection wishing to live elsewhere	Grand Total	Households in Parish <sup>35</sup>	Housing need as % of households in the parish <sup>36</sup>
Hursley	12	7	4	0	23	7	30	347	6.63
Itchen Stoke & Ovington	6	2	1	0	9	4	13	91	9.89
Itchen Valley	8	11	4	0	23	9	32	572	4.02
Kilmeston	4	1	1	0	6	6	12	98	6.12
Kingsworthy	100	39	20	2	161	48	209	1630	9.88
Littleton & Harestock	89	32	16	3	140	5	145	1381	10.14
<i>Littleton</i>	23	8	7	1	39	12	51		
<i>Harestock</i>	66	24	9	2	101	31	132		
Micheldever	23	12	3	0	38	17	55	494	7.69
New Alresford	79	22	15	2	118	29	147	2233	5.28
Old Alresford	33	9	5	2	49	25	74	216	22.69
Otterbourne	20	10	3	0	33	15	48	573	5.76
Owslebury	9	7	0	1	17	12	29	301	5.65
Shedfield	50	18	14	0	82	12	94	1482	5.53
<i>Shedfield</i>	18	5	7	0	30	5	35		
<i>Shirrell Heath</i>	9	6	2	0	17	3	20		
<i>Waltham Chase</i>	23	7	5	0	35	4	39		
Soberton	10	2	3	0	15	8	23	611	2.45
South Wonston	16	7	6	0	29	16	45	1026	2.83
Southwick	7	3	4	0	14	4	18	280	5
Sparsholt	19	6	2	2	29	10	39	267	10.86
Swanmore	28	15	11	1	55	14	69	1055	5.21
Twyford	36	14	4	2	56	16	72	613	9.14
Upham	3	7	2	0	12	5	17	252	4.76

Number of Households on Housing Register with a local connection to each rural parish									
Parish	Bedrooms					Number on Housing Register			
	1	2	3	4	Total <sup>34</sup>	Total with local connection wishing to live elsewhere	Grand Total	Households in Parish <sup>35</sup>	Housing need as % of households in the parish <sup>36</sup>
Warnford	3	1	0	0	4	2	6	87	4.6
West Meon	13	4	2	1	20	7	27	298	6.71
Whiteley	6	5	4	1	16	4	20	1350	1.19
Wickham	52	20	11	1	84	19	103	1789	4.7
Wonston	31	21	16	0	68	25	93	539	12.62
<i>Wonston</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>26</i>		
<i>Sutton Scotney</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>67</i>		
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1608</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>2112</b>	<b>27953</b>	

Table 11: Infrastructure measures being considered. Affordable Housing proposed within Winchester District for new development

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Preferred Option policy required a minimum of 40% housing provision. If the site is to be developed for 2,000 new dwellings then it is expected that 800 of them may be affordable homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/ RSL/ HCA depending upon grant funding. Costs will depend upon viability testing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1<sup>st</sup> phase, within 5 years</li> </ul>
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Preferred Option policy required a minimum of 40% housing provision. If the site is to be developed for 3,000-3,500 new dwellings then it is expected that 1,200-1,400 of them may be affordable homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/ RSL/ HCA depending upon grant funding. Costs will depend upon viability testing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commensurate with development</li> </ul>
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Preferred Option policy required a minimum of 40% housing provision. If the site is to be developed for 3,000 new dwellings then it is expected that 1,200 of them may be affordable homes. The affordable housing tenure is currently being negotiated for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/ RSL/ HCA depending upon grant funding. Costs will depend upon viability testing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commensurate with development</li> </ul>
<b>Non-PUSH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Preferred Option policy required a minimum of 40% housing provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/ RSL/ HCA depending upon grant funding. Costs will depend upon viability testing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commensurate with development</li> </ul>
<b>PUSH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Preferred Option policy required a minimum of 40% housing provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/ RSL/ HCA depending upon grant funding. Costs will depend upon viability testing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commensurate with development</li> </ul>

## Sheltered Housing and Extra Care Housing

- 3.3.18 In 2008, 11% of people on the housing register were 65 years or over, and it is predicted that the number of “75 and over” households will continue to increase. There are currently over 1,300 affordable sheltered housing units in Winchester and 545 affordable Extra Care housing units in Hampshire. None of the Extra Care units are within Winchester although there is a need for at least 216 units by 2026<sup>37</sup>. The report '[Providing a Context and setting Priorities in Accommodation and Care for Older People in Hampshire](#)' sets out the recent demand for Extra Care accommodation within Hampshire.
- 3.3.19 The Local Strategic Housing Partnership is intending to provide additional Extra Care housing when required resources and suitable sites have been found. New schemes and improvements to existing schemes are being developed in neighbouring districts. Within Winchester there is care accommodation at Victoria House, Danemark Court, Abbotts Lea Cottages and Matilda Court in Winchester and at Whitewings in Denmead and Makins Court in Alresford which may be suitable for increasing care and support to make them Extra Care. This will be dependent on being able to make the Extra Care homes financially sustainable and having funding available to undertake the improvements. Developing community based support services to allow older people to stay in their own homes is also being explored. Current proposals under consideration to provide for Extra Care services within the Strategic Allocations proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Option are set out in Table 12 below.
- 3.3.20 It is important when considering where to locate Extra Care Housing that the location of appropriate health care facilities is taken into account. HCC Extra Care Housing Team and WCC have discussed possibility of developing ECH at West of Waterlooville, but no firm plans are in place as yet.

Table 12: Infrastructure measures being considered. Extra Care Housing proposed within Winchester District

<b>Area</b>	<b>Proposed Extra Care Housing units (figures not yet agreed)</b>
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There is a possibility for improving existing facilities to provide for 24/7 care at Victoria House, Denemark Court and Matilda Court in Winchester and Makins Court in Alresford. Will require WCC contributions</li></ul>
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>unknown– Will require developer contributions</li></ul>
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>60– Will require developer contributions</li></ul>
<b>Rest of PUSH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There is a possibility for improving existing facilities to provide for 24/7 care at Whitewings, Denmead. Will require WCC contributions</li></ul>

<sup>37</sup> From Hampshire County Council Statement on Affordable homes and Extra Care Housing January 2011

- 3.3.21 The proposals to improve existing facilities could result in an additional 150 Extra Care units for the whole District.

### Risks

- 3.3.22 The recent drop in the value of housing has reduced the affordability gap, but it still remains substantial: as the market picks up and house prices increase then the affordability gap will once again widen. Currently affordable housing is not being provided within the District at a sufficient rate to meet the needs of the local population, and those in need of affordable housing might have to look outside the District for accommodation. There is also a strong risk that the lack of affordable housing will lead to severe overcrowding, which in turn will create social and economic pressures including risks to health and educational attainment. This will impact on those with local connections looking for affordable housing and will affect many people of employable age with possible knock on effects on employment and commuting patterns within the District.
- 3.3.23 The population over 65 years of age in Winchester District is predicted to rise from 21,000 in 2010 to 30,000 in 2025. If Extra Care schemes are not progressed then more independent living will not be available for many older people within our District.

### Delivery - Funding and contingencies

- 3.3.24 The majority of affordable housing units recently built in the District have been provided in association with market housing development. Funding for other affordable schemes in Winchester comes from a funding mix from developers, Local Authority capital and a major component comes from Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) central government grants.
- 3.3.25 Funding has been secured from the Homes and Communities Agency for committed projects although recent budget changes and the forthcoming comprehensive spending review means that this funding can no longer be considered secure.
- 3.3.26 Rural areas and settlements of less than 3000 people are eligible for small settlement rural funding from the Homes and Communities Agency. Rural funding is also available for these villages as a separate Homes and Communities Agency funding stream for settlements up to 10,000 population.
- 3.3.27 The Extra Care Housing unit figures have not been agreed in HCC's capital programme: new build schemes will require developer contributions and enhancements will be supported by WCC contributions. Larger developments could provide for Extra Care units through S.106, but Extra Care accommodation is unlikely to be provided through very small housing developments. There is therefore a need to look at alternative ways of providing Extra Care for example through a community based model of care or through clustering accommodation.
- 3.3.28 Funding may also be sought through private funding, RSLs, HCC, WCC grant funding, Department of Health, exception sites and developer contributions. Funding options will be explored for further Extra Care homes development.

HCC and WCC will act as enabling partners to provide Extra Care housing, but the facility would be owned and run by an RSL.

- 3.3.29 There are no contingencies identified: if funding is not secured, then schemes will not progress. Table 13 below sets out the estimated costs of providing affordable housing based on information published in 2005.

Table 13: The total estimated costs of affordable housing provision calculated based on the 2005 Roger Tym Report.

These figures were published in 2005 and therefore should only be used as an estimation until more up-to-date figures are available.

Affordable housing	Land costs per unit	Comments
<b>Average cost of providing serviced land for affordable housing</b>	<b>£0.035m</b>	Cost of developer providing land and off site infrastructure. Usually provided free of charge to RSL. On exception sites, HARAH have a general principle of paying circa £8,000 per plot depending upon site constraints/
<b>Construction, groundwork and sundry costs</b>	<b>£0.05m</b>	
<b>Total estimated cost</b>	<b>£0.105m</b>	This average value is described as being highly variable due to the different construction costs involved.
From the above total it is estimated that RSLs will usually borrow around £0.05m per unit and the remaining £0.055m will either be provided through the developer providing free land and the subsidy of the extra £0.02m needed for social rented housing, or this would have to come from the public purse.		

- 3.3.30 The City Council will seek as much affordable housing as possible through new development, but continued availability of housing grant will be necessary to support the levels of affordable housing. However, the relatively short term nature of the funding mechanisms for affordable housing through the HCA and the Regional Housing Board introduces uncertainty into the process, making long-term delivery of affordable housing difficult to plan.

### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- 3.3.31 The primary agents for delivering affordable housing will be the RSLs, in close cooperation with the Council and HCA and with developer funding. Any significant amount of affordable housing can only come through the development of market housing. With the slowdown in development the number of affordable units coming forward is also likely to be reduced.
- 3.3.32 The County Council together with cross council partners on the Hampshire Senate and Hampshire Alliance for Rural Affordable Housing has launched the 'Project 500' initiative to bring forward available County Council and partner

held landholdings with the aim of providing 500 high quality and sustainable affordable homes on suitable sites.

---

### **3.4 Education provision**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- Active Communities
- Prosperous Economy

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Children's Services Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2012/13](#)
- [Developers' Contributions towards Children's Services Facilities 2010 Hampshire County Council](#)
- [School Places Plan \(Annual\) Hampshire County Council](#)
- [University of Winchester Masterplan, 2009. Report to Planning Committee CAB 1757, 21 May 2009](#)

#### **Definition of Education Infrastructure**

- 3.4.1 Education covers nursery, primary (4-11), secondary (11-16), further education (post 16) higher education (post 18) and special education in the District, both in state run and independent schools. This section also includes Children's Centres which are mainly targeted at the under 5s and their families to provide integrated services.

#### **Lead Organisations involved**

- Children's Centres are provided by HCC
- Nursery schools are registered with HCC Early Education and Childcare Unit and may be private or publicly funded.
- Children's Services at HCC is the lead authority for primary, secondary and special education within the District, although faith groups also have a vital role in providing education in the district. It is not known at the present stage how many of these have or will apply for academy status.
- 6<sup>th</sup> Form education is provided by separate 6<sup>th</sup> Form colleges.
- Further education was directed by the Learning and Skills Council which has now been replaced by the Young People's Learning Agency and the Skills Funding Agency.
- Higher education organisations such as universities are independent bodies.
- There are a number of independent/public schools offering primary and secondary education.

3.4.2 Changes in the Government's policy for the provision of education will mean that other agencies including parents, local communities and the private sector are likely in the future to be more active in meeting local education needs.

### **Standards/triggers**

3.4.3 HCC has set standards on the optimum number of pupils for a school to be viable in their 2009 School Places Plan. HCC policy is that a school should be considered as full when it has 5% or less spare capacity:-

#### Primary schools

- Should not normally have fewer than 60 pupils.
- HCC policy is that new primary schools should be delivered in new developments which are big enough to support their own provision. New schools should be within 800m (20min walking) of pupil's homes and should be close to local facilities.
- HCC use the general calculation that a new development will generate an additional 0.3 children per new dwelling of 2 or more bedrooms (excluding housing specifically for the elderly) of primary school age (ages 4 to 11).

#### Secondary schools

- A new secondary school is unlikely to be provided for less than 900 students. Expansions to existing schools beyond the optimum pupil numbers to accommodate growing numbers of school pupils may be more suitable than providing a new school. However, proposals to expand an existing school beyond 1,600 students will have to be carefully weighed up against the provision of a new school.
- New schools should be within 800m (20min walking) of pupil's homes but can be located on the periphery of new development.
- HCC use the general calculation that a new development will generate an additional 0.21 children per new dwelling of 2 or more bedrooms (excluding housing specifically for the elderly) of secondary school age (ages 11 to 16).

3.4.4 Where developments are large enough to justify new schools, in general HCC would expect as a minimum the following areas of land to be provided free of charge by the developer for schools development (fully serviced and cleared):

- 1 Form entry primary (210 places): 1.2 hectares
- 2 Form entry primary (420 places): 2.0 hectares
- 3 Form entry primary (630 places): 2.8 hectares
- Secondary school – area will depend upon size of school proposed.

3.4.5 Where a development is not large enough to justify a new school, it is expected that the additional pupils from the development will be served by the nearest school. In these cases, developer contributions may be sought to address the capacity or suitability issues affecting existing schools.

## **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

### Children's Centres

- 3.4.6 Children's centres are provided across the District with the aim of providing services to all parishes. Three more centres are planned to ensure all families in the District have access to a local centre: - one at Kings Worthy Primary School to cater for Kings Worthy, Micheldever, Wonston and Itchen Valley; one at Bishops Waltham Library to cater for Bishops Waltham, Owslebury and Curdridge and Colden Common and one at Denmead Infant School to cater for Denmead, Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon, Swanmore and Newton and Upper Meon Valley.

### Primary and Secondary Schools

- 3.4.7 There are many primary schools and 5 state run secondary schools in the District; Swanmore, Perins (Alresford), Kings, Henry Beaufort and Westgate in Winchester, and Peter Symonds Sixth Form College. All have some degree of community use. There are several independent schools including Chiltern Tutorial School, Princes Mead School, Rookesbury Park School, St Swithun's School, Twyford School and Winchester College.
- 3.4.8 Within the non-PUSH area of the District, there is insufficient primary education capacity in Winchester City and New Alresford to accommodate the predicted increased demand for school places over the next five years. Some additional secondary education capacity is also required to meet future requirements suggested through the former SE Plan housing allocations. No additional demand for special education is anticipated.
- 3.4.9 Within the PUSH area of the District, Bishops Waltham and Wickham have substantial surplus spaces giving sufficient capacity to cater for the level of additional demand suggested by the PUSH housing targets. There are substantial deficiencies of primary school provision at Whiteley. Some additional secondary education capacity is required to meet future requirements suggested by the PUSH housing targets. The Strategic Development Allocation at Whiteley could provide a new secondary school which would meet this requirement, as well as additional primary school provision. No additional demand for special education is anticipated.

### Higher Education

- 3.4.10 Higher Educational establishments at the University of Winchester, the Winchester School of Art (Southampton University) and Sparsholt College are located within the District.
- 3.4.11 The University of Winchester has recently opened a 400 bed residence in Winchester town. They are also looking to develop a new 500 bed residence for 2012/13 which will further relieve pressure on housing as a high proportion of students currently live in private rented sector housing.

- 3.4.12 Given these developments, the University of Winchester will be able to meet the needs of their students as well as the higher education students at Sparsholt and the Royal Hampshire County Hospitals' residential requirements for student and locum doctors for the period.
- 3.4.13 The University are also looking to provide an additional 2000 m<sup>2</sup> of teaching space for 2013 as well as a new gym for 2012/12 which will be a community facility to add to the new sports stadium at Bar End which has already opened as a community facility.
- 3.4.14 There is an issue of inadequate road access to King Alfred Campus which will need to be addressed.
- 3.4.15 The measures being considered for education provision planned/required to accommodate future growth is set out in Table 14 below.

Table 14: Infrastructure measures being considered. Education provision planned/required to accommodate future growth

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
Non-PUSH area of Winchester	<p><b>Nursery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-school facilities may be required on site to serve strategic development. This could adjoin other educational or community facilities where provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for more primary school places in part of Winchester Town. There is currently only 4% surplus capacity which is expected to be at over capacity by 7% in 2014.</li> <li>Additional capacity is therefore being provided at Weeke and at St Bedes. Alresford primary schools have 6% surplus places, but are predicted to be over capacity by 2014. Increased capacity may be provided at more schools pending the outcome of HCC reviews and consultations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Secondary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary schools in Winchester Town and Alresford only have a 2% remaining capacity; however by 2014 this is predicted to increase to 6%. At the moment, King's School and The Westgate School are over capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer would provide land. The facility would be funded by the commercial or voluntary sector.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winchester schools proposal (excl Barton Farm) primary school extension <b>£17m</b> and secondary school extension <b>£14m</b></li> <li>Developer contributions have been secured from smaller developments such as Francis Gardens and will be sought from smaller sites where local circumstances allow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No external grant funding is available through central government for additional school places.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
	<p><b>Special Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Lanterns Children's Centre in Winchester is a pre-school with additional integrated therapy and parental support services particularly providing for young children with special educational needs.</li> <li>Shepherds Down Special School at Compton caters for children of primary school age.</li> <li>The Osborne School is located in Winchester Town and caters for secondary school age pupils with complex learning difficulties. There are also boarding facilities for the students.</li> </ul> <p><b>Independent schools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winchester also has a number of independent schools including Winchester College and prep school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Further and Higher Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional facilities have been identified as a requirement of major new development. Training and skills development will be considered.</li> <li>The University has recently completed a 400bed student hall in Winchester Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further residential developments for Winchester University Students are likely to be carried out in</li> </ul>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
	<p>In future they are looking to provide the following additional facilities:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a new 500 bed residence in 2012/13,</li> <li>- additional 2000m<sup>2</sup> teaching space in 3,</li> <li>- a new gym for 2012 which will be a community facility to add to the new sports stadium at Bar End, and</li> <li>- improved road access to King Alfred Campus.</li> </ul>	<p>partnership with private developers.</p>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<p><b>Nursery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-school facilities will be provided on site adjoining other educational or community facilities. 3 sites are to be provided; if no commercial take up, they can return to other uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires at least two new primary schools with up to 5FE</li> </ul> <p><b>Secondary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires one new secondary school up to 8FE to also serve the existing population of Whiteley - may be some community access.</li> </ul> <p><b>Further and higher</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional facilities required for this development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer will provide land. The facility will be funded by the commercial or voluntary sector. – Cost to be established. Site to be delivered in phase 1, then 3 and 5.</li> <li>• Estimated up to <b>£18m</b>. Funded by HCC/ Developer. First school to be delivered in phase 1 and second in phase 4.</li> <li>• Estimated up to <b>£28m</b>. Funded by HCC/ Developer Delivery time to be agreed, but likely at phase 3 or 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer contributions will be sought for North Whiteley.</li> <li>• No external grant funding is available through central government for additional school places.</li> <li>• Some public sector funding is likely to be required for the secondary school which will serve a wider area.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
West of Waterlooville	<p><b>Nursery</b></p> <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 x 2FE new schools will be provided (the first to be developed will be suitable for a 3FE until the second primary school is built and the surplus land handed back to the developer).</li> </ul> <p><b>Secondary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area being developed by Grainger has sufficient capacity at existing schools within the catchment.</li> <li>• The area being developed by Taylor Wimpy will require contributions which have been agreed with HCC</li> </ul> <p><b>Further and Higher Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional facilities needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Cost – Grainger will make land available for 10 years prior to occupation of 100 homes.</li> <li>• <b>Grainger - £13.4m</b> – funded by the developer. Timing of provision to be agreed with HCC.</li> <li>• Grainger – no cost</li> <li>• Grainger – no cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers' contributions have been agreed for the first 2,000 dwellings – the remaining contribution will be negotiated. The additional cost will need to be funded from HCC capital programme resources – some capital funding will need to be found in advance of the developers contributions.</li> <li>• No external grant funding is available through central government for additional school places.</li> </ul>
Rest of PUSH	<p><b>Nursery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whiteley Parish Council has identified a need for a crèche/nursery to be incorporated into any redevelopment at Whiteley Village (Whiteley Parish Council Corporate Strategy 2009/10). The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer contributions will be sought from smaller sites where local circumstances allow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No external grant funding is available through central government for additional school</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
	<p>Wickham community has also identified in their Parish Plan a need for a day nursery within their parish.</p> <p><b>Primary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bishops Waltham area has over 10% surplus primary school capacity. HCC will consider ways that this can be reduced.</li> <li>Increased capacity may be provided at more schools pending the outcome of HCC reviews and consultations.</li> <li>Whiteley residents have identified a need for more primary school places within their parish.</li> </ul> <p><b>Secondary Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whiteley residents have identified a need for a secondary school within their parish.</li> <li>In Bishops Waltham area (Swanmore), the secondary school only has a 3% remaining capacity; however by 2014 this is predicted to increase to 14%.</li> </ul>		places.

## Time Line

- 3.4.16 The requirement for new school places will need to be reviewed as planning policy and allocations are finalised.

## Risks

- 3.4.17 The provision of new educational facilities will be consequent on new development. This will also be important for meeting some of the current shortfalls in provision.
- 3.4.18 The risks are that development does not come forward within the required timescales to meet existing deficits, and where additional public funding is required to match the private sector contribution, cutbacks in public sector finance makes this impossible to achieve.

## Delivery - Funding and contingencies

- 3.4.19 New schools to accommodate growth from new development will be funded by HCC and landowner/developer contributions. New school sites should be provided free of charge by developers and a financial contribution made towards the cost of the additional school accommodation. Contributions are expected from all developments that would result in a shortfall in school capacity. Table 15 sets out the funding guide for education contributions.
- 3.4.20 No external grant funding is available through central government for additional school places. Information is needed on whether this applies to HCC funding directly and to confirm whether there are any Winchester schools in what is left of Building Schools for the Future programme.
- 3.4.21 Contingencies for funding not being forthcoming are dependent on circumstances involved, but options could include temporary buildings or transportation of pupils to schools with capacity outside the area.
- 3.4.22 The cost of providing additional school places is variable, but as a guide, HCC have calculated the following costs:

Table 15: Funding. Guide costs of school places resulting from new development

<u>Data from 2010 HCC Developers' Contributions towards Children's Services Facilities</u>	<u>Cost per pupil place</u>	<u>Cost per new dwelling (2 bed or more)</u>
New 2 form entry primary school	£20,266	£6,080
Small extension to existing primary school (for 100 dwellings or less)	£19,111	£5,733

<b>Data from 2010 HCC <u>Developers' Contributions</u> <u>towards Children's Services</u> <u>Facilities</u></b>	<b>Cost per pupil place</b>	<b>Cost per new dwelling (2 bed or more)</b>
<b>Extension to secondary school</b>	£21,570	£6,040
<b>Special Education primary – larger developments</b>		£83
<b>Special Education secondary – larger developments</b>		£154
<b>Pre-school facilities.</b>		HCC can provide a calculation to assess the appropriate level of demand – could be provided within community facility, but often preschool facilities will look for exclusive use space.
<b>Children's Centres (combined pre-school education, childcare and health services). New or extended facilities for larger developments.</b>		£110

### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Hampshire County Council
  - Obligations in a Section 106 agreement.
-

### **3.5 Health facilities and social services**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Hampshire LINK](#)
- [Hampshire NHS Estates Strategy 2010/2015](#)
- [Hampshire NHS PCT Estates Strategy 2008-2013 \(update Feb 2009\)](#)
- [Healthy Horizons for Primary Care, Primary Care Strategy, 2009. NHS Hampshire](#)
- [NHS White Paper 'Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS](#)

#### **Definition of Health Facilities and Social Services Infrastructure**

- 3.5.1 NHS Hampshire is the primary care trust (PCT) currently responsible for commissioning primary and secondary care services for local residents within Hampshire. Local providers for Winchester include Winchester & Eastleigh Healthcare NHS Trust for acute (secondary) care and GP practices, Dentists, Pharmacies and Optometrists for primary care. Subject to legislation in the forthcoming Health Bill, the bulk of NHS commissioning will be moved to GP Consortia and NHS Commissioning Boards under new government changes with PCTs being phased out by April 2013.
- 3.5.2 A separate body, Hampshire Community Health Care is currently responsible for primary care within the community covering services such as rapid-response teams, scheduled care, adult services and physio- and occupational therapy. This department is now to be merged with the Hampshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
- 3.5.3 Private and charitable sectors provide a significant proportion of the health infrastructure, including private hospitals, hospice and respite care.
- 3.5.4 The [NHS White paper 'Equity and excellence: Liberating the NHS'](#) proposes that local health improvement functions are transferred from PCTs to local authorities governed by Health and Wellbeing Boards. There are also proposals being considered to move some services currently being provided in hospitals out to community based acute care.
- 3.5.5 Local authorities already have a duty to promote or improve health and wellbeing reflected in PPS1. Under the White Paper proposals, local authorities would have enhanced statutory duties for health and well being. As part of a Health and Well Being Board, local authorities would lead on joint strategic needs assessments, promote joined up commissioning of local NHS services, social care and health improvement and leading on local health improvement

and prevention activity as well as supporting local voice and the exercise of patient choice<sup>38</sup>

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- 3.5.6 The NHS Hampshire (Commissioning) Board and the Hampshire Community Health Care Board govern their respective sectors. Following Government changes set out in the [NHS White paper](#), local health care improvement functions will be commissioned by the local authority who will be responsible for linking up NHS, social care, public health and children's services via Health and Wellbeing Boards. It is not yet clear for Winchester whether this would be Hampshire County Council or Winchester City Council.
- 3.5.7 The South West Hampshire LIFT (Local Improvement Finance Trust) Company, in which WCC is a partner, is also involved in delivering primary healthcare care in the District; they have an exclusive right to consider development of healthcare buildings which are publicly led.

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.5.8 According to the SQW report to SEERA in 2006, a new GP practice is triggered for an increase in population of 6,592 i.e. 4 new GPs.
- 3.5.9 NHS Hampshire has set the following local access standards on acceptable distances to travel to access GP services in their [Primary Care Strategy](#) (tables 16 and 17 below provide a summary which covers the whole of Hampshire, please see the [Primary Care Strategy](#) document for full description of the classes):-

Table 16: Standards. Facilities provided for different population scales and access standards for primary care provision within Hampshire

	<b>Will serve population of scale</b>	<b>Access standards</b>
<b>Community hospitals stand alone or within general hospital site</b>	• 100,000 to 200,000	• within 30 mins.
<b>Polyclinics (ambulatory care incl out-patients and diagnostics)</b>	• 100,000	• within 30 mins.
<b>Health centres (GP and other Primary Care facilities incl. dentistry, community nursing...)</b>	• 35,000 – 100,000	• within 15-20 mins.
<b>GP Surgeries</b>	• Network to meet needs of local community	

<sup>38</sup> [Liberating The Nhs: Local Democratic Legitimacy In Health BMA Summary \(England\), 2010. British Medical Association](#)

<b>Community and Well Being Centres (incl. services for chronic disease management and voluntary sector services)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To meet local needs</li> </ul>	
---	---	--

Table 17: Standards. Proposed distance standards for primary care provision within Hampshire

	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>
<b>Services for meeting local health needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 4km.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 1.6km.</li> </ul>
<b>Services for populations over 5,000 (such as acute health care needs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 8km and have a choice of at least 2 GPs.</li> <li>• Have access to routine dental assessment from a primary care dental practitioner which may be part of or supported by a larger practice and, in rural areas, available at certain days or times during the week.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 2.5km and have a choice of at least 2 GPs.</li> <li>• Have access to routine dental assessment from a primary care dental practitioner which may be part of or supported by a larger practice</li> </ul>
<b>Services for populations over 30,000 (e.g. services for people with unstable long term conditions, more specialised services needing additional skills or expertise, more specialised minor surgery)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 12km.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible within 2.5km.</li> </ul>
<b>Services for populations of at least 150,000 (e.g. urgent out of hours primary care services)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible over 12km.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible over 4km.</li> </ul>

#### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

3.5.10 Changes in population numbers and age structure will have a strong influence on health care provision.

3.5.11 GP facilities are located at:

- Winchester District General Hospital (Royal Hants);
- St Clements' Partnership in Winchester;
- St Paul's Practice in Winchester;
- The Friarsgate Practice in Weeke;
- Alresford Group Surgery;
- Bishops Waltham Surgery;
- Denmead Health Centre;
- Gratton Surgery at Sutton Scotney;
- Twyford Surgery;
- West Meon Surgery;
- Wickham Group Surgery;
- At branch surgeries at Droxford Surgery; Colden Common Surgery and Hambledon Village Hall.

3.5.12 The Friarsgate Practice in Weeke has recently been redeveloped; Wickham Group Surgery and St Clements' Partnership, Winchester are both being considered for further investment in 2011/12.

3.5.13 There is currently adequate primary care capacity across Winchester for most services, although even small population and demographic changes could affect primary care services. Given the accessibility standards, the provision of primary care will need to be local to new development. Table 18 sets out the health provisions being considered to support development in the strategic allocations proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Option.

3.5.14 Dentistry is a different matter: there is not enough capacity to provide NHS dental services for everyone in Winchester, and many people choose private or insurance funded treatment. The PCT is working on increasing the capacity and flexibility of dental services in Winchester for example by providing a mobile unit to cover some of the rural areas, but this will have limited capacity. Mobile dental services have recently been provided in Wickham and Bishops Waltham.

3.5.15 NHS Hampshire will provide for modest growth in Wickham by providing a new GP surgery. In Winchester one practice has capacity for growth, but this would displace other services.

Table 18: Current level of Infrastructure. Primary Health Care requirements

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<p><b>Health Centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PCT would require an impact assessment of change in population on current health services in the local area.</li> <li>Particular pressure may be faced in Alresford from anything other than very small developments.</li> <li>The Otterbourne Parish Plan sets out a local community need for a medical practice within their parish.</li> <li>Major new development may need to provide health centres for example with a community centre. Minimum build of 600m<sup>2</sup> (no max). NHS Hampshire would make decisions as to the size and utilisation of such a building based on local need. The new site may have generic use including many health facilities but not necessarily a GP service.</li> </ul> <p><b>Hospitals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for additional facilities has not been identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer to contribute serviced land and provide capital contributions subject to Developer/PCT/ Private agreement.</li> </ul>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<b>Ambulance Service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for additional facilities has not been identified.</li> </ul>		
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some local capacity exists in Whiteley but near service location would be required and associated section 106 support to achieve this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health Centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of 3-3.5 GP practices as confirmed by NHS</li> </ul> <p><b>Hospitals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional facilities required to serve this development</li> </ul> <p><b>Ambulance Service</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional facilities required to serve this development</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be agreed with NHS. There is GP support to provide a service at N. Whiteley. Likely to be delivered at Phase 4.</li> </ul>
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently Forest End GP practice (which is currently within the Havant District) engaged with PCT to move into new premises within the West of Waterlooville development. Section 106 funds might be required to support this development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health Centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New surgery and health centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grainger will make serviced land available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be agreed with NHS Hampshire</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<p><b>Hospitals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional facilities required to serve this development</li> </ul> <p><b>Ambulance Service</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional facilities required to serve this development</li> </ul>	The development of the facility will be funded by NHS/ private funding/ developer contributions.	
<b>Fareham SDA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fareham Community Hospital will plug some of the existing gap in provision along the M27 Corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme will be expected to meet any new health requirements (but not GPs which would need significant 106 investment) arising as a result of this development and funded through developer contributions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Rest of PUSH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Particular pressure may be faced in Bishops Waltham from anything other than very small developments.</li> <li>• Wickham Parish Plan identifies the need for a local NHS dentist to serve their community. A mobile dental service has recently been provided to address this need. This service has also been provided in Bishops Waltham.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be agreed with NHS Hampshire Dental Commissioning</li> </ul>

- 3.5.16 NHS Hampshire has advised that even small changes in population could affect primary care services particularly in places such as Alresford and Bishops Waltham which may face pressure on health services from anything other than small developments. In addition to those listed in the table above, particular pressure may also be faced in Denmead, West Meon and Twyford from anything other than very small developments. Plans to meet any capacity deficiencies will need to address both infrastructure and service provision and solutions may vary depending on location and proximity to existing services and their opportunity for expansion. These will be considered alongside the other priorities identified for the NHS in its forward financial planning and will be dependent upon availability of ongoing funding.
- 3.5.17 Fareham Community Hospital at Coldeast, Fareham (a new build LIFT scheme) may be crucial for delivering the Core Strategy policies as it will fill the gap along the M27 Corridor between Southampton and Portsmouth, and is therefore likely to be a key consideration for the proposed Strategic Development Area at Fareham. The Fareham Community Hospital will cater for outpatients and diagnostics, alongside community services (no inpatients and no A&E) and became fully operational in May 2010.
- 3.5.18 Hospices within the District include the Wessex Children's Hospice Trust/ Naomi House at Sutton Scotney providing children's respite care and catering for young people with complex medical needs. The Rowans Hospice is located at the south eastern tip of the district and immediately adjoins the West of Waterlooville MDA: it is believed to require additional car parking spaces. A small proportion of the funding for the hospice comes from the Department of Health with most funding from charitable/voluntary support.

#### Community and Acute Care

- 3.5.19 Information in the Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study relating to South Hampshire/Portsmouth Primary Care Trust states that a new hospital will only be considered if the population in the catchment area increases by over 400,000. As this does not relate directly to the Winchester District, this should only be used as an example of the scale of additional population which would trigger a new facility. The community facilities are supported by the acute care hospitals at Royal Hampshire County Hospital at Winchester, Southampton, Portsmouth and Basingstoke. Most of the Winchester population is served by the Royal Hampshire County Hospital.
- 3.5.20 Southampton General Hospital is set to become the major trauma centre for the area which is likely to change the way hospitals such as the Royal Hampshire County Hospital will operate in future. Further changes are likely to be necessary with the increasing age of the population, further urgent unscheduled care may be necessary in future.
- 3.5.21 In addition to these public hospitals, there is also a private hospital in Winchester Town on Old Sarum Road which caters for acute care.

## **Time Line**

- 3.5.22 Operational capital of under **£1m** for maintenance and minor improvements is available to PCTs through a 3 yearly cycle bidding process. Alternative funding may be available from national funds and through partnerships such as LIFT.
- 3.5.23 Hampshire NHS PCT Estates Strategy 2008-2013 (update Feb 2009)
- 3.5.24 PCT 5 year Strategic and Operational Plans

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.5.25 The PCT are assessing the condition of their existing premises in association with the NHS Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Local Authorities LDF development strategies to identify future investment requirements which will result in a priority list being drawn up for future projects. There is also a process to consider development opportunities outside the priority list.
- 3.5.26 Only the primary care development at Wickham Group Surgery has agreed funding and Forest End, Waterlooville has an agreed business case to relocate it within the West of Waterlooville development. In the Estates Strategy – update Feb 2009, investment in St Clement's Partnership has also been considered. The construction cost of providing a new GP practice/Health Centre for 4 GPs (650m<sup>2</sup>-700m<sup>2</sup>) was estimated in the SQW 2006 Report to SEERA as **£1,147,500 (£172 per new dwelling)** base on an average for the SE. It is important to note that these figures date back to a 2006 report and therefore are only an indication of current costs.
- 3.5.27 No alternative funding sources have been identified. NHS Hampshire will seek contributions from developers to mitigate the cost to the NHS of new primary care facilities and would welcome discussion on how best contributions can be made. NHS Hampshire will need to be consulted on any S106 or CIL for any proposed development.
- 3.5.28 New Government proposals would direct all primary care funding to GP consortia that will then be responsible for commissioning PCT services by 2013. There is already a practice based commissioning group in Winchester, WINCAR which consists of 13 practices covering Winchester City and rural villages.
- 3.5.29 There are no contingencies if developer contributions cannot be agreed to mitigate the cost to the NHS of new primary care facilities as a result of new development. In order to encourage healthy lifestyles new development will be expected to provide a range of facilities to promote walking, cycling, sporting activities, and access to healthy food through such facilities as local allotments.

## **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- NHS
  - Private Funding
  - Developer Contributions
-

### **3.6 Social Infrastructure: Creative Industries, Arts and Culture including Community Halls**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities
- Prosperous Economy

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- The Economic Impact of Community Buildings in Rural Communities, Village Halls Advisors in the South West of England 2005-2006.
- South Hampshire Creative Industries Development Framework - Consultation Draft. 2010
- [The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit, 2010. Audience South/Cultural Consulting/ Professor M. Elson/ Charles Freeman](#)
- Vision and Strategy for Hampshire's Library and Information Service, 2009 – 2014 Hampshire County Council
- [Winchester4Communities](#)
- [Winchester District Arts Strategy 2006-2009](#)
- [Winchester Cultural Strategy 2009](#)

#### **Definition of Creative Industries, Arts and Culture Infrastructure including Community Halls**

- 3.6.1 Creative industries include architecture, design, performance and arts, which alone encompasses a wide range of disciplines (set out in the Winchester District Arts Strategy).
- 3.6.2 The arts and creative industries need infrastructure to provide facilities for the conception, creation, performance, study, recording and delivery of the Arts. Such facilities include libraries, museums, archives, galleries, cinemas, theatres, multi-purpose media venues, rehearsal and performance venues. Community Halls have been included in this category as they often provide venues and rehearsal spaces for this sector. They are also an important part of the social infrastructure in their own right, playing a key role in local communities by bringing communities together and providing a base for the provision of many services.

#### **Lead Organisations involved**

- HCC Hampshire Library and Information Service
- WCC Economy and Arts, Museums, and Curatorial Services
- Parish Councils

## **Standards/triggers**

- 3.6.3 New library and community halls, together with the necessary infrastructure for community development and cohesion are dependent upon future housing developments.
- 3.6.4 The Hampshire Infrastructure Report considers that every 3,000 additional new dwellings should trigger one new small community centre. The estimates from the strategic allocation information suggest this would cost around **£2,000 per m<sup>2</sup>** and start up funding may be needed for the initial running. The same study estimates that a part-time community development officer can cost around £45,000 for the first 3 years. Winchester City Council does not consider this to be an adequate provision, for example the Council sought a contribution of £350,000 over 10 years towards a community development worker for the West of Waterlooville.
- 3.6.5 The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit sets out the following national targets from the Museums and Libraries Archives Council:-
- Library space minimum requirement of 30m<sup>2</sup> per 1000 population.
  - Archive space minimum requirement of 6 m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 population.
  - Museum space minimum of 28 m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 population.
  - Arts Council England set a minimum of 45 m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 population for arts provision (for galleries, multi-use arts venues and theatres; and production, rehearsal and education space for arts).

- 3.6.6 Information from the emerging Creative Industries Development Framework suggests that there should be medium or small scale production, rehearsal and education space venues available for centres of population over 50,000 and a range of venues for amateur companies and choirs within 20mins of settlements with a population of over 20,000, with village halls and community centres catering for small settlements.

## **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.6.7 Creative industries are an important sector for Winchester and the Southern Hampshire area, particularly architecture, IT and Digital and Arts industries, fuelled by the strengths of the local universities and colleges. The sector provides for an estimated 30,000 jobs responsible for around 10% GVA for the Regions; jobs in this sector have increased 100% over the last 10 years. However, graduates in these sectors tend to move out of the area to mid Hampshire and London, where facilities and affordable accommodation allow. To retain these graduates in future, the area needs to provide suitable workspace as well as business support and access to finance and the market. The Council is aware that there is a significant demand for affordable workspace for this sector. Creative and cultural facilities not only support the local economy, but also help to bring communities together, and contribute towards a better quality of life.
- 3.6.8 Winchester Town is an important cultural centre for the sub-region. However the South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit indicates that

the number and type of existing facilities do not meet all the needs of the local Winchester population nor do they fulfil its role as a sub-regional cultural centre. The study also predicts that there will be an increasing deficit in arts facilities, museums and library floorspace to 2026 given forecasted population growth when measured against aspirational floorspace targets set for the County. The following information on cultural and arts facilities is taken from this study. Table 19 sets out potential projects to address existing needs and the requirement of new development from the proposed strategic allocations.

#### Arts Provision

- 3.6.9 The condition of arts facilities in the District is generally good, however there are opportunities to develop some existing facilities which are currently not used to their capacity.

#### Libraries

- 3.6.10 Winchester currently has one Discovery Centre (within Winchester City) and three neighbourhood libraries at Alresford, Bishops Waltham and Stanmore as well as school library services. Rural areas have poor library coverage, but there is also a mobile library service, which helps provide coverage in the rural areas. In general the library provision in the District is in good condition, but many are running at capacity and there is an increasing demand for libraries to provide multimedia services. The Discovery Centre is already at capacity but there are plans to increase the capacity to accommodate additional population from new developments, but the expectation is that this would have to be funded through new development.
- 3.6.11 Communities in Whiteley Parish do not have good access to library services (Whiteley Parish Council Corporate Strategy 2009/10) and a learning resource centre will now be provided through a section 106 agreement for the redevelopment at Whiteley Village.
- 3.6.12 The Hampshire Library and Information Service is also looking into partnerships with other providers such as the Registration Services.

#### Multipurpose Venues

- 3.6.13 There is a good range of larger multipurpose venues within the District. Within Winchester Town, multipurpose venues include the Tower, the Discovery Centre, Theatre Royal, Chesil Theatre, Winchester Guildhall and Winchester University. These facilities need substantial development periodically to stay fit for purpose. Village halls and community centres provide smaller multipurpose venues outside Winchester Town and provide performance and education space and amateur dramatic rehearsal space in the rural areas, but may not be fit for this purpose.
- 3.6.14 The private sector also provides a range of facilities and opportunities, including public houses with rooms to hire for cultural activities, or pubs that put on music events. Opportunities might arise in new development to ensure that such flexible multi-purpose spaces are included in the scheme.

#### Museums, and cultural assets

- 3.6.15 Winchester meets the benchmark requirements for Museums provision and attracts visitors from the wider sub region. There are a number of museums in the Town, including the City Museum and the military museums in Peninsula Barracks. Other historic assets which offer an educational as well as cultural experience include the Great Hall, the Water Mill, West Gate, Wolvesey Palace and the Bishops palace at Bishops Waltham
- 3.6.16 Local history museums are targeted more at the local user; specialist museums tend to pull a wider audience, but may need to be in particular locations.

#### Archives

- 3.6.17 Winchester is well above the minimum benchmark for archive provision.

#### Community Halls

- 3.6.18 Community facilities such as community halls provide an important facility for the provision of a wide variety of services such as debt advice, pre-school provision, adult education, support for the elderly and local government activity such as parish council meetings and election polling stations. Public bodies within Winchester District are looking for further opportunities to use community facilities to provide shared services, which can help combat current inefficiencies in service provision and budget cuts (see chapters on policing for e.g.).
- 3.6.19 Co-locating social and community infrastructure is a cost-effective means of providing a range of facilities: however, it requires an imaginative and flexible approach to the design of the buildings. At the moment settlements such as Colden Common, Kings Worthy and Denmead have community halls that are shared with the Parish Council. However, public bodies are now looking at whether new community halls could be provided through the developments at West of Waterlooville and redevelopment of Whiteley Village which could accommodate community facilities with office space for the Parish Council, City Council and Police. At West of Waterlooville, this will be able to accommodate a community worker, and in Whiteley, there is the possibility of providing a library service in the same building.

Table 19: Current level of Infrastructure. Community and Cultural Facilities

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hampshire Library and Information Service has made a case for developer contributions towards increasing capacity (public spaces, stock and public service facilities) for any major new development around Winchester City.</li> <li>• New development may need to provide new community centres.</li> <li>• A percentage for art contribution would be agreed with WCC, through a S.106 agreement.</li> <li>• There may be a need in New Alresford for a facility suitable to cater for large indoor events, but further work is required to assess the need (New Alresford Town Health Check).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded – contribution to be agreed through S.106.</li> <li>• Developer funded – contribution to be agreed through S.106.</li> </ul>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current plan is to propose a joint school and public library in the new secondary school.</li> <li>• There have also been initial discussions between Whiteley Parish and HCC about including a library facility in the extension to Meadowside Sports Centre.</li> <li>• A new community centre of up to 400m<sup>2</sup> is proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer funded/ HCC funded</li> <li>• Some funding from Whiteley Parish Council and Winchester City Council has been identified.</li> <li>• Developer funded – contribution to be agreed through S.106. Commensurate with development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A learning resource centre will now be provided through a section 106 agreement for the redevelopment at Whiteley Village</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A percentage contribution for art is also proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer contribution to be agreed. Commensurate with development.</li> </ul>	
West of Waterlooville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a large library adjacent to the area which should have capacity; therefore there are no immediate plans to any further library development.</li> <li>A community facility to is being considered at West of Waterlooville which would provide a venue for a wide range of community activity and also office space for the Citizens Advice Bureau, City Council, Police and possibly also for a community worker. An estimate of a 720 m<sup>2</sup> centre is proposed.</li> <li>A % contribution for Art is also proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer funded <b>£1.5m</b></li> <li><b>£0.446m</b> is proposed to fund a community development worker funded by developer contributions</li> <li>Proposed <b>£0.510m</b> for art on site contribution funded through developer contributions and phased through the development.</li> </ul>	
Rest of PUSH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities in Whiteley Parish have identified a need for a library to be incorporated into any redevelopment at Whiteley Village (Whiteley Parish Council Corporate Strategy 2009/10). They also require facilities for young people such as youth club, café, or internet café.</li> <p><u>Whiteley Village redevelopment</u></p> <li>Proposal to provide community facility which would provide office space for the Parish Council, City Council, Police and possibly also library services.</li> </ul>		

## Time Line

3.6.20 Will depend upon the timing of new development.

## Risks

3.6.21 While it is often possible to provide new community facilities through development, it is essential to ensure that an operating body such as a parish council is identified in advance, and that they have a strong business case to ensure that they can meet future revenue costs

## Delivery - Funding and contingencies

3.6.22 The facilities considered are not for profit organisations and are supported by the public and local authorities. Funding for social infrastructure is expected from developer contributions with opportunities to add value though bidding for additional money alongside local authority funding. Using developer contributions to fund revenue work may be limited.

3.6.23 No further capital expenditure on libraries is planned in Winchester over the next two years. No external funding is anticipated. If funding cannot be found for a new library facility in Whiteley, the mobile library service will continue. The County Council are looking into developing a public library tariff for developer contributions.

3.6.24 The Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study estimates that a new community centre can cost from **£560,000** to over **£1 million** pounds to build depending on the size and type of facilities that need to be included. Studies indicate that capital investment in community halls increases and diversifies the use of the hall and also generates further revenue, making the facility more viable in the long-term<sup>39</sup>. Funding can be sought from Defra via Action with Communities in Rural England or from Lottery or Landfill tax funds. Winchester City Council has been able to fund new community facilities jointly with Parish Councils. This funding has been granted for capital works on facilities which will be used by a wide range of users. Following the cuts in public spending, the future of this grant has not been determined. Information on grants for community buildings can be found on the [Winchester4Communities website](#).

## Primary Delivery Mechanism

- Developer Contributions
- Hampshire County Council
- Winchester City Council
- Private and charitable organisations
- Parish Councils
- Local Communities

---

<sup>39</sup> [The Economic Impact of Community Buildings in Rural Communities, Village Halls Advisors in the South West of England 2005-2006.](#)

### **3.7 Emergency Services - Police Service**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Hampshire Police Authority & Hampshire Constabulary Policing Plan 2008 - 2011](#)
- [Secure by Design](#)

#### **Definition of Police Service Infrastructure**

- 3.7.1 Hampshire Constabulary manages the policing of the Winchester District. The District forms part of the Central Hampshire Operational Command Unit (which also includes Fareham, Gosport and Havant) with each district managed as a discrete policing area.

#### **Lead Organisations involved**

- [Hampshire Constabulary – Winchester District](#)

#### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.7.2 There are no set standards on the number of homes needed to justify a new PCSO or Police Officer post in the District. The Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study gives the current ratio of **2.1 officers per thousand population**. This ratio may change as Government funding is reduced. The same study estimated that to employ one officer costs around **£52,000/year** (includes all aspects of employment such as organisational support etc). The cost of building a new facility will greatly depend on the scale of the new facility, but can cost around **£35,000/officer** (Tym Report).

#### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.7.3 Winchester has two police stations; the main station is located in Winchester Town and a second in Bishops Waltham. There are also two further sub stations located in New Alresford and Twyford.
- 3.7.4 Communities in the southern periphery of the District may be closer to stations located outside the District. However, apart from emergencies when the nearest unit is employed, the main response units come from Winchester City and Bishops Waltham.
- 3.7.5 There is currently a lack of facilities for local/neighbourhood policing in the periphery of the District. Bishops Waltham is the main hub for the southern area, but reaching communities on the edge of the District can take time which results in inefficiencies in the service. The location of neighbourhood teams and response units is therefore an important issue to consider for future developments which could also help provide service efficiencies.

- 3.7.6 Major new developments will result in localised population changes which may require additional policing resources as the new community establishes. Given the general reduction in public funding, money for additional policing is less likely to be available from the public purse. Alternative solutions to support policing for future developments therefore need to be sought.
- 3.7.7 A key step towards reducing the amount of policing required for new development is to ensure it is built to '[Secure by Design](#)' standards. There is an expectation for all new development to meet the criteria set out in this document without compromising the quality of the place.
- 3.7.8 There are also a number of options which should be considered for major new developments:-
- A Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) could be funded through S.106 agreements with the developer. This could provide an initial link into the establishing community where additional input is needed during the early stages of community development. Long-term commitment to funding posts would need to be considered. However, the objective of development should be to create a coherent community which would not need additional PCSO's and sufficient resources should be available to achieve this through good quality community development.
  - Satellite facilities could be provided through new development which would allow neighbourhood teams to be located close to local communities.
  - Drop-in multi-agency offices could be provided in new community which could serve as satellite facilities.
- 3.7.9 Any new office space provided as part of new development will need to be fit for purpose. There will need to be access to the secured police system and therefore the provision of suitable e-communications will be an important consideration in the development of new facilities.
- 3.7.10 Where an office is not practicable then there may still be a requirement for additional technology, vehicles and other types of support.

### **Time Line**

- 3.7.11 Policing options for major new development should be negotiated at master planning stage.

### **Funding and contingencies**

- 3.7.12 60% of funding for Hampshire police currently comes from central government; the remaining 40% is currently funded through council tax payments.
- 3.7.13 Developers may be asked to provide funding towards officer posts or facilities on site through the S.106 or CIL process particularly in larger developments where the Hampshire Constabulary may want to have a permanent presence in the form of a police office as a base for the community safety team.

### **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.7.14 Capital funding for new facilities (including land costs) and possibly short term funding for new PCSOs would be through developer contributions.
- 3.7.15 Services would be delivered through the Hampshire Constabulary.

### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Developer Contributions
  - Hampshire Constabulary
- 

## **3.8 Emergency Services - Ambulance Service**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [The South Central Ambulance Service Strategy & Business Plan 2007– 2010](#)

### **Definition of Ambulance Service Infrastructure**

- 3.8.1 The South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SCAS) is the ambulance service which covers Hampshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- South Central Ambulance Service

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.8.2 There is no set trigger for when a standby point should be provided (e.g. it is not based on a set number of new dwellings being built or increase in population size), but will be placed where there is significant demand on the service and ideally are placed not more than 10mins away from a major population. A standby point is due to be located at West of Waterlooville; another is likely to be located around Winchester Town.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.8.3 There is currently an ambulance station based in Winchester. This will be replaced by a joint Resource Centre (RC) and a Hampshire Area Response Team (HART) located at Woodside in Eastleigh.
- 3.8.4 Standby Points are strategically located where there is significant demand on the service to enable the capability of meeting national response times. The

majority of standby points in the SCAS area are ‘unserviced’<sup>40</sup>, giving flexibility where there is the greatest need (e.g. a lay-by close to a motorway junction giving good accessibility in all directions to facilitate quick response times). The trigger for a standby point is led by the demographics of a population in a particular area rather than its density. A standby point is due to be located to the West of Waterlooville and another will be located in Winchester.

- 3.8.5 Strategic Allocations and development levels set within the Winchester District Local Development Framework will inform future target areas for ambulance service planning. Any proposed new developments around Winchester Town and North Whiteley will be considered by SCAS when reviewing the location of Standby Points in relation to their existing network. It will be subsequent to the completion and occupation of a development that the ambulance service would anticipate an increase in demand. The need for standby points is prioritised based on historic information.

#### **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.8.6 The serviced standby points and resource centres are funded by the South Central Ambulance Services. The HART element of the proposed Winchester & Eastleigh Resource Centre at Eastleigh is funded by central government and this facility is planned to become operational early in 2011. A serviced standby point is to be provided, late 2010, to the west of the centre of Waterlooville to meet current needs.
- 3.8.7 Information from the SCAS in the Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study for 2006 estimated an increase an additional 10,000 incidents/year based on growth proposed in the SE Plan which would require additional funding.

#### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- South Central Ambulance Service

---

### **3.9 Emergency Services - Fire Service**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service Plan 2010 to 2013](#)
- [Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service Plan 2011 - 2014](#)

---

<sup>40</sup> A serviced standby point is one which has basic facilities where ambulance crews can take a natural break without the need to return to a Resource Centre or Ambulance Station.

## **Definition of Fire Service Infrastructure**

- 3.9.1 The Fire Service manages the fire risk across Hampshire. They are responsible for identifying and lowering fire risk within local communities.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.9.2 There are no set standards on the number of homes needed to justify an additional fire service. Information within the Hampshire Infrastructure Study states that new greenfield development is likely to need adjustments to existing services rather than new facilities. The fire service is being reviewed with the aim of implementing the 'efficient and flexible crewing project' to provide a more efficient service.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.9.1 The fire service in Winchester District is split between 6 fire stations within the District and one within Eastleigh covering part of the District as follows:-

- Winchester Town and outlying rural areas - The main station for Winchester is now located in Winnall. This station has one whole-time crewed appliance, one whole-time Crewed Special Equipment Unit (currently under service review) and one Retained Duty System Crew. This station covers the Town and outlying rural areas including the M3 and A34. This station has provision to increase central capacity within the Winchester District and central Hampshire being strategically placed close to Junction 9 of the M3 motorway. The Special Equipment Unit at North Walls often supports surrounding stations at road traffic incidents. There is also an additional Retained Duty System (RDS) section at Winchester City (RDS respond for fire calls from their permanent place of work or home via pager)
- Bishops Waltham, Swanmore, Upham, Durley and part of Curdridge and Waltham Chase are served by the Retained (on-call) Fire Station at Lower Lane, Bishops Waltham.
- Alresford and the surrounding area is served by the RDS Fire Station at Pound Hill, Alresford.
- Wickham is served by the RDS Fire Station at Mill Lane, Wickham.
- Droxford is served by the RDS Fire Station at Union Lane, Droxford.
- Sutton Scotney, Wonston, Micheldever, Stoke Charity and South Wonston are served by the RDS Fire Station at Sutton Scotney.
- Twyford, Otterbourne and Hursley are served by the station at Stelle Close, Eastleigh.

- 3.9.2 From outside the District, Eastleigh fire station provide some fire cover in to the west area to Colden Common, Fareham fire station provides some fire cover in the south area towards Whiteley and Waterloovile fire station provides some fire cover in to the south east at Denmead.

- 3.9.3 A number of key fire risks have been identified for the District including road traffic incidents on country roads and the major road network (M3 and A34); accidental fires and injuries linked to the increasing number of elderly residents, and major employers and a thriving student population which both increase the risk of fire<sup>41</sup>.
- 3.9.4 Future requirements from new development are more likely to be accommodated using existing resources and adjusting the service.

#### **Time Line**

- 3.9.5 Fire service options for major new development should be negotiated at master planning stage.

#### **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.9.6 The fire service is funded through central Government and with local authority (Council Tax) funding.
- 3.9.7 Funding for new facilities would be through developer contributions if there is a justified requirement resulting from the development; however it is assumed that the majority of new development will be accommodated by adjusting existing services rather than new facilities.

#### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Services would be delivered by the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
- 

### **3.10 Utility services: General**

- 3.10.1 There is limited scope in planning utility services for future development. Long term investment and pricing is set by the regulator, which prevents speculative investment and creates difficulty in planning beyond the shorter investment planning timeframes.

### **3.11 Utilities Services - Gas and Electricity Provision**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Prosperous Economy

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Energy \(2007\) Department of Trade and Industry](#)

---

<sup>41</sup> [Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service Plan 2010 to 2013](#)

- [National Electricity Transmission System Seven Year Statement, 2010. National Grid](#)

### **Definition of Gas and Electricity Infrastructure**

- 3.11.1 Most household gas comes from offshore sources and is delivered through the main pipelines of the National Transmission System (NTS) at high pressures (up to 85bar). The high pressured gas is pushed around the system by compressor stations down to lower pressure pipes which serve consumers within Local Distribution Zones (LDZ). The high pressured gas transmission system is owned and operated by the National Grid. The LDZ covering Winchester is owned and managed by Scotia Gas Networks, operating as Southern Gas Networks.
- 3.11.2 Scotia Gas is an Independent Gas Transporter (IGT) which develops and maintains its own gas infrastructure and which will negotiate with third party companies who wish to lay infrastructure to supply gas for new developments and connect into the system. Connections to new development are agreed through a competitive market. Development of the main transmission system is usually as a result of growth in the overall demand within a region.
- 3.11.3 The national electricity network is owned, maintained and operated by the National Grid. The National Grid does not provide electricity directly to individual households, but they supply electricity to local distribution network operators (DNO). They must offer connection to any DNO who wishes to generate electricity or who requires a high voltage supply,
- 3.11.4 Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) is the DNO for the District which owns and is responsible for operating the electricity distribution networks including most of the overhead lines with the exception of 400kV tower lines which are the responsibility of the National Grid.
- 3.11.5 If demand increases significantly across a local distribution electricity network area then the local DNO may need National Grid to reinforce an existing substation or supply a new grid supply point.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- National Grid
- Scotia Gas operating as Southern Gas Networks
- Scottish and Southern Energy
- Other third party gas and electricity supply companies

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.11.6 There will need to be substantial changes to the UK's energy systems over the next 20 years to meet the goals of the Energy White Paper and meet the increasing demand for electricity over coal and oil. National Grid have identified a future need to expand the national infrastructure including overhead power lines, underground cables, extending substations and new gas pipelines as there is a need for new forms of infrastructure such as smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites to meet the goals of the White Paper.

- 3.11.7 Owners and occupiers of premises have the right to provide their own gas supply and connect to the network under the Gas Act 1986 (as amended 1995). The pipe(s) are then offered for adoption to an IGT such as Scotia Gas. This third party connection must be undertaken by an authorised body such as an IGT or a Utility Infrastructure Provider (UIP).
- 3.11.8 There is also a duty for a public electricity supplier to supply connection to the network upon request to an owner or occupier of any premises under the Electricity Act 1989.
- 3.11.9 National Grid provides information on the type of works allowable near their network and the distances between the works and the network needed for different types of development activity<sup>42</sup>.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.11.10 There are no identified deficits in energy provision within the District. Development in Winchester is unlikely to have a significant effect on the capacity of the national transmission network which should be able to cope with additional demands. Table 20 sets out the projects being considered to support the proposed strategic allocations.
- 3.11.11 In general, the South East has a good distribution of gas infrastructure and gas can be provided to most locations in the District either through reinforcing the existing infrastructure or providing new network connections. Areas within the District where there is no gas supply are likely to be the more isolated locations; however, there are some more populated areas within Winchester District such as Cheriton where there is no gas mains supply.
- 3.11.12 The electricity infrastructure in Winchester District is adequate to supply the proposed strategic allocations and to accommodate up to an additional 500 properties around the larger settlements if required. In general, a slight increase in the total annual electricity usage is predicted between 2011 and 2015, although this will be offset by an increase in embedded generation (where energy is generated closer to users for example)<sup>43</sup>.
- 3.11.13 Over time, development has gradually encroached on the National Grid's transmission pipelines and overhead cables, and this infrastructure may impede further encroachment. Where overhead lines cross a site, the area can be used for open space, parking, garages or public highways; alternative arrangements will have to be agreed with Southern Electric Power Distribution if the lines need to be moved and costs can not be born by existing customers.
- 3.11.14 The [National Grid Infrastructure](#) within the Winchester District is listed below. Maps of both networks are available on the web. Maps of the finer infrastructure regulated by the DNOs is not publicly available. Table 20 below, sets out the current level of energy infrastructure requirements for the proposed Strategic Development Areas

---

<sup>42</sup> [National Electricity Transmission System Seven Year Statement, 2010. National Grid Chapter 2](#)

<sup>43</sup> [National Electricity Transmission System Seven Year Statement, 2010. National Grid Chapter 2](#)

### Electricity Transmission

- 400kV route from Nursling substation in Test Valley to Lovedean substation in East Hampshire / Winchester
- 400kV route from Fawley substation in New Forest District to Lovedean substation in East Hampshire / Winchester via Botley Wood substation in Winchester

3.11.15 The following substations are also located within the administrative area of Winchester District:

- Lovedean substation – 400kV
- Botley Wood substation – 400kV

### Gas Transmission

3.11.16 The following high pressure gas pipeline passes through the north west of the District near Crawley.

- Pipeline: 2308. 7 Feeder Barton Stacey / Mappowder

Table 20: Current level of Infrastructure. Energy requirements of the proposed Strategic Development Areas

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply will be provided by the Energy Providers.</li> <li>• Possible need to improve/strengthen existing system for increased energy demands – or develop renewable energy source (self generation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funded by the developer/provider</li> <li>• Funded by the developer/provider. Costs dependent on feasibility studies being carried out with utility companies.</li> </ul>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gas supply to be determined subject to Renewable Energy Strategy. Likely requirement for gas supply back-up to the site to guarantee continuity of supply. Commensurate with development phasing.</li> <li>• Electricity - Primary 33/ 11 Kv substation could be required; this would be fed from existing infrastructure – likely to be provided in phase 1 or 2 of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These will be funded by the Provider</li> </ul>	
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply will be provided by the Energy Providers funded by the developer.</li> <li>• Strategic on site utilities (including telecommunications and water and sewage infrastructure as well as energy supply).</li> <li>• Electricity Diversions and Reinforcements</li> <li>• 33kv overhead power lines</li> <li>• 2 x 11kv overhead powerlines</li> <li>• Reinforcement of sub-station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated cost to the developer of <b>£7.65m</b></li> <li>• <b>£1.590m</b> funded by the developer and to be delivered with Scottish and Southern.</li> </ul>	

## **Time Line**

- 3.11.17 Scotia Gas has a 30 year mains replacement programme which is on a rolling review every five years at which time they reassess their programme against Local Planning Authority planning policies and site allocations.
- 3.11.18 The approval and agreeing costs of supplying new electricity infrastructure does not usually take more than 2 years.

## **Risks**

- 3.11.19 The Tym report identifies that there may be cost and time implications where local substations are nearing their ceiling capacity and major new development may require an upgrade of the substation. Information on the capacity of the local substations is needed to identify whether this is an issue for any local substation within the District.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.11.20 The cost of connecting into the gas system depends upon whether an IGT or a UIP provides the connection. Connections to the system may be funded by the IGT such as British Gas who may recoup costs through future charges from the development. If the connection is made by a UIP then it is more likely that developer will have to bear the costs. Due to the long-term nature of residential development, it is more often the case that the IGT will fund new residential connections as they will recoup their costs; industrial and commercial development gas demand can be more variable and connection costs are more likely to be sought from the developer.
- 3.11.21 The cost of connection will therefore depend upon the site in question and the companies who are interested or able to provide a connection to the network.
- 3.11.22 For existing dwellings, the cost of connecting into the system would have to be born by the landowner.
- 3.11.23 New development which will need additions/improvements to the existing electricity infrastructure will be funded by the developer and the DNO in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology; the process does not usually take more than 2 years.

## **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Negotiation between the developer and the DNO. If overhead lines are to be moved, then the approach needs to be made before the application is submitted.
- Development of National Grid gas infrastructure is likely to be as a result of overall housing growth, rather than an individual development. Works on the local network would be delivered by DNO in negotiation with the developer.

## **3.12 Renewable Energy**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment
- Prosperous Economy

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Energy \(2007\) Department of Trade and Industry](#)
- PUSH Sustainability Framework
- [Renewables Obligation](#)
- [The UK Renewable Energy Strategy \(2009\) Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change by command of Her Majesty](#)
- [Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy](#)

### **Definition of Renewable Energy Infrastructure**

- 3.12.1 Much of the renewable energy required to meet the target will come from sources outside of the District e.g. marine wind power, but a significant proportion will need to be generated either in the home through solar energy or ground source heat pumps. Renewable energy schemes must be appropriate in form and location to provide renewable energy efficiently without negatively impacting on the environment. The main source of renewable energy which is relevant to this study is that created through district heat and power systems.
- 3.12.2 Decentralised energy efficiency measures in some form of local CHP system could also help to reduce the carbon footprint of new development

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.12.3 Renewable energy targets are set out in Table 21 below. The UK has signed up to the following legally-binding EU targets:
- 15% of energy to come from renewable sources by 2020 (enough to supply the equivalent of nearly all 26 million homes in the UK with their current electricity needs, and 4 million homes with their current heating needs).
  - Reduce the UK's emissions of carbon dioxide by over 750 million tonnes between now and 2030;
  - Reduce overall fossil fuel demand by around 10% and gas imports by 20–30% against what they would have been in 2020.
  - Increase renewable energy's share of the market to 15% by 2020, which equates to approximately 30% of electricity from renewable sources.
- 3.12.4 The Government has produced a Climate Change Strategy with a combined heat and power (CHP) target for at least 10GW of electrical CHP capacity by 2010. It also aimed for 10.4% of electricity consumption to be sourced from renewables by 2010. However it is estimated that only 8.2% has been achieved

but forecasts are that 18.6% will be achieved by 2015/16, above the target of 15.4%.

- 3.12.5 Winchester City Council will be developing their own targets through the Core Strategy based on giving priority to reducing energy demand before looking at energy generation measures.

Table 21: Standards. Renewable Energy Targets

	Target Date		
	2010	2015/16	2020
CO2			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce UK's emissions of carbon dioxide by over 750 million tonnes between now and 2030^</li> </ul>
Fossil Fuels			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce overall fossil fuel demand by around 10% and gas imports by 20–30%^</li> </ul>
Electricity consumption and Renewables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity consumption to be sourced from renewables Target: 10.4%*</li> <li>• Estimated achievement: 8.2%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity consumption to be sourced from renewables Target: 15.4%*</li> <li>• Forecast achievement: 18.6%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the renewable energy's share of the market by 15% (30% of electricity from renewable sources)^</li> </ul>
CHP Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CHP target for at least 10GW of electrical CHP capacity*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CHP electrical capacity Forecast: 8.6 GW by 2016/7*</li> </ul>	

^ EU targets

\* UK Climate Change Strategy

## **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.12.6 Creating a series of local networks providing energy and heat from renewable sources is an essential part of planning for the District's future. The District will be starting from a very low base-line.
- 3.12.7 Hampshire has three energy from waste (ERFs) plants at Marchwood, Chineham and Portsmouth which process residual (unrecyclable) waste and generate enough energy each year to power 50,000 homes. They take over 90% of the County's waste which would otherwise go to landfill<sup>44</sup>.
- 3.12.8 Recently local authorities have been given the power to generate and sell energy. The Energy White Paper sets out how over the next twenty years, the UK will need to invest in new electricity generation capacity to meet expected increases in demand and provide as much of the energy through low carbon forms of generation as possible.
- 3.12.9 It is therefore essential that the Core Strategy develops a viable and deliverable strategy for providing heat and energy from renewable energy sources throughout the District. Work on these initiatives will need to feed into the future infrastructure delivery strategy. Table 21 below sets out the projects being considered to meet the requirements from new development in the proposed strategic allocations.

---

<sup>44</sup> [Press release, Hampshire to benefit from new rules on selling energy, 09 August 2010. Department of Energy and Climate Change](#)

Table 22: Infrastructure measures being considered. Renewable Energy Targets

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• Opportunities to provide renewable energy and on-site generation will be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be funded by developer throughout all phases.</li> <li>• To be agreed following feasibility studies.</li> </ul>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large-scale wind turbines or community energy system with energy centre (biomass and/or gas CHP/boilers) are being considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Developer/Utility provider and Local Authority will be responsible for delivery and funding. Costs will depend on outcome of the Energy Strategy. Gas/ electricity supply backups are in place.</li> </ul>	
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of renewable energy in line with PUSH and National Guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be funded by the developer throughout the development. Costs to be agreed.</li> </ul>	

## **Time Line**

3.12.10 The Core Strategy will set out renewable energy policies for providing heat and energy from renewable energy sources. The Council is currently producing an associated SPD/guidance note which will explain how the policy will be implemented in respect of development schemes – including renewable energy considerations. In the longer term, it is essential that the Core Strategy is linked to clear targets and a secure financial framework is developed.

## **Risks**

3.12.11 Failures to meet the District's energy needs from sustainable sources will contribute to climate change and the District's already large carbon footprint. It will also increase fuel poverty as energy prices rise.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

3.12.12 A Climate Change Levy is charged on the energy use of industrial, commercial businesses, agriculture and public administration which is then used to support energy efficiency and low carbon technology.

3.12.13 A Renewables Obligation is used which requires energy suppliers to provide increasing proportions of electricity sourced from qualifying renewable fuels.

3.12.14 Feed-In Tariffs were also introduced in April 2010 to fund domestic energy users for the renewable electricity they produce.

3.12.15 In addition, a Renewable Heat Incentive is being considered by Government as a way to provide funding to support renewable heating schemes.

3.12.16 A carbon off-set fund will be considered to secure funding for renewable energy technologies from development which cannot meet the challenges of carbon neutrality on site.

## **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

3.12.17 This Strategy will be delivered through a partnership between the City Council, energy providers, and social enterprise groups.

---

## **3.13 Utility services – Waste and Resource Management**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan 1998 Saved Policies](#)
- The above document has mainly been superseded by the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2007](#) but some of the key policies have been saved.

Some of the Core Strategy minerals and waste policies are being reviewed and there has recently been a consultation on these policies.

- Waste and Resource Management HWRC Redevelopment and Relocation Capital Programme for 2010/11 to 2012/13.
- Waste and Resource Future Strategy (currently in preparation)
- Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) (2008)

### **Definition of Waste Infrastructure**

- 3.13.1 The County Council is the waste disposal authority, and is responsible for the Household Waste Recycling Centres. The Material Recovery Facilities, Composting Sites and Energy from Waste infrastructure in the county are also provided by Hampshire County Council.
- 3.13.2 Winchester City Council is responsible for the refuse collection service and this is funded through council tax charges. Collections of waste and recycling materials from your home are transferred to the County Council for processing and disposal.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- Hampshire County Council
- Winchester City Council

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.13.3 The strategy in Hampshire is to reduce waste in the first instance then re-use waste, followed by recycling and finally energy recovery. Some unavoidable waste is sent to landfill. However, Hampshire sends just 10% of its household waste to landfill currently, which is much less than any other UK authority.
- 3.13.4 The South East Plan set targets for reducing waste growth to 1% by 2010 and down to 0.5% by 2020. The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy also has the target to increase the average recycling rate to 60% by 2020.
- 3.13.5 There is no set trigger point for new HWRC facilities; however, developments over 2,000 dwellings can have a significant impact on HWRCs and provision of a new facility may be appropriate for this scale of new development.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.13.6 Hampshire has 4.5 years of non-hazardous landfill capacity left. Waste handling capacity also needs to be increased. In addition, there is a lack of recycling facilities for construction and demolition waste in Hampshire.
- 3.13.7 There are 3 Household Waste Recycling Centres in the Winchester district. The largest site is located in Winchester Town where ca.75% of the waste is recycled. There is a medium sized site at Bishop's Waltham and a smaller site at New Alresford. All of these sites are either operating at or near their operational capacity.

3.13.8 Table 23 below sets out potential options for providing waste and resource management facilities to accommodate new development in the proposed Strategic Allocations.

Table 23: Infrastructure measures being considered. Waste and Resource Management

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
Non-PUSH area of Winchester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible investment into the existing HWRC facilities if a significant number of new dwellings are built which can not be accommodated by existing facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer Contribution based on additional population will be sought</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HWRC at Winchester is working close to or near capacity at peak times.</li> <li>There is a small site at New Alresford which is operating at or near to its operational capacity.</li> </ul>
North Whiteley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investment into the existing HWRC facilities or into new site depending upon the population increase from new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer contributions either towards improvements at existing sites or towards a new site (which may include the developer providing the land).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nearest HWRC site is located at Segensworth which is currently close to operational capacity at peak times. It is likely that the capacity will be exceeded as a result of the additional waste from the proposed development. The HWRC at Hedge End is also at the limits of its capacity.</li> </ul>
West of Waterlooville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new facility will be provided when the developer meets 'trigger' commitments set out within the S106. Agreement and funding is available – estimated delivery in summer 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer Contribution Estimated cost of the new facility <b>£0.90m</b>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nearest facility is at Waterlooville within Havant district. The proposal is to relocate this facility within the site on a piece of land provided by the developer (Taylor Wimpey) and provide a new site with increased capacity.</li> </ul>
PUSH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible investment into the existing HWRC facilities if a significant number of new dwellings are built which cannot be accommodated by existing facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer Contribution based on additional population will be sought</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a medium sized site at Bishops Waltham which is operating at or near to its operational capacity.</li> </ul>

## **Risks**

- 3.13.9 The provision of household waste recycling facilities can be part funded by developer contributions, but because it usually serves a wider area the majority of the funding is also required from the County Council. There are risks associated with securing the funding and timely procurement of these facilities.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.13.10 Developer contributions may be sought towards improvements at existing sites or towards a new site, where HCC may ask the developer to provide a suitable plot of land alongside a financial contribution towards design and development costs. The cost of the build could be up to **£1million** and HCC would also need to secure funding. No external grant funding is available.
- 3.13.11 If new facilities are not available in time or can not be funded, household waste may be redirected to facilities which have more capacity.

## **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Hampshire County Council is responsible for the provision and management of the HWRCs. WCC will need to assist in the identification of suitable sites within the District, if additional HWRCs are deemed to be required or existing sites are relocated.
- 

## **3.14 Utility services - Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Future water and sewerage charges 2010-15: Final determinations Ofwat](#)
- [Groundwater protection: policy and practice \(GP3\) Environment Agency](#)
- Portsmouth Water: 2010-2035 Water Resources Management Plan 2010
- [Portsmouth Water Updated 2009 Draft Water Resources Management Plan September 2010](#)
- PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy
- [Southern Water: 2010-2035 Water Resources Management Plan October 2009](#)
- [South East River Basin Management Plan](#)
- [Updated Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2009 \(Update draft published July 2010\) - Appendices](#)
- Water Framework Directive

## **Definition of Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge Infrastructure**

- 3.14.1 The District plays an essential role in the provision of water resources for the District and PUSH area, providing a significant number of public and private water supply abstraction points. Importantly, the Environment Agency views the groundwater resources in Winchester District as amongst the most sensitive in the region, the most important of which are currently at 'poor' status under the Water Framework Directive. These water resources need continued protection against impacts from development as well as from diffuse pollution.
- 3.14.2 Portsmouth Water supply treated water to the south east part of Winchester District covering areas from West Meon and Bishop's Waltham. They abstract from springs, boreholes and from the Lower Itchen at Gaters Mill which when treated is piped to service reservoirs as required, such as the reservoir located at Wickham. They do not treat any wastewater within the District.
- 3.14.3 Southern Water supplies Winchester's water from ground water and from surface water abstraction points on the Rivers Itchen (augmented by Candover and Alre groundwater sources if required) and Test. All waste water within the District is treated by Southern Water. Within the District, Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) are located at Morestead, Harestock and Bishops Waltham. Peel Common, Budds Farm and Chickenhall Eastleigh serve parts of Winchester but are all located outside the District's boundary.
- 3.14.4 The Environment Agency has designated 80% of the District which overlies Chalk Strata as a principle aquifer and 46% of the District is protected by Source Protection Zones covering the abstraction points. Water quality and impacts of contamination are therefore key issues in the District. The Agency will review abstraction licences through the Habitats Directive Stage 4 Review of Consents a review of discharge consents under this process is ongoing.

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.14.5 The Water Companies' Water Resource Management Plans set out measures to demonstrate how predicted demand can be met and a surplus in supply maintained. The predicted demand is based on housing numbers above those allocated in the South East Plan and therefore it is considered that there is sufficient capacity in the trunk system to accommodate the planned level of growth providing measures are put in place in new developments to reduce water usage. These measures will include water efficiency, leakage control, wash-water recovery and compulsory metering. However, there may be localised capacity issues at some sites where connection to the nearest point of capacity would be required.
- 3.14.6 As new development meets higher levels in the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) so it will need to meet higher standards of water efficiency, thus reducing the demand for water and wastewater sent for treatment. CfSH aims to reduce water consumption and sets targets in the codes. To reach code level 5 or 6, grey-water or rainwater recycling will be required and consideration of how this will work with wastewater flow requirements will be needed. Portsmouth Water is not basing its reduction targets on the principle of water neutrality.

## **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.14.7 Future capacity and deficits calculated in the Water Company Management Plans are based on forecasted population growth and take account of the household growth set out in the former SE Plan. Measures being considered to provide freshwater and wastewater management to accommodate additional development are set out in Table 24 below.
- 3.14.8 Portsmouth Water demonstrates in their updated draft WRMP that they can meet average freshwater demand for their area up to 2034/35. However, the “baseline” forecast demand will exceed supply during critical period peak demand (peak week demand in a dry year) from 2015/16 as the River Itchen sustainability reductions are put into effect. To prevent this from occurring, the Portsmouth Water, Water Resource Management Plan sets out actions to prevent the deficit including water efficiency, leakage control, wash-water recovery and compulsory metering. Post 2034/35 the Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir will be required to meet the projected demands.
- 3.14.9 Both the Portsmouth Water and Southern Water abstraction areas are “seriously water-stressed” which means that the amount of water available per person is low and the water demand per person is therefore a high proportion of effective rainfall<sup>45</sup>. The Water Company management plans therefore identify options for addressing this including introducing compulsory metering.
- 3.14.10 In the short-term, the Southern Water managed water resources for the area are robust and there is a positive supply: demand balance so there is sufficient capacity to serve the development identified in the saved policies of Winchester’s Local Plan Review (2006).
- 3.14.11 Investment is needed to provide additional wastewater treatment capacity and treated water resources and to provide additional local sewerage and water distribution capacity. Southern Water has a scheme in place to increase water treatment capacity at Testwood Water Supply Works, and to transfer water from Testwood to Otterbourne Water Supply Works. The scheme is part of the River Itchen sustainability solution and the pipeline will need to pass through small parts of Winchester District to reach Otterbourne. However, Southern Water has identified no absolute constraints in delivering additional capacity to serve new development in Winchester pending the ongoing review of abstraction and discharge licences under the Habitats Regulations Review of Consents process carried out by the Environment Agency.
- 3.14.12 Following potential reductions in abstraction licences through the Asset Management Plan (AMP) 6, there are potential future deficits from 2019/20. Programmes in place to address this include a program of metering and leakage reduction. Additional capacity will be required to serve the level of development identified in the South East Plan.
- 3.14.13 Portsmouth Water is using new boreholes at Lower Upham (Northbrook WTW – abstraction from River Hamble Catchment) and Newtown (Soberton WTW – River Meon Catchment) to compensate for reduced abstraction at Hoe WTW as a result of environmental impact on The Moors SSSI. These new boreholes do

---

<sup>45</sup> [Areas of water stress: final classification. Environment Agency](#)

not allow for any additional increase in abstraction and the licences are time-limited to 2016 so they will be reviewed through the next round of Asset Management Plans (AMP 5) and feed into the Water Resource Management Plans in 2014 (there is a presumption of renewal for time limited licences). The overall abstraction from Soberton has been reduced on environmental grounds to deal with the over-abstraction of the River Meon Catchment and is unlikely to require further reduction on environmental grounds. Abstraction licences for the River Itchen are also due (by 2015) to be reduced to improve minimum residual flows on the river.

- 3.14.14 The requirements of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) may further reduce abstraction licences and discharge consent limits. The Directive seeks to achieve "good status" for all designated water bodies in addition to "no deterioration" (awaiting Defra guidance on "no deterioration") in current quality. The South East River Basin Management Plan looked at the integrated management of water resource and set out environmental improvement measures to meet the requirements of the WFD and under the advice of the EA the Water Companies will carry out investigations on the River Hamble; the outcomes of which are only likely to be incorporated in the next round of Water Company Management Plans in 2014.

Table 24: Infrastructure measures being considered. Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
Non-PUSH area of Winchester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an adequate supply of water with effective water reduction measures put in place. Additional measures are identified in the Water Resources Management Plan.</li> <li>• The adequacy of capacity in the local sewerage and water distribution systems would need to be assessed on a site-by-site basis. There may be capacity issues in the sewerage network to Morestead WWTWs to serve additional development.</li> <li>• Investment will be required to provide additional wastewater treatment capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs to be met by developer. If network needs upgrading due to new development, developer contributions will be sought.</li> <li>• Investment required to the local sewer and water distribution infrastructure to serve new development would need to be funded by the development. This is consistent with Ofwat's view that this infrastructure should be paid for by those that directly benefit from it, rather than existing customers who would otherwise have to pay through increased general charges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options for sustainable on-site treatment will be considered alongside measures to overcome the network peak capacity issues, necessary to protect the underlying aquifer.</li> <li>• Additional wastewater treatment capacity may not initially be technically possible in some locations already operating at the best available level of treatment. In other cases, additional treatment may be considered unsustainable in terms of carbon costs and/or financial costs which will mean funding is unlikely to be approved.</li> <li>• Water efficiency and metering initiatives being introduced through the Water Resource Management Plans should reduce pressure on treatment capacity.</li> </ul>

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding to deliver wastewater treatment capacity and additional water resources can be obtained through the periodic review process, provided there is planning certainty.</li> </ul>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is adequate supply with effective water reduction measures put in place. Additional measures are identified in the Water Resources Management Plan.</li> <li>Connection at the nearest point of capacity, or investment off-site to the local water distribution system will be required.</li> <li>Connection at the nearest point of capacity, or investment off-site to the local sewerage system will be required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer to fund supply connections as part of development plot cost.</li> <li>Developer/Provider at an estimated cost of <b>£1m to £1.5m</b>.</li> <li>Investment to the local water distribution system would need to be funded by the development.</li> <li>Investment to the local sewerage system would need to be funded by the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure may be reduced by detailed modelling of diversified flow rates and an element of attenuation.</li> <li>Additional wastewater treatment capacity may not initially be technically possible in some locations already operating at the best available level of treatment. In other cases, additional treatment may be considered unsustainable in terms of carbon costs and/or financial costs which will mean funding is unlikely to be approved.</li> <li>Water efficiency and metering initiatives being introduced through the Water Resource Management Plans should reduce pressure on treatment capacity.</li> </ul>
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate supply with effective water reduction measures put in place.</li> </ul>		

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New pumping station on site for waste water treatment as well as new gravity sewers to the south.</li> <li>• Connection at the nearest point of capacity, or investment off-site to the local sewerage system. will be required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funded by the developer (Grainger). Estimated cost of £1.7m.</li> <li>• Investment to the local sewerage system would need to be funded by the development<sup>38</sup>.</li> </ul>	
Rest of PUSH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For development that would exceed the capacity of the existing infrastructure, investment will be needed both at the WWTW and to improve the trunk and local sewerage system.</li> <li>• A large new site is likely to need a requisition to connect directly to the WWTWs, or if cheaper, the developer may opt to contribute towards the upgrade of the existing rising main.</li> <li>• The adequacy of capacity in the local sewerage and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity is available for development identified in Winchester's adopted local plan (2006). Additional capacity will be required to serve development beyond this level.</li> <li>• Once proposals are firmed up in the Core Strategy, this will provide the evidence for Southern Water's investment proposals to Ofwat in 2014 to secure funding between 2015-2020.</li> <li>• Investment required to the local sewer and water distribution infrastructure</li> </ul>	

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments
	<p>water distribution system would need to be assessed on a site-by-site basis.</p>	<p>would need to be funded by the development<sup>38</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relating to Wickham specifically, past experience indicates Ofwat will agree funding to support new development with planning certainty, however if funding is agreed, the earliest the works could be completed is probably 2017. If development is proposed before 2017, then it is likely that the developer would be expected to reduce the amount of surface water runoff entering the system so that the new development could use resulting spare capacity for foul water, but this would be considered by Southern Water on a case-by-case basis as the prevailing expectation is that development should be delayed until capacity can be provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents in Wickham have highlighted an issue of foul water flooding of properties in Riverside Mews. Advice from Southern Water is that the existing capacity at the WWTW is limited and an assessment carried out in 2009 found that Wickham WWTW could only accommodate around 50 new homes up to 2017 without the need to upgrade the facility. Therefore, new development must not exacerbate the flood risk within the catchment (the systems peak flow in rain fall events must not exceed existing levels). To achieve this either surface water needs to be removed from the sewerage system (this currently drains into the existing combined system) which is a more suitable option for small, dispersed development), or by connecting new development directly into the WWTWs. The latter is only likely to be viable for significant development on a single site, but this is likely to exceed capacity and is therefore unlikely to be a suitable option until after 2017, when phasing of development could be considered which would allow for the necessary upgrading of the infrastructure.</li> </ul>

## **Time Line**

- Southern Water's Water Resources Management Plan runs from 2010-2025. Portsmouth Water (PW) is currently consulting on their updated Management Plan until November 2010 which will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. The next round of Water Resource Management Plans is already underway and will be influenced through the Asset Management Plans 5. There will be public consultation on these Plans.
- Next Ofwat review of water industry's charges will be in 2014 for the 2015-2020 period. Once proposals are firmed up in the Core Strategy, this will provide the evidence for Southern Water's investment proposals to Ofwat in 2014.

## **Risks**

- 3.14.15 Additional demand on resources will cause deficits before the measures to address future deficits can be implemented.
- 3.14.16 The Development Plan Documents are not adopted in time to support Southern Water's investment proposals to Ofwat in 2014 and therefore the City Council will not be able to secure funding to support the development polices.
- 3.14.17 The Environment Agency's Review of Consents (RoC) process may identify environmental impacts which would require more stringent licensing which is above BAT. The RoC is largely completed in the PW area of supply and the requirements are being implemented; the requirements for the River Itchen have not yet been finalised. PW state that the time limiting of some licence variation has added an additional element of risk for them.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

- 3.14.18 Funding for strategic infrastructure, such as extension to wastewater treatment works and water resources can be obtained through the Ofwat review of the water industry's charges, which takes place every five years: the next periodic review has commenced and will be finalised in 2014.
- 3.14.19 Current funding is agreed in the 2009 Ofwat price determination from 2010 to 2015 which allows for additional capacity to be provided for development identified in the saved policies of Winchester's Local Plan Review (2006). Funding is specified for the company and therefore exact funding for the District is not provided.
- 3.14.20 Additional funding will be required to provide the extra capacity needed to meet similar levels of development set out in the former SE Plan and for projects post 2015. Ofwat generally agrees to fund investment required to serve new development, but in order for any funding to be agreed through the 2014 Ofwat review, the investment proposals to Ofwat need to be based on development proposals which have planning certainty (i.e. based on an adopted Development Plan Document).
- 3.14.21 Ofwat expects Water Companies to recover costs of providing local infrastructure to new properties through the requisitioning process (requiring the

developer to connect to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity) supported through planning policies.

3.14.22 No external grant funding is anticipated.

#### **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- Environment Agency
- Southern Water
- Portsmouth Water
- Developer contributions towards local infrastructure, supported by planning policies.

3.14.23 The provision of water resources and wastewater treatment capacity is dependent on obtaining:-

- necessary environmental permits from the Environment Agency;
- planning certainty from planning authorities
- necessary planning permissions from planning authorities; and
- approval of investment proposals by Ofwat.

3.14.24 The delivery of infrastructure for water and wastewater services is dependent on the planning authority:-

- phasing the development with the provision of necessary infrastructure and
- supporting the requisitioning process in appropriate cases so that local sewerage and water distribution capacity can be delivered.

---

### **3.15 Utility services - Water Management - Flood defences**

#### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- High Quality Environment

#### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [An assessment of the additional flood losses associated with groundwater flooding: a report to Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council \(2006\) Colin Green, Theresa Wilson, Trevor Masterson and Neil Boothby](#)
- [Groundwater protection: policy and practice \(GP3\) Environment Agency](#)
- [Making Space for Water](#) 2005 Defra et al.
- [Managing Flood Risks In Parishes A Best Practice Guide 2nd Edition, Hampshire Flood Steering Group](#)
- Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk
- [Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps](#)
- [South East Hampshire Catchment Flood Management Plan](#)

- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Atkins
- [Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Halcrow](#)
- [Test & Itchen Catchment Flood Management Plan](#)

### **Definition of Flood defence Infrastructure**

- 3.15.1 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has overall policy responsibility for flood and coastal erosion risk in England.
- 3.15.2 In April 2008, the Environment Agency became responsible for overseeing the management of flood risk in England. This includes the allocation of all flood risk management capital funding. The Environment Agency is also an operating authority.
- 3.15.3 Other operating authorities include WCC and highways authorities (HCC and Highways Agency), who lead on the management of local flood risk and the flooding of roads and highways respectively. HCC became a Lead Local Flood Authority as a result of the Flood & Water Management Act 2010 (due to be implemented in April 2011). Water Companies are responsible for foul water system flooding. Operating authorities have permissive powers that allow them to protect both people and property where it is economically, technically and environmentally viable, and where affordable within national budgets. There is, however, no legal duty to build and maintain defences.
- 3.15.4 The highways authorities (HCC and Highways Agency) also act regarding flooding of roads and highways.
- 3.15.5 Landowners are liable for maintenance works on their own area of streams, but cannot change downstream flows.

### **Lead Organisations involved**

- Defra
- Environment Agency
- WCC/HCC
- HA/HCC
- Water Companies
- Landowners

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.15.6 Under PPS25, Local Planning Authorities should set planning policies which avoid where possible; manage (taking account of climate change) and reduce flood risk to and from development.
- 3.15.7 The Environment Agency has produced Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMP) which set out proposed actions to manage flood risk from fluvial, surface and ground water flooding.
- 3.15.8 Fluvial flooding maps are managed by the Environment Agency and are used to inform the flood risk assessments for development proposals. The level of flood

risk associated with an area will determine the type of development that could be considered for the site. This information and requirements for flood risk assessments or exception tests is set out in PPS25.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.15.9 The District is affected by Fluvial flooding from the many rivers and tributaries flowing through the District, groundwater flooding from natural springs and winterbournes fed by the underground aquifers and surface water flooding where water can not drain away quickly enough.
- 3.15.10 Groundwater flooding is a significant risk within the District. The EA hold some information on this source of flooding and have an advisory role regarding groundwater flood management, but the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 sets the responsibility on the County Council to address local risks. Areas such as Hambledon experienced devastating groundwater flooding events in 2000/2001. Flooding issues have also been raised in Wickham where residents experience foul water flooding of properties in Riverside Mews during rainfall events when the peak flow exceeds the capacity of the system.
- 3.15.11 The South East Hampshire CFMP confirms that flood risk in the Hambledon and Wickham area is mainly from groundwater flooding as a result of excessive seasonal rainfall. Reducing groundwater flooding directly is not always feasible, therefore other risk management actions are needed such as local improvements, improving the maintenance of drainage pathways and reducing the consequences of flooding by using flood resilience measures. For development this means avoiding inappropriate development in the areas at risk of flooding.
- 3.15.12 Surface water flooding is identified as an issue affecting the middle reaches of the River Hamble when the drainage network is overwhelmed (South East Hampshire CFMP). In general fluvial flood risk is low, but there is risk to some properties in Bishops Waltham. Surface water flooding is also an issue affecting Denmead. The EA expect new development to manage drainage so that there is no net increase in flood risk and avoid inappropriate development in the floodplain.
- 3.15.13 Fluvial flooding is an issue for Winchester Town and the EA (in the Test and Itchen CFMP) propose that action should be centred around improving channels and channel structures and promoting greater resilience to flooding. They are also proposing to look into the potential for storing floodwaters in the floodplains upstream of Winchester which could help Winchester downstream.
- 3.15.14 The Environment Agency's Flood Risk maps show flood risk from rivers across the District. Historic flooding events have been mapped for the District and can be viewed in the Appendices of the [Halcrow SFRA](#). Both of the proposed strategic allocations have some risk from flooding.
- 3.15.15 The measures being considered to manage flood risk from new development are set out in Table 25 below.

Table 25: Infrastructure measures being considered, Flood Mitigation

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
<b>Non-PUSH area of Winchester</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SuDS can be used to mitigate potential flooding and surface water sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funded by developer</li> </ul>	
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood defences not required.</li> <li>SuDS will be used to mitigate potential flooding and to manage surface water sustainably.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer funded – cost will depend on strategy yet to be agreed.</li> </ul>	
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SuDS will be used to mitigate potential flooding and to surface water sustainability</li> <li>Commuted sum (covering future maintenance costs of system to be adopted by Local Authority – in this case HCC)</li> <li>River Wallington restoration works</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be funded by developer (Grainger) at cost of <b>£5.6m</b></li> <li>Funded by developer at a cost of <b>£1.2m</b></li> <li>Funded by developer at a cost of <b>£1.94m</b></li> </ul>	
<b>District wide</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development to manage drainage so that there is no net increase in flood risk and avoid inappropriate development in the floodplain.</li> <li>Seek opportunities for multi-functional green infrastructure (flood storage, reducing risk elsewhere), and through the provision of SUDs infrastructure on new development sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer</li> <li>Developer/EA</li> </ul>	

## **Time Line**

3.15.16 Flood risk maps are updated regularly by the Environment Agency.

## **Risks**

3.15.17 The impact of flooding is expensive. For example the Hambledon groundwater floods are estimated to have cost over **£1.1 million** in 2000/01<sup>46</sup>. If the infrastructure for flood defence is not provided, then the costs of flooding events may have a significant impact on local communities.

## **Delivery - Funding and contingencies**

3.15.18 Defra provide grants to the Environment Agency to carry out their activities. Defra also support capital improvement projects carried out by operating bodies to reduce flood risk.

## **Primary Delivery Mechanism**

- It is now a pre-requisite of all new major development sites that they provide an effective Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) which is appropriate for the location (i.e. not located in areas of known or potential contamination, and ensuring groundwater is protected from pollution). This is to be funded through the development. Under the new Flood and Water Management Act 2010, Southern Water will be expected to adopt the underground SUDs infrastructure and HCC to adopt the remaining SUDs area.
- 

## **3.16 Utilities Service: Communications**

### **Relevant Sustainable Community Strategy Policies**

- Prosperous Economy
- High Quality Environment
- Active Communities

### **Other Studies/Strategies Providing Guiding Principles**

- [Digital Britain Report, 2009](#)
- [eHampshire](#). The eHampshire website provides further information on the development of e-communications across the county.
- [EU Digital Agenda](#). The Digital Agenda is the EU Initiative for 2010-2020 which sets out the EU strategy to achieve a ‘flourishing digital economy’ by 2020.

---

<sup>46</sup> [An assessment of the additional flood losses associated with groundwater flooding: a report to Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council \(2006\) Colin Green, Theresa Wilson, Trevor Masterson and Neil Boothby](#)

- [Information and communications technology toolkit, 2006. East Midlands Development Agency.](#)

### **Definition of Communications Infrastructure**

- 3.16.1 Having good communications networks (such as high speed broadband and improved mobile service) across the District which allow businesses to work efficiently and remain competitive in the market is vital for the economic success of the District. Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) are responsible for 5% of European GDP directly and indirectly it is responsible for much more than this<sup>47</sup>; ICT is also an increasingly important social tool.
- 3.16.2 ICT includes different forms of telecommunications technologies, including high speed broadband connections. A study has recently been launched by WCC and eHampshire to identify the shortfall in broadband provision and to develop opportunities to ensure that the District remains economically competitive.
- 3.16.3 The infrastructure required for communication will include plant and equipment including communication masts, which can be difficult to locate sensitively.

### **Standards/triggers**

- 3.16.4 The EU Digital Agenda aims to:-

*'deliver sustainable economic and social benefits from a digital single market based on fast and ultra fast internet and interoperable applications.'*

Member states are therefore committed to provide a common EU broadband communications network by 2020.

[The National Broadband Strategy 2010](#) sets out the UK government plan for a Universal Service Commitment to ensure virtually every household will be able to access a broadband line capable of delivering at least 2 Mbps (mega bytes per second) by 2015 to be funded from the public purse. This is less than required by many businesses and the government has further commitments to provide the best 'superfast' broadband in Europe by 2015.

### **Current level and future capacity/deficits and measures in place**

- 3.16.5 eHampshire have produced a [broadband speed map](#) for the District. This indicates that the higher broadband speeds are centred around the larger settlements with the exception of places such as Colden Common, Denmead, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Whiteley, Olivers Battery, Kings Worthy and South Wonston where most postcodes have speeds of less than 2Mbps.

---

<sup>47</sup> EU Digital Agenda

Table 26: Infrastructure measures being considered. Communication

Area	Measures under consideration	Funding mechanism	General Comments:
Non-PUSH area of Winchester	• Nothing specific identified	• Delivered by developer but funded by the provider	• South Wonston Village Plan identifies a need for better broadband provision for their community.
North Whiteley	• Nothing specific identified	• Delivered by developer but funded by the provider	
West of Waterlooville	• Nothing specific identified	• Delivered by developer but funded by the provider	

- 3.16.6 The majority of high-speed broadband networks will be funded through private investment with government providing some investment to help with installation in rural communities. Within Hampshire, broadband improvements will be delivered through a partnership between the County Council, local authorities and the providers.
- 3.16.7 Winchester City Council is promoting broadband to Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) and communities through eHampshire. Within the District, eHampshire are providing advice and grants for new broadband connections.

### Risks

- 3.16.8 The main risk is that Winchester will get left behind the rest of the country/sub-region, which in turn will create difficulties in attracting the investment necessary to grow and diversify the local economy, and to retain highly skilled jobs.

### Primary Delivery Mechanism

- Service Provider
- Developer

# Bibliography

## General References

- [Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations](http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/147537.pdf)  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/147537.pdf>
- Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study, 2009. Hampshire County Council
- National Infrastructure Plan 2010. October 2010. HM Treasury, Infrastructure UK
- [The Cost & Funding Of Growth In South East England Final Report, 2005, Roger Tym and Partners With Rita Hale and Associates Ltd. SQW](#)
- [Technical Report on Infrastructure Requirements in the South East 2006-2026, 2006, Final Report to the South East of England Regional Assembly](#)

## Transport

- [Car Parking Standards SPD 2010 Winchester City Council](#)
- [Circular 2/07: Planning and the Strategic Road Network, 2007. Department for Transport](#)
- [Control Period 4 Delivery Plan update 2010, Network Rail](#)
- [Countryside Access Plans \(Forest of Bere, South Downs, Hampshire Downs and Test and Itchen\)](#)
- [Delivering a Sustainable Transport System Study Department for Transport \(DAST\)](#)
- [Funding transport infrastructure for strategically significant developments, 2009. Department for Transport](#)
- [Great Western Route Utilisation Strategy March 2010](#)
- [Hampshire's 2nd Local Transport Plan, 2006. Hampshire County Council](#)
- [Highways Agency business plan](#)
- [Highways Agency's \(HA\) Regional Network Report \(RNR\) for the South East 2008](#)
- [Highways Agency's \(HA\) Regional Network Report \(RNR\) for the South East 2008 \(2010 version due out later this year\).](#)
- [Local Transport Scheme List, 2010. Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council](#)
- M27 Corridor Parallel Study, TfSH 2010
- M27 Corridor Study, Transport for South Hampshire 2010
- [Road Transport Forecasts 2008 Results from the Department for Transport's National Transport Model](#)
- [Third Hampshire Local Transport Plan \(LTP 3\) consultation draft– final to be](#)

published by March 2011

- Transport for South Hampshire Bus-Rapid-Transit information
- Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Stage 2 Report November 2009
- Winchester Town Access Plan, Consultation Draft 2010

### **Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space**

- Natural England's Access to Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt)
- Open Space Strategy 2010-2011 Winchester City Council
- Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study also known as Winchester City Council PPG17 Study March 2008 – 2026
- PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy
- PUSH Recreational Pressure Study on impacts to HRA sites
- South East Green Infrastructure Framework
- Sports Facility Report - Winchester District. May 2009. Sport Hampshire and IOW
- The South Downs Management Plan 2008 – 2013
- Winchester City Council Green Infrastructure (GI) Study 2010
- Winchester District Sport and Physical Activity Strategy. 2006 – 2012  
Winchester District Sport and Physical Activity Alliance

### **Housing**

- Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008) Winchester City Council
- Central Hampshire Sub-Region Housing Viability Study (2008) Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council, Winchester City Council
- Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing 2010 DCLG
- Rural Housing Development Action Plan 2008/09 - 2012/13 (2009) Winchester Housing Board
- The current Housing Strategy for 2008/9 – 2012/13 sets out the Council's vision and priorities for the five year period; this is reviewed annually. These have been used to inform the development of affordable housing policies in the Core Strategy.
- The Housing Green Paper 2008
- The Partnership for Extra Care Housing in Hampshire (2008) Hampshire County

Council and District and Borough Councils and Hampshire PCT.

- Winchester City Council Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010) Adams Integra
- Winchester City Council Local Connections Study (2010) Adams Integra

## **Education**

- Children's Services Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2012/13
- Developers' Contributions towards Children's Services Facilities 2010 Hampshire County Council
- School Places Plan

## **Health**

- Hampshire LINK
- Hampshire NHS Estates Strategy 2010/2015
- Hampshire NHS PCT Estates Strategy 2008-2013 (update Feb 2009)
- Liberating The Nhs: Local Democratic Legitimacy In Health BMA Summary (England), 2010. British Medical Association
- NHS White Paper 'Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS
- Healthy Horizons for Primary Care, Primary Care Strategy, 2009. NHS Hampshire:

## **Social Infrastructure: Creative Industries, Arts and Culture including Community Halls**

- Emerging South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural infrastructure Needs Assessment. 2010
- South Hampshire Creative Industries Development Framework - Consultation Draft. 2010
- Vision and Strategy for Hampshire's Library and Information Service, 2009 – 2014 Hampshire County Council
- Winchester Cultural Strategy 2009
- Winchester4Communities

## **Emergency Services:**

- Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service Plan 2010 to 2013
- Hampshire Police Authority & Hampshire Constabulary Policing Plan 2008 - 2011
- Secure by Design

- [The South Central Ambulance Service Strategy & Business Plan 2007– 2010](#)

### **Gas and Electricity Provision**

- [Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Energy \(2007\) Department of Trade and Industry](#)
- [National Electricity Transmission System Seven Year Statement, 2010. National Grid](#)
- [National Grid Seven Year Statement 2010](#)

### **Renewable Energy**

- [Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Energy \(2007\) Department of Trade and Industry](#)
- [PUSH Sustainability Framework](#)
- [Renewables Obligation](#)
- [The UK Renewable Energy Strategy \(2009\) Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change by command of Her Majesty](#)
- [Press release, Hampshire to benefit from new rules on selling energy, 09 August 2010. Department of Energy and Climate Change](#)

### **Waste and Resource Management**

- [Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan 1998 Saved Policies](#)
- [The above document has mainly been superseded by the by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2007 but some of the key policies have been saved. Some of the Core Strategy minerals and waste policies are being reviewed and there has recently been a consultation on these policies.](#)
- [Waste and Resource Future Strategy \(currently in preparation\)](#)
- [Waste and resource Management HWRC Redevelopment and Relocation Capital Programme for 2010/11 to 2012/13.](#)
- [Waste Framework Directive \(2008/98/EC\) \(2008\)](#)

### **Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge**

- [Areas of water stress: final classification. Environment Agency](#)
- [Future water and sewerage charges 2010-15: Final determinations Ofwat](#)
- [Portsmouth Water Updated 2009 Draft Water Resources Management Plan September 2010](#)
- [Portsmouth Water: 2010-2035 Water Resources Management Plan 2010](#)

- PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy
- [South East River Basin Management Plan](#)
- [Southern Water: 2010-2035 Water Resources Management Plan October 2009](#)
- Updated Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2009 (Update draft published July 2010) - Appendices
- Water Framework Directive

### **Water Management - Flood defences**

- [An assessment of the additional flood losses associated with groundwater flooding: a report to Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council \(2006\) Colin Green, Theresa Wilson, Trevor Masterson and Neil Boothby](#)
- [Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps](#)
- [Making Space for Water 2005 Defra et al.](#)
- [Managing Flood Risks In Parishes A Best Practice Guide 2nd Edition, Hampshire Flood Steering Group](#)
- Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Atkins
- [Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Halcrow](#)



## **Appendix 1: Current level of open space and built facilities provision within Winchester District**

Table 27: The following table sets out the current provision and deficit throughout Winchester District in formal open space provision as identified through the [Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study \(2008\) \(Part 4 - Built Sports Facilities Study - Main report\)](#).

Sports Facility	Current provision per 1000 pop (current Quantity)	Current shortfall per 1000 pop (Quantity)	Quantity required by 2016 (current shortfall)	Quantity required by 2026 (current shortfall)
Sports halls with community access	47.6m <sup>2</sup> (9 halls included)	6.9m <sup>2</sup> (1.3 halls)	11.3 (2.3)	12 (3)
Swimming pools with community access	8.6m <sup>2</sup> (3 pools included)	4.4m <sup>2</sup> (1.53 pools)	5 (2)	5.3 (2.3)
Fitness Gyms All provision	3.7 stations (418 total)	0.3 stns (34 in total)	500 stations in total (82)	528 stations in total (110)
Synthetic turf pitches All provision	283m <sup>2</sup> (0.04) (5 pitches)	47m <sup>2</sup> (0.8 pitches)	6.3 (1.3)	6.6 (1.6)
O/D Tennis Courts All courts	0.6 court (74 courts included)	0.2 (23 courts)	100 (28 courts)	106 (34 courts)
Indoor Bowls Rinks	1 x 6 rink centre per 120,000 pop	No shortfall	6 rink indoor centre	6 rink indoor centre

**Table 28: Informal greenspace provision as defined by the ANGSt standards as identified through Winchester's Green Infrastructure Study. Accessibility does not consider barriers such as whether the access roads have pavements, whether there is adequate parking for sites that are further away or whether there is direct road access.**

	<b>Accessible sites <math>\geq</math> 20 ha within 2km of home</b>	<b>Accessible sites <math>\geq</math> 100 ha within 5km of home</b>	<b>Accessible sites <math>\geq</math> 500 ha within 10km of home</b>
<b>Winchester Town</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Catherine's Hill SSSI (65ha)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crab Wood SSSI (Pt Of Farley Mount CP)</li> <li>• West Wood Hursley SINC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>North Whiteley</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swanwick</li> <li>• Meon Valley Railway Path</li> <li>• Kitnocks Estate</li> <li>• Botley Woods and Everett's &amp; Muses Copses SSSI (includes Whiteley Pastures)</li> <li>• Manor Farm Country Park (part of Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Botley Woods and Everett's &amp; Muses Copses SSSI (includes Whiteley Pastures)</li> <li>• Manor Farm Country Park (part of Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI)</li> </ul>	
<b>West of Waterlooville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creech Woods SINC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creech Woods SINC</li> <li>• Farlington Marshes (part of Langstone Harbour SSSI and also SPA, Ramsar and SAC site)</li> <li>• Havant Thicket</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>Fareham SDA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wickham Common SINC</li> <li>• Meon Valley Railway Path</li> <li>• Botley Wood and Everett's &amp; Muses Copses SSSI (includes Whiteley Pastures)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CROW</li> <li>• Botley Woods and Everett's &amp; Muses Copses SSSI (includes Whiteley Pastures)</li> <li>• West Walk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>Bishops Waltham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>New Alresford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

## **Appendix 2: Service Providers who were asked to provide information to inform this study.**

### **Infrastructure Delivery Plan Contacts**

#### **Site Contacts**

Interest	Agent	Site
Developer interest contacts	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Bushfield Camp
Developer interest contacts	RPS Planning	Barton Farm
Developer interest contacts - Strategic Allocations	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	North Whiteley
Developer interest contacts - Strategic Allocations	Savills	West of Waterlooville

#### **Key Infrastructure Providers**

Sector	Interest	Business
Education	Education	HCC Children's Services Department
Education	Education	Winchester University - Higher Education
Green Infrastructure	Community and recreation provision	Natural England
Green Infrastructure	Community and recreation provision	Natural England Planning
Green Infrastructure	Environment and Landscape	Landscape & Open Spaces Manager - WCC
Green Infrastructure	Green Infrastructure	Forestry Commission - LSP Rep
Green Infrastructure	Green Infrastructure	Wildlife Trust
Health	Health Facilities	Primary Care Projects Facilitator NHS Hampshire
Housing	Extra Care	HCC Wellbeing and Partnerships, Adult services – Extra Care Housing
Housing	Affordable Housing	RSL A2 Dominion
Housing	Affordable Housing	Community Action Hampshire
Housing	Affordable Housing	RSL Firstwessex
Housing	Affordable Housing	RSL Hyde Housing
Housing	Affordable Housing	RSL Radian

<b>Housing</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	RSL Sovereign
<b>Housing</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	RSL Swaythling Housing Society
<b>Housing</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	Head of Strategic Housing - WCC
<b>Infrastructure Planning</b>	<b>County - Overview</b>	HCC - Principal Planning Officer Environment Department
<b>Infrastructure Planning</b>	<b>WCC overview</b>	Head of Planning Control Management - WCC
<b>Public Services</b>	<b>Emergency Services</b>	Hampshire Fire Authority - Group Manager Winchester & District
<b>Public Services</b>	<b>Emergency Services</b>	Hants Police Authority Chief Inspector for Winchester
<b>Public Services</b>	<b>Emergency Services</b>	Ambulance - Head of Planning, South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust
<b>Public Services</b>	<b>Libraries</b>	Libraries - Acting Head of Libraries and Information HCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Arts Development Officer</b>	Arts Development Officer - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Communities</b>	Assistant Director (Commissioning) - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Community Services and Facilities</b>	Community Planning Manager Winchester City Council
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Community Services and Facilities</b>	HCC Library and Information Service
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Community Services and Facilities</b>	WACA
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Culture and Economic</b>	Assistant Director (Commissioning) - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Culture and Economic</b>	Economic Development Officer - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Culture and Economic</b>	PUSH Quality Places Delivery Manager
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Environment</b>	Assistant Director (Commissioning) - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Recreation provision</b>	HCC Countryside service
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Sports</b>	Sports and Physical Activity Manager - WCC
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Sports</b>	Sports Facilities Officer
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<b>Sport England</b>	Sport England
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Bus</b>	Bus Companies - Stagecoach
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Bus</b>	Blue Star Buses - Services between Southampton, Eastleigh and Winchester

<b>Transport</b>	<b>Bus</b>	BriJan Coaches - serves Bishops Waltham, Swanmore and Waltham Chase
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Local Road Network, Public Transport and Rights of Way</b>	HCC Transport
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Rail</b>	Network Rail
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Strategic Road Network</b>	Highways Agency – Network Planning Manager
<b>Transport</b>	<b>Transport and Access</b>	Head of Access and Infrastructure - WCC
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Communication</b>	British Telecom
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Communication</b>	eHampshire
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Power</b>	Scotia Gas Networks - Network Support Manager
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Power</b>	Scottish-Southern - Strategic Planner SSE Power Distribution
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Power</b>	National Grid, Land & Development Team
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Waste</b>	HCC- Waste & Resource Management
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Water</b>	Portsmouth Water
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Water</b>	Southern Water
<b>Utilities and Waste</b>	<b>Water and Flood Defence</b>	Environment Agency Development Control

