

Winchester District Local
Plan Part 1

Examination

Hedge End Consortium
(02740)
12 October 2012

**Further written submissions on behalf of
The North Hedge End Consortium**

Housing General Policies CP1, WT1 and SH1

i) Is the overall number and the locations of new housing consistent with the JCS objectives and realistically deliverable within the plan period, taking into account the SHLAA and the opportunities identified, including in Winchester and other centres?

1.1 In respect of the overall housing number, the South East Plan remains extant. The District Council considers that it is in general conformity with the South East Plan, but this is not the case. The South East Plan requires the provision of 6,740 dwellings within the South Hampshire sub-regional part of Winchester District over the period 2006 – 2026. It also requires the provision of part of an SDA, to be shared with Eastleigh Borough (Note: the pre-submission Eastleigh Local Plan does allocate a strategic site for 1,400 dwellings at North East Hedge End - Boorley Green - extending up to the Winchester border). Neither of these requirements from the South East Plan are satisfied by the submitted local plan and it cannot therefore be in general conformity.

1.2 We note that PUSH has revised its strategy for growth and the distribution of that growth (October 2012) based on its Economic Development Strategy, published 2010. This identifies a housing distribution for the South Hampshire part of Winchester District of 6,200 dwellings between 2011 and 2026. This works out at 413 dwellings per annum and, we assume, includes any shortfall in provision incurred 2006 - 2011. When extrapolated to cover the JCS plan period (2011 to 2031), the total PUSH distribution to Winchester is 8,267 dwellings.

1.3 Whilst the driving objective of the PUSH approach is to ensure that the area provides enough resident workers to match economic growth and is therefore driven by assumptions about the economy rather than conforming to the NPPF requirement, which is clear that an objective assessment of need relates to population and household growth, it is a useful cross-check on numbers. This is because job-led forecasts, however imperfect, try to address the impact of changing job opportunities on housing demand and relate housing provision to jobs.

1.4 Notwithstanding the above, the PUSH figures, having been revised downwards in the current economic climate, are low because planning for economic downturn is not an accepted way forward and real demographic figures, highlighted by the 2011 census information, show a need for a greater provision of housing rather than less housing.

1.6 As a consequence, there is no current objective assessment of Winchester's housing need by PUSH, nor an appropriate cross-boundary response to the Duty to Cooperate.

1.7 Taking the above in context, as set out in the Housing Background Paper (June 2012), Winchester is planning for a maximum of 7,250 dwellings for the PUSH area 2011 to 2031. This is made up as follows.

1.8 Winchester's South Hampshire 'Urban Area' does not cover exactly the same area as PUSH (refer to page 34 of Background Paper -1 Housing Provision, Distribution and Delivery), also the JCS covers a period from 2011 to 2031 (20 years) compared to PUSH's South Hampshire Strategy October 2012 which runs from 2011 to 2026 (15 Years). The JCS suggests that there will be an additional 5,500 dwellings over the plan period within the PUSH 'urban area' (effectively North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville). This increases to a range of 6,540 to 7,250 dwellings when including relevant rural settlements within Winchester that PUSH considers to fall within its sub-region but the Winchester Plan places within its general 'rural areas'.

1.9 This provision compares to the requirement of 8,267 and is therefore 1,017 – 1,727 short.

1.10 This deficit could be delivered within the north/north-east Hedge End SDA as required by the extant South East Plan and supported by the PUSH feasibility work on the SDA (published June 2010), and as a further extension to the Boorley Green allocation emerging in Eastleigh's local plan.

1.11 In any event, given the above significant concerns with the approach taken, there is a very strong case for the policy to recognise the need for an early review of housing targets.

iv) Should the JCS address contingencies/alternatives, including in relation to the strategic allocations, in the event that completions do not come forward as expected?

1.12 Yes. It is important that the JCS identifies appropriate contingencies. Extending development from Eastleigh Borough into Winchester District, a distributional approach well tested and proven through the South East Plan process, would be an appropriate response. A positive indication on this matter would enable an interim position to be identified and master planning to proceed in cooperation with the adjacent Eastleigh Borough.