

Littleton, Littleton Lane, Winchester

Written Representation

Winchester District Local Plan Part One – Joint Core Strategy Examination in Public
Policy MTRA 3

Prepared on behalf of Holmes and Sons

October 2012

**Littleton, Littleton Lane
Planning 1270
Issue 01**

Prepared by: Stephen Smallman

Date: October 2012

Checked by:

Signed:

Date:

PV Projects

Grosvenor Court

Winchester Road

Ampfield

Winchester

Hants, SO51 9BD

COPYRIGHT: The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written consent of PV Projects.

Introduction and context

- 1.1 Holmes and Sons own and occupy land on the western edge of Littleton the extent and location of which is shown edged red on the attached plan. The site extends in total to about 2.8 ha and includes polytunnels, storage buildings and associated hard standing. In 2008 a Certificate of Lawfulness was issued for B8 use. The site is therefore previously developed land, located on the edge of Littleton; a third tier settlement in the Core Strategy's settlement hierarchy. It is proposed to redevelop the site for a mixed use scheme comprising up to 30 dwellings (including affordable housing) together with employment, open space and landscaping.
- 1.2 Holmes and Sons made representations at the pre-submission stage of the preparation of the Core Strategy (copy attached). Those representations sought amendments to Policy MTRA3 so that the policy was more flexible and positively framed to allow for appropriate levels of housing growth in the third tier settlements. The submission draft of the joint Core Strategy was not amended in response to those representations
- 1.3 Holmes and Sons are particularly concerned that the wording of Policy MTRA3 could frustrate or limit the development potential of their site either in the context of a potential allocation (or review of the settlement policy boundary) in the Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management and Allocations Document) or in the context of determination of a planning application.

Consistency with NPPF

- 1.4 The redevelopment of the Holmes and Sons site is entirely consistent with the policies and provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. The redevelopment of previously developed land on the edge of a highly accessible village to provide a small scale mixed use development (including affordable housing and the local employment opportunities) and which would secure the landscape including an environmental enhancements as a result of removing the existing operations, is clearly a form of sustainable development. The Core Strategy should therefore in principle allow for such a redevelopment scheme, which would make a useful contribution to meeting the District's overall housing requirements. Detailed suitability of the site and the development proposals could then be considered in the context of the Local Plan Part 2 or potentially in a Neighbourhood Plan.

Littleton

- 1.5 Littleton is a thriving village of about 450 dwellings on the northern edge of Winchester. It is a highly accessible settlement within walking and cycling distance of local services at Harestock and Weeke (convenient store, primary school, secondary school, post office) and linked to the higher order services and facilities available in Winchester City Centre by a high frequency bus service. The village is a thriving community with a good range of local services and facilities including church, village hall, public house, sports and recreation ground, pre-school group and a range of local clubs and societies.
- 1.6 Whilst we have not suggested that Littleton should be elevated to an MTRA2 settlement, given its relatively small size, it is nevertheless clear that it represents a highly sustainable location. We do however recognize that the scale of further growth would necessarily be limited and proportionate to the size of the village to ensure that it is well integrated and does not harm the nature and character of the village.

- 1.6 Littleton has successfully assimilated new development through infilling, redevelopment and intensification of sites within the defined Settlement Policy Boundary. But as the SHLAA map illustrates (see attached) there are no identified further opportunities within the tightly drawn Settlement Policy Boundary. It is therefore unlikely that any further significant development would come forward from these sources within the Plan period to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community. The Holmes and Sons site (1925) is the only site outside the existing settlement boundary identified in the SHLAA which is previously developed land. It is not of high environmental value. The Core Strategy should therefore encourage the effective use of such sites particularly in locations which are sustainable (as is the case with Littleton).

Modifications sought to policy MTRA3

- 1.7 As currently drafted MTRA3 is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework for the following reasons:
1. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that guide how the presumption should be applied locally. Policy DS1 confirms that the use of previously developed land in accessible locations will be prioritised. But that priority is limited to sites within existing defined settlement policy boundaries by virtue of policy MTRA3. It is not reasonable to restrict sustainable development in other settlements where there may be opportunities to redevelop brownfield sites adjacent to existing settlement boundaries as is the case at Littleton. **We therefore propose that MTRA3 should be amended to allow for redevelopment opportunities within or adjoining existing settlement boundaries.**
 2. The NPPF requires that Local Planning Authorities should boost significantly the supply of housing. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. By restricting development to within existing defined boundaries, the Core Strategy will restrict development which could make a contribution to meeting the wider area's housing requirements, help sustain existing settlements and put to beneficial use brownfield sites.



 Holmes & Son Nursery Site

CLIENT:
Holmes & Son

PROJECT:
Holmes Nursery, Littleton

DRAWING:
Site Plan - as existing

SCALE: **1/2500 @ A3** DWG No: **1270/PRE01**

DATE: **August 2012** REV: **#**



Based on Ordnance Survey Scale Map Data with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © S Copyright Licence AR 100018708

 Grosvenor Court, Winchester Road, Ampfield, Winchester, SO51 98D
 Tel: 01794 368 698 Fax: 01794 368 637 email: admin@pvprojects.com

 St Mary's House, 40 London Road, Newbury, RG14 1LA
 Tel: 01635 40184 Fax: 01635 41459 email: admin@pvprojects.com



**Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 –
Joint Core Strategy
Pre-Submission Stage Representation
Form**

Ref:

(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

Winchester District Local Plan Part 1-
Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission

Please return to: Head of Strategic Planning, Winchester City Council, City Offices, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hampshire SO23 9LJ or email ldf@winchester.gov.uk no later than 5pm Monday 12 March 2012

This form has two parts –
Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate Part B for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Steven"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Smallman"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="Holmes & Sons"/>	<input type="text" value="Carter Jonas"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text" value="C/O Agent"/>	<input type="text" value="Mayfield House"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="256 Banbury Road"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Oxford"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="OX2 7DE"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="01865 404442"/>
E-mail Address (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="steven.smallman@carterjonas.co.uk"/>

Office use only

Date received:

Consultee ID:

Rep number:

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Holmes & Sons

3. To which part of the Local Plan Part 1 does this representation relate? Please state which

Paragraph number	Policy number	CP1 – Housing Provision	Key Diagram/ Proposals Map
------------------	---------------	-------------------------	----------------------------

4. Do you consider the Core Strategy is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	X	No
4.(2) Sound	Yes		No
			X

*If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6.*

5. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 1 is **unsound** because it is not:

(1) Justified

(2) Effective

(3) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan Part 1 is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan Part 1, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The total amount of housing proposed fails to take account of National guidance, the Government's latest household projects, the Strategic Housing market Assessment and the demonstrable need for housing in the area. The approach is unsound because it is not justified against the evidence and does not comply with National policy.

Government policy is to facilitate a step-change in housing supply and increase affordability across all areas. This has recently been emphasised in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework, published in July 2011, which states, 'every effort should be made to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth'.

The Housing Technical Paper (June 2011) fails to identify the full extent of the housing requirement for the District and its sub-regions and/or the draft Core Strategy fails to have proper regard to the assessment of housing need and demand.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 1 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The overall level of housing provision should be not less than 12,000 dwellings and the amount of housing provided in the Market Towns & Rural Area should be increased proportionately.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Office use only

Date received:

Consultee ID:

Rep number:

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the invitation of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination? (tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Yes, I wish to speak to the Inspector at the hearing sessions

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

10. Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please mark all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above unless you specify an alternative address.

(1) when the Local Plan Part 1 has been submitted for independent examination

(2) when the Inspector's Report is published

(3) when the Local Plan Part 1 is adopted

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000

Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulation 2004, as amended, requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. The Council will also provide names and associated representations on its website but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1 you confirm that you agree to this and accept responsibility for your comments.

Signature:

Date:

09/03/2012

Office use only		
Date received:	Consultee ID:	Rep number:

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Holmes & Sons

3. To which part of the Local Plan Part 1 does this representation relate? Please state which

Paragraph number	Policy number	Policy MTRA 3	Key Diagram/ Proposals Map
------------------	---------------	---------------	----------------------------

4. Do you consider the Core Strategy is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	X	No
4.(2) Sound	Yes		No
			X

*If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6.*

5. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 1 is **unsound** because it is not:

- (1) Justified
- (2) Effective
- (3) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan Part 1 is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan Part 1, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We support the small levels of housing growth set out in Policy MTRA 3 (Other Settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area) but have concerns about its wording and effectiveness. The policy states that development may be supported. The Government is seeking a step-change in housing in both urban and rural areas and therefore we consider a more positive approach to be appropriate. Continuing the current policy of only allowing development within existing settlement boundaries will not deliver the new homes required, particularly for affordable housing. Infill development is normally small-scale and spread out over the entire plan period. The current policy will not deliver the step-change in supply and would not support or sustain existing services and facilities.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 1 legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Policy MTRA 3 should include a housing target after taking account of existing commitments, even if this just sets out the overall number for those villages with a settlement boundary. The policy should include a reference to amending the settlement policy boundaries to allow developments and this could make reference to Neighbourhood Plans and/or a Site Allocations DPD.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Office use only

Date received:

Consultee ID:

Rep number:

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the invitation of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing part of the examination? (tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Yes, I wish to speak to the Inspector at the hearing sessions

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

10. Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please mark all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above unless you specify an alternative address.

(1) when the Local Plan Part 1 has been submitted for independent examination

(2) when the Inspector's Report is published

(3) when the Local Plan Part 1 is adopted

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000

Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulation 2004, as amended, requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. The Council will also provide names and associated representations on its website but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1 you confirm that you agree to this and accept responsibility for your comments.

Signature:

Date:

09/03/2012

Office use only		
Date received:	Consultee ID:	Rep number:

MAP 15 – LITTLETON

