

Wickham Residents' Association

Observations and objections to the Local Plan with reference to the Parish of Wickham and Knowle.

To be entered into the online Consultation process citizenspace (link provided by WCC)

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---|
| WK1 | 456 - 458 | Winchester Road Housing Allocation and Open Space Allocation | 14.110 "...which includes the provision of new sports pitches and pavilion on land in the same ownership to the east of Mill Lane. This provision is necessary to help meet part of the open space requirements for development and to improve the amount and distribution of available sports grounds." | <p>I. The Winchester Playing Pitch Strategy (WPPS) does not support this project. The WPPS makes no mention of this site as a future sports facility. It was not therefore included in its assessment of future provision. Yet, even without this site, table 1.2 page 15 of the WPPS clearly states that future need in Winchester South District for new adult 3g or grass football pitches will not be needed – indeed there is overcapacity. There is a minor shortfall in youth grass 11v11 and 9v9 and mini 5v5 capacity. This shortfall could all be satisfied by existing pitches at Knowle Green within the Wickham and Knowle Parish – pitches that are currently underutilised despite the projected shortfall of capacity.</p> <p>II. Sports site provision at this site contravenes the following policies: NE8: South Downs National Park: (p 160) "Development in close proximity the South Downs National Park will only be permitted where it would... enhance the intrinsic quality of dark night skies and the setting of the National Park.</p> | <p>NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED: plan fails to consider WCC's own evidence of area's objectively assessed needs; is not a financially sustainable development; contradicts the provisions of policies NE8, NE 13, NE14; local consultation rejection of the planned provision</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Development proposals in close proximity to the South Downs National Park are expected to take account of the National Park assessments of landscape and tranquillity and demonstrate how a proposal conserves and enhances the special qualities of the Park” (including impact on Dark Skies)</p> <p>NE: 13: Leisure and Recreation in the Countryside: (7.100, p 170) “As well as visual intrusion, there may be issues of noise and light pollution, or disruption to the rural setting caused by increases in the amount and type of traffic and patterns of travel. In these cases, detailed information will be required as to the nature and degree of the effects”</p> <p>NE 14 (p 171): Rural Character: 7.105 “Traffic intrusion may adversely affect the character of the area due to numbers of trips and the type of vehicles (e.g. heavy goods vehicles). The suitability as well as the capacity of rural lanes should also be considered, as physical re-modelling of rural roads and introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances necessary for the development may have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character. Rural lanes are a particular characteristic of the district that have historic as well as landscape significance”</p> | <p>NOT JUSTIFIED: there is better and more sustainable alternative use of the site in compliance with policies NE8, Ne 13, NE14; alternative use has support of residents; cannot be financially justified; there is a better alternative site in the parish for sports pitches if WPPS update calls for more pitches. (see Welborne Open Space section)</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>P 173: “Tranquillity – developments should not have an unacceptable effect on the rural tranquillity of the area, including the introduction of lighting or noise occurring as a result of the development, taking account of the relative remoteness and tranquillity of the location. New lighting will generally not be permitted in unlit areas and the type, size, design and operation of any lighting may be controlled where necessary by the use of conditions.”</p> <p>“The impact resulting from the volume and type of traffic generated by the development will be assessed along with the ability of rural roads to accept increased levels of traffic without alterations that would harm their rural character”</p> <p>III. The location was subject to a Hampshire Highways holding objection when the nearby surgery expanded (see letter in documents on planning portal ref 20/01484/FUL): the Planning Committee at the time were rebuked by the Local Government Ombudsman for failing to consider the objection. (Letter dated 25/03/21 ref 20 011 720). The reasons for the Highways objection still apply</p> <p>IV. The site was initially promoted by the Parish Council without prior consultation with residents</p> <p>V. A Master Plan was drawn up by a consultant that comprised a 3G adult football pitch and junior pitches. The Master Plan was put out to resident</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>consultation in Spring 2022 and was rejected by 80% of residents (192 respondents). Ref: Note: sub analysis of the responses, eliminating those post codes not within the parish was not published by the the Council but the sub analysis can be provided showing 80% rejection)</p> <p>VI. Locational conditions do not meet criteria for a successful football hub: poor access (narrow, rural country lane and narrow country lane feeder roads); no public transport within 400-500 metres; no safe pedestrian access across the road; no club making its home at the site</p> <p>VII. In Autumn 2023 the Parish Council conducted a survey of local sports clubs to determine their potential use of facilities at the site. This information was fed into a financial viability analysis with advice and oversight of the originally commissioned expert consultancy: the conclusion was reached that no sports pitch solution at the site would be financially viable, either as to capital or ongoing operational requirements. The findings were shared with WCC in Spring 2024.</p> <p>VIII. An alternative use of the site as a country park has been proposed by the Parish Council and shown to be financially viable and is likely to receive strong majority support by residents including WRA's 280+ members. A plan illustrating the financial viability of a country park v sports pitches for the</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>site is, at the time of writing, understood to be pending the Parish Council's review.</p> <p>IX. The alternative use for the site proposed by the Parish Council will give greater BNG, be more acceptable to the adjacent SDNP, alleviate traffic intensity that will affect the rural Mill Lane, provide informal recreation space to the settlement, provide the desired access to the Meon Valley Trail</p> <p>X. An alternative site in the parish is available and supported by the Parish Council that will much better serve the sports pitch needs of the settlement and be more consistent with all the policies and criteria that the Mill Lane site fails to satisfy (see entries re Settlement Gap WK 3)</p> | |
| WK1 | 456 - 458 | Winchester Road Housing Allocation and Open Space Allocation | 14.111 "Access should be from Winchester Road and a traffic light junction is likely to be the optimum solution in terms of vehicular and pedestrian safety (also allowing safe crossing arrangements)" | <p>i. The first tranche of houses and a pedestrian crossing on Winchester Road have been completed.</p> <p>ii. WRA has monitored the safety of the Winchester Road crossing and a civil engineer has demonstrated that it is not to the specification contained in the planning approval. (Details to be provided) Photographic evidence can be provided.</p> <p>iii. WRA has mounted a SpeedWatch operation at the pedestrian crossing site and its records show that (details to be provided)</p> <p>iv. WRA confirms that in view of inaccurate carriage way dimensions and speeding at the site, a traffic light junction is the optimum solution, but it</p> | The plan and its current implementation is NOT JUSTIFIED . It fails to take into account and support the reasonable alternatives that have been demonstrated by evidence to be needed. |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | has not been implemented with the consequent safety concerns amplified. . | |
| WK1 | 456 - 458 | Winchester Road Housing Allocation and Open Space Allocation | 14.111 “The details of the access arrangements, including off-site improvements <i>which are likely to be necessary to the A334/Titchfield Lane junction, will need to be developed and tested at the planning application stage</i> and other access arrangements which meet the requirements of policy WK2 are not ruled out.” | I.Improvements to the junction were included in the approved plans for the development. (details required) II.The improvements have not been implemented. III.There is no Policy WK2 in the Plan so it is not possible to determine if it is missing or whatever it contained is/is no longer relevant. | NOT JUSTIFIED – the plan has not been implemented NOT EFFECTIVE –the requirements of the approved planning application have not been carried out |
| WK 3 | 459 -460 | Welborne Open Space | 14.115 Green buffers are provided to ensure that Welborne does not coalesce with Wickham or Knowle. It is also necessary for this Plan to define the general extent of open land within Winchester district which should be retained as a gap between Welborne and these settlements. It may be possible to accommodate some natural green infrastructure on land within Winchester district, provided it does not include buildings and maintains the open and rural | I.This site is the green buffer between Wickham and Welborne. II.WRA and residents of Wickham thoroughly support the need for and maintenance of the green buffer III.The extent of the buffer is considerable, extending to 210 hectares, so development should be allowed within the terms of Policy NE7 Settlement Gaps; Policy NE7 Within these areas only development that does not undermine the function of the gap and its intended role to define and retain the separate identity of settlements will be permitted. Any | This site is not considered in the Plan for development. It meets the criteria in the Plan under NE7 and its EXCLUSION as a selected development site in place of the alternative at Mill Lane is |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>character of the land and enables its long-term management to be secured.</p> <p>The overriding requirement is to retain the open rural nature of this land and to prevent changes which would urbanise its undeveloped character. The uses and management of the area must help to secure an effective, viable and long-term gap between Welborne and the separate settlements of Knowle and Wickham.</p> | <p>development should not threaten the generally open and undeveloped nature of the gap and avoid coalescence</p> <p>7.6.1 (page 157): In defining the extent of a gap, no more land than is necessary to prevent the coalescence of settlements should be included having regard to maintaining their physical and visual separation.</p> <p>7.6.2 The Framework states that it will be individual Local Plans that will identify the location of gaps and include policies to set out the types of development which will be permitted, based on the following principles:- It would not diminish the physical and/or visual separation of settlements; and It would not individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development compromise the integrity of the gap.</p> <p>IV.A proposed development of 100 homes plus sports pitches at the northern boundary of the site immediately adjacent to the village boundary and existing sports and leisure facilities makes complete sense – yet still provides sufficient land for the green buffer – more than meeting the requirement that it should comprise “no more land than is necessary”.</p> | <p>NOT JUSTIFIED based upon proportional evidence AND is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED based on the need to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs. It should be the preferred option for the Plan.</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>V.The site includes the only brownfield site in the village and so should take priority over greenfield sites.</p> <p>VI.The site has a farm access already onto Hoads Hill that will make for safe and easy entry/exit from the site onto a wide road with ample space for turning in both directions without any need for special road alterations (unlike the site at Mill Lane where two access points, one on each side of a minor rural lane would be required, one for housing and one for the Sports Pitch site that is proposed but opposed by residents)</p> <p>VII.There are numerous existing access points to and from properties running to the top and beyond of Hoads Hill, with vehicles crossing the carriageway in both directions. This would be just one more.</p> <p>VIII.Car park facilities would be feasible as part of the sports pitch provision. Providing such parking would meet the need of the village where parking is considered by residents in the local plan survey of 2020 to be a significant problem. No other provision for additional parking is included in the proposed Local Plan and so this opportunity should be taken.</p> <p>IX.Consultation among residents conducted by the parish Council rated this site as the most preferred for development.</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>X.The site is within walking distance of the settlement and is on a bus route thus potentially reducing car traffic to the sports pitches, and thus speaking to WCC's green agenda. These benefits commend as they are not offered by the Sports Pitches site at Mill Lane.</p> <p>XI.There is the possibility that the remaining extent of the buffer could be placed in the ownership of the Parish Council thus complying with the provision in the aims for settlement gaps of delivering against the goal that enables its long-term management to be secured.(145.111)</p> <p>XII.The site also avoids conflicts faced by the Mill Lane Sports Site relative NE 8: South Downs National Park; NW 13 Recreation and Leisure in the Countryside; NE14: Rural Character</p> | |
| WK 5 | 461 -463 | Housing Allocations Mill Lane | <p>"Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character through concentrating development to the south and SW corner of the site, maintaining a buffer to the protected woodland to the west of the site and locating open space on the more elevated parts of the site." Potential number of units: 40</p> | <p>I. 14.117 Supporting text: "The site is located to the north of the recently completed housing development at Houghton Way and the Wickham Surgery which in turn are located to the north of Wickham Community Centre." The location is also to the north-east of the primary school and is close to its boundary. The area is already overdeveloped with significant parking and access problems owing to the nature of the facilities located there: none are easily accessible by foot, most visitors arrive by car and there is no public transport. A developer with an interest in this land may argue that the</p> | <p>This development does not meet the soundness criteria: it is NOT JUSTIFIED relative to better alternatives; it is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>concentration of activity is a benefit: that would indeed be a benefit in a village centre, but not up a narrow country lane There is no sense in exacerbating problems already experienced in the area and which will only worsen over time as the Surgery is required to take a minimum of 2000 new patients from the nearby Welborne development that can only reach the Surgery by car. The school roll is also expected to rise.</p> <p>II. The level of development fed by rural lanes is already greater than should be allowed</p> <p>III. 14.117 Supporting text. The landscape to the north of the village makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character and rural setting of the village and is likely to be valued for its intrinsic countryside character, beauty and tranquillity. The boundary of the South Downs National Park lies approximately 100m to the north. The word 'likely' is redundant in the above sentence: it is valued but now threatened by further development and the Sports Pitch site designated for the east side of the lane.</p> <p>Policy NE 14 Rural Countryside 7.105 p 171 applies: Traffic intrusion may adversely affect the character of the area due to numbers of trips and the type of vehicles (e.g. heavy goods vehicles). The suitability as well as the capacity of rural lanes should also be considered, as physical re-</p> | <p>because it ignores the evidence of community opinion and highways objections. There has been no updated consultation on this site.</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>modelling of rural roads and introduction of signage, visibility splays and entrances necessary for the development may have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and rural character. Rural lanes are a particular characteristic of the district that have historic as well as landscape significance</p> <p>IV. 14.117 Supporting Text: The boundary of the South Downs National Park lies approximately 100m to the north. However, there is scope to mitigate the impact through careful siting and design. Development could be accommodated without changing landscape character through concentrating development to the south and SW corner of the site...". This statement is not contentious – such mitigations could be made but they only need to be made at this site. Other sites _ available (Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space and the Glebe) do not need take into account the restrictions and limitations described that affect this site. Therefore, it is completely counter-intuitive that this site is put forward for development.</p> <p>V. There is no logic in dividing the housing allocation between several sites.</p> <p>VI. The parish consultation regarding sites place this one lower than either Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space or the Glebe.</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>VII. 14.119. “Mill Lane is currently a narrow rural road with relatively low traffic volume. Pedestrian and cycle access should be established at the southern end of the site through to Houghton Way, to link into existing pedestrian facilities”.</p> <p>III.WK 5: Access ii. The proposals include direct, safe and lit, where appropriate, active travel links as part of a strategy that minimises car journeys from the development by providing opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport that is connected to the surrounding area; Access iv: As part of the design process a transport assessment, should consider any improvements to be provided to Mill Lane, as necessary, to accommodate increase in traffic;”</p> <p>IX.Mill Lane is indeed a narrow rural road with passing only possible at certain points. The rural nature of the lane should be maintained as per policy but the southern end of the lane leads to the overdeveloped Surgery and Community Centre area. The traffic survey completed on this part of the lane in conjunction with the Surgery expansion plan was criticised by Hampshire Highways who issued a holding objection as a result – that was ignored by WCC’s Planning Committee. However, the reasons for that objection still apply. It would be impossible to create safe cycle and pedestrian</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|---------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>routes without significantly infringing Policy NE 14. It is also unnecessary in relation to the building of 40 houses. Inasmuch as those 40 units should be located elsewhere such disruption to and alteration of, the rural nature of the lane, against Policy NE 14, is not necessary and a cost that can and should be avoided,</p> <p>vi.WK 5 Environmental. Provide useable and accessible on-site open space in accordance with the approach set out in policy NE3. Reference to NE 3 does little to support this site allocation. NE 3 refers to the provision of open space in any development: the plan for this site claims that but in fact what it does <i>is reduce</i> open space. It is already open space and development will simply reduce it and the landscape benefits that NE 14 seeks to deliver.</p> <p>X.There are better alternatives to this site.</p> | |
| WK 6 | 465-468 | Housing Allocations at Southwick Road and School Road | 14.122 (p 465) Supporting Text. "The site lies to the east of the recently developed site at The Glebe. The site is not prominent from public viewpoints and well concealed within the wider landscape due to topography and trees." Indicative allocation 60 homes | <p>i. This site is larger than the recently developed site west of it on the Glebe (which comprises 82 dwellings) and should therefore be capable of hosting all the 100 homes required of Wickham in this plan this obviating the need to develop at the problematic Mill Lane site.</p> <p>ii. 14.124: "Motor vehicle access to the site WI03 site would need to be gained via Grindall Field. Development proposals will need to demonstrate that this access is able to serve the additional;</p> | This site is POSITIVELY PREPARED meeting as it does the whole development requirement placed on the settlement and JUSTIFIED by |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>development or provide sufficient improvements. Proposals will need to ensure there are appropriate walking and cycling links through The Glebe, and on to Wickham village centre and beyond.” This will be essential. It should have been done for the Glebe development to the west but was not. The developer this time MUST provide these safe routes.</p> <p>iii. 14.126: “The nearby site at The Glebe contained to the north west significant archaeological remains. Further archaeological evaluation of the site will be needed prior to development to ascertain the full nature of the archaeological resource within the site.” It is not known if the proposed site at Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space has archaeological remains but assuming it doesn’t then from a practical point of view it might be a better prospect.</p> <p>iv. There are no intrinsically negative elements to this site. However, it is a greenfield site and the alternative at Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space is the better choice because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It ensures long-term sustainability of the settlement gap b) is on a bus route c) offers sports amenities adjacent to existing provision | <p>proportionate evidence.</p> <p>It is preferred to Mill Lane to contain the whole requirement but is relegated to third place in comparison with the Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space site</p> |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) includes development of the only brownfield site in the settlement e) does not increase traffic volumes directly onto the tight roundabout at the entrance to Grindall Field, v. If Mayles Lane/Welborne Open Space is not chosen for the 100 homes and the choice remains between the Southwick Road/School Road and Mill Lane the former is preferred because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the site is away from the tight and overdeveloped north west corner of the village b) has access to proper roads and not a narrow rural lane c) it is adjacent to the Northern Open Space and additional open space off site will not be required | |
| KN1 | 470 - 472 | Housing Allocations Ravenswood | 200 houses – declared to be a new site. | <p>i. 14.137 “The site falls within what is currently designated as a settlement gap under adopted LPP1 Policy SHUA4. However, the planning application, and associated technical evidence, has demonstrated that development of this site will secure a much larger part of the Gap to be safeguarded for the longer term, and in that context the loss of this part of the gap is acceptable.” Attention is drawn to the fact that the same argument is made with respect to the Mayles Lane site, which if approved, holds the potential to</p> | |

| Policy id | page | Subject | Plan provisions | Observations/objections | Grounds for objection |
|-----------|------|---------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | <p>secure the settlement gap between Wickham and Knowle for the long-term</p> <p>ii. 14.144 “Considerable discussions have been held with the community regarding this proposal, and with the Wickham Community Land Trust regarding the provision of affordable dwellings.” WRA has been asked by Wickham Community Land Trust (which provides 18 affordable in the parish) to make clear that the site had its support (it was the “community-led partner”) but that the s106 for this site is written in such a way that Homes England grant will not be available to it. Without grant from some source it will not be able to participate and so this passage may need to be re-written.</p> <p>iii. In general WRA can see the potential benefits to the Community of this development and has no objection to raise</p> | |