



# Land at Pitt Vale, Winchester

## Winchester City Council Local Plan Examination

Response to Inspector's Questions: Matter 3



# Boyer

## Report Control

Project:	Pitt Vale, Winchester
Client:	Linden Homes Strategic
Reference:	12.182
File Origin:	Z:\Project Folders\12.182 Pitt Vale Winchester\4 Boyer Planning\4.02 Reports\LPP2 reps\LPP2 EIP statement\LPP2 EIP Statement Matter 3.docx
Primary Author	Mandy Owen
Checked By:	Mike Newton

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Checked By</i>
1	14/6/16	1 <sup>st</sup> draft	MN



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Introduction	2
2. Active Communities – Policies DM1-5 (Matter 3)	3

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This Statement has been prepared by Boyer on behalf of Linden Homes Strategic in response to the Inspector's questions regarding the Examination in Public of the Winchester Local Plan Part 2.
- 1.2 The statement responds to the following hearing session:
  - Chapter 3: Active Communities – Policies DM1-5 (Matter 3)

## 2. ACTIVE COMMUNITIES – POLICIES DM1-5 (MATTER 3)

**Are policies DM1-5 reasonable and realistic, clear and consistent with national policies/guidance and do they establish suitable and appropriate criteria?**

- 2.1 This statement only refers to policies DM1 (Location of New Development) and DM2 (Dwelling Sizes).
- 2.2 A separate statement has been prepared in relation to Matter 2 which highlights concerns regarding the ability of Winchester District Council to demonstrate a five year housing land supply and has discussed this in light of the housing delivery trajectory in LPP1.
- 2.3 We object to **Policy DM1** on the basis that there is a need for housing to be located outside settlement boundaries at Winchester and that this should be the subject of positive and proactive planning for sustainable development.
- 2.4 The justification for policy DM1 is inconsistent with the policy itself. Paragraph 6.2.2 states “Outside these (settlement) boundaries built development especially for housing, is normally only permitted where there is a particular need for it which cannot be met within a built up area”. This wording would allow recognition of the potential need for sites to be allocated outside settlement boundaries to meet a particular need for housing that may be established through the application of the policy set out in paragraph 47 of the NPPF. However, the policy wording states “Outside of these areas (i.e. the defined boundaries of named settlements) countryside policies will apply and only development appropriate to a countryside location will be permitted, as specified in policies MTRA4, MTRA5,DM10 – DM13,etc.”
- 2.5 We consider that the wording of Policy DM1 should be consistent with its supporting text and allow for development outside settlement boundaries where there is a particular need for it, as may be established through the application of NPPF policies.
- 2.6 We object to the statements within **Policy DM2** that “...two bedroom housing should not generally exceed 100 sq.m. when first constructed, and three bedroom-housing 150 sq.m. when first constructed” and that “Proposals that provide for dwellings bigger than the maximum sizes above will be expected to justify the excess in relation to the requirements of Policy CP2.” We consider this wording to be contrary to the intention and content of LPP1 Policy CP2 which states:  
  
*“New residential development should meet a range of community housing needs and deliver a wide choice of homes....”*;and;  
  
*“Development should provide a range of dwelling types, tenures and sizes.....”*
- 2.7 The requirement of Policy DM2 for size limits to two and three bedroom dwellings is overly prescriptive and inflexible. It is impossible to reconcile with the requirement of LPP1 policy that new residential development should provide a range of dwelling sizes. The size limits in

Policy DM2 are also blanket restrictions that do not allow development proposals to respond appropriately to market requirements that may differ between areas. Nor do these limits allow types and sizes of new dwellings to respond appropriately to the residential character of the area in which they are located. Consequently, we consider these provisions within Policy DM2 to be unsound as they are not justified and are inconsistent with LPP1.