

## **Review on the proposed SHELA sites to WCC (Draft)**

### **SW01 (183 houses)**

This land area equates to approximately an additional 25% of the village footprint

- **Access.** Any development of this size would create a serious increase in the morning and evening density of traffic using Downs Road and would increase the potential situations of the junction to Christmas Hill and the village depending on the development access.

Currently there is no public road access to this site, the approach being along what currently is classed as a restricted byway

Access from the site if allowed to be towards the East would undoubtedly also seriously affect the traffic density using Alresford Drove which already has issues with the single carriageway at the entrance of the village.

West Hill Road North is also not capable of the potential to carry the traffic derived for a possible 183 houses.

A development of this scale could generate an additional **580** vehicle movements in a day through the village. **There should be no direct access into the village road network from any such development.**

- **Utilities.** The village water supply is serviced from the Water tower which already creates pressure issues in hot summers. It is considered that there is insufficient capacity to cater for a new development of this size and would seriously compromise the existing village. In addition currently the southern water sewerage system has serious capacity issues with now frequent problems and blockages requiring lorry movements down Lower Road to either over pump or to attempt to clear the issues. It is considered that the current sewerage network is insufficient to cater for a new development of the potential size that SW01 could generate
- **Boundaries.** This large area falls outside the current settlement boundary and is completely out of scale in context with the village.
- **Transport.** As noted above the public transport system that the village has is not effective both in frequency and cost ( £6.50 return to Winchester). This will mean that the majority of the new houses will be using personal transport thus increasing the density of cars entering and leaving via downs road and Alresford drove.

This could also create more issues in the area of the school on Downs Road. There is no provision in the Winchester mobility plans to assist or increase the access to public transport or to cap costs so that the alternative is a viable alternative.

### **SW07 (41 houses)**

This section of land lies on the corner of West Hill Road North and Alresford Drove.

- **Access.** Access for the possible 41 new homes could mean an increase of some **160** daily vehicle movements a day onto west Hill Road North and Alresford Drove neither of which currently are considered to not have additional capacity nor with the restriction that exist on the Alresford Drove.
- **Utilities.** . The village water supply is serviced from the Water tower which already creates pressure issues in hot summers. It is considered that there is in sufficient capacity to cater for a new development of this size and would seriously compromise the existing village. In addition currently the southern water sewerage system has serious capacity issues with now frequent problems and blockages requiring lorry movements down Lower Road to either over pump or to attempt to clear the issues. It is considered that the current sewerage network is insufficient to cater for a new development of the potential size that SW07 could generate.
- **Boundaries.** . area falls outside the current village boundary  
**Transport.** As noted above the public transport system that the village has is not effective both in frequency and cost ( £6.50 return to Winchester). This will mean that the majority of the new houses will be using personal transport thus increasing the density of cars entering and leaving via downs road and Alresford drove. This could also create more issues in the area of the school on Downs Road. There is no provision in the Winchester mobility plans to assist or increase the access to public transport or to cap costs so that the alternative is a viable alternative.

### **SW02 (64 houses)**

This plot is only accessible onto the unmade Drove Links Road

- **Access.** As note this area of land is only accessible onto Drove Links Road which is an un surfaced road. This exits on to Alresford Drove and we understand that Highways are not responsive to allowing a high density of vehicles to access / exit onto the Drove due to its capacity. This proposed development could lead to a density of some **240** vehicle movements a day.

- **Utilities / Boundaries.** The village water supply is serviced from the Water tower which already creates pressure issues in hot summers. It is considered that there is insufficient capacity to cater for a new development of this size and would seriously compromise the existing village. In addition currently the southern water sewerage system has serious capacity issues with now frequent problems and blockages requiring lorry movements down Lower Road to either over pump or to attempt to clear the issues. It is considered that the current sewerage network is insufficient to cater for a new development of the potential size that SW02 could generate.
- **Transport.** In regard to transport links this area is even less well served by public transport.

### **SW03 (3 houses )**

Not considered to have any significant impact on the village considering the volume of building / infilling that is currently in hand.

### **SW05 no comment as this site is well outside the village boundary**

### **General comments relating to all the local sites that are adjacent to the settlement boundary:**

- Capability of the village school to cater for the potential increase in child intake, ie can the school cater for this potential intake.
- The local infrastructure of roads etc to cater for the school influx as this school serves the adjacent parishes ie the school will be required to cater for the proposed SW expansion as well as the Sutton Scotney and adjacent parishes who are in the catchment boundary of the school
- The ability of the only Doctors surgery in Sutton Scotney to cater again for the potential influx of some 100 to 120 homes ie in excess of an additional 240 patients ignoring children etc as well as parking etc at the surgery.
- There is little inherent available employment in the local village boundary and so any expansion in housing will simply increase the density of traffic through the only main access along Downs Road and the restricted road junction onto Christmas Hill.

The Alresford Drove access is very limited and is already struggling with the traffic density currently using it. The restricted single carriageway section only exacerbates the problems.

- In respect to the environment any increase in numbers will impact on the desire to reduce the carbon footprint of the village. As noted there

is no significant employment in the village settlement and so the majority of the new residents will be commuting. The woeful public transport serving the settlement means this will all be by personal transport ie increases in air pollutants etc.

- In respect to houses being built on SW01 this field as the bats use the northern border of the field travelling up and down the hedgerows, and putting in housing will directly impact their roost runs. These are a protected species and so are the Bat runs. We have a few bat recordings, and two different bats have been noted, one is the long eared bat which is quite a lot bigger than the common pipistrel
- Also due to increased light pollution that this would generate in the village, which is in an area of dark sky. Any new homes being built will no doubt have street lighting, which will have an impact on the dark skies .
- Foxes, rabbits, field mice and voles can be found in the area of SW01. Developing the land would be a significant loss of habitat for many creatures. The field vole and it's habitats are also protected.

#### Comments received

*1. Any residential addition to the village on SW01,07,03 & 02 represents a significant land use change from rural land to residential buildings - such a significant change of use negatively impacts the residents both human & not around the area of land that is chosen.*

*2. As previously demonstrated with the rural exception affordable housing failed campaign there is not a local need for 50/60 houses to be built in our parish and with our roads already struggling there must be better out of parish brownfield sites available. In all else WCC must prove there is not any other option - I quote Cllr Horrill - "Brownfield before Greenfield" -*

*3. Worthy Down is considered part of the parish - out of interest why have no sites been identified there - has this been asked of WCC?*

*4. It's not just the village school capability - but also the secondary schools - our catchment being Henry Beaufort is it worth enquiring as I believe it is near if not over capacity - also Kings Barton will increase their intake..*

*5. Accessibility is listed as Green on SW07 this is simply not the case.*

*6. If Andover Road is indeed closed and the awful rat run through Kings Barton takes place an increase in traffic using Alresford Drove for a quicker entry into town is almost 100% certain and with that in particular SW01 & SW07 would increase that risk further.*

*7. I think it a grave misjudgement that the SWPC make no comment on SW05. I would very much seek to understand the reason for the policy at the moment to be to make no comment when the site is identified as "belonging" to South Wonston. At risk of repeating myself continuously surely it has to be commented on as the only Brownfield site within the designated South Wonston sites - a risky and foolhardy perhaps (in my opinion) choice to ignore potentially the only site which causes the least issues to the current village boundary and more so the current village residents.*

8. A detail to tweak from within your comments, where you discuss the Utilities I think you don't mean there to be a space between in and sufficient as such:

- It is considered that there is in sufficient capacity to cater for a new development of this size and would seriously compromise the existing village.

Finally I'd like to address a comment you made at the meeting last week that the emotional response "not wanted" is not relevant to refuse planning and I understand that in it's simplicity simply saying "No Thank You" is not considered a valid reason to refuse - but I think an emotional response is what drives all of us whom have taken a signifiant amount of time to draft responses to SWPC..

The impact of such a huge increase in homes to the village will significantly reduce the quality of life and negatively affect the mental health and wellbeing for any residents that have the misfortune to live close to the building works which could take years, the traffic routes used by the heavy vehicles, and on completion the permanent change to the noise levels, serenity and views from their homes which all of us have enjoyed and valued over the years we have been fortunate to be residents here.

I speak from experience. I once had no choice but to buy a new build home on a site that was still being extended (think Kings Barton as an example) and my experience of the devastating effect on my health of 9am starts 6 days a week of lorries, drills, motorised equipment, builders, radios, shouting, dust, grime, & air pollution was simply awful. I couldn't open my windows to let in fresh air for nearly 18 months. I am very anxious having to even consider living here in my home which we worked so hard to buy and having to experience such things again. The thought of how the peace and serenity I currently enjoy will be impacted permanently by closer density dwellings, complete with more people, more cars and more noise really upsets me. The mental health, peace and wellbeing of current residents does not seem to be of any concern to planners but I think it should be - it is a valid reason to not want such a negative permanent change to our lives.

I am unable to attend the parish meeting tomorrow as I have long standing prior engagements on most Mondays in the month. It would be great if the clerk was able to publish draft minutes of the meeting within 24 - 48 hours, or the parish council to at least publish the transcript of the debate on this specific item, and the Chair's comments & experience of the meeting with the other chairs, with some urgency & speed so that we are all able to continue to contribute feedback to the SWPC within this time critical phase.

*Two of the proposed sites can be rejected straight away. 03 would make a negligible contribution to the total allocated (50). The problematic access has already been the subject of a withdrawn planning application (20/02245/FUL). 05, the only brownfield site, is unsuitable for residential development. Remote from the village, accessible only by a restricted byway or the A272, it would better suit economic/employment purposes.*

*The remaining sites, 01, 02, 07, all have issues. All are greenfield sites, outside the settlement or planning boundary, where they should be protected by MTRA4. All have access issues resulting from their location. 01 is currently only accessible from a poorly surfaced, narrow bridleway (in which the adjacent properties have a proprietary interest) or an unsurfaced restricted byway leading to the C234. 02 is accessed from the hazardously narrow Alresford Drove, a surfaced former restricted byway, via a chalk track now known as Drove Links Rd which is in shared ownership of the frontagers. Highway engineers have been doubtful in the past about permitting access to a development from Alresford Drove. 07 borders West Hill Rd North, which leads to a blind crossroads with Alresford Drove. 01 and 02 would need costly roadworks which might render them unviable but, if achieved, would seriously affect users of the rights of way.*

*01 and 07 are situated in a "sensitive" landscape. 02 has a highly important archaeological constraint. 07, considered in 2017 for affordable housing, produced mixed reactions from Winchester City Council's Planning department (Highway concerns, issues around planning policy and physical separation from the village). In fairness, the site was deemed "worthy of consideration".*

*01, 02 and 07 are close to areas with European Protected Species Records. 01 and 02 are close to priority habitats, 01 and 02 are a long step from village facilities. 07 is less than 800 metres away, but still a fair walk.*

*We should also take into account the strain on village utilities and the traffic generation of fifty houses from 01, 02 or 07.*

*In conclusion, it is very difficult to say anything positive about any of the SHELAA sites in South Wonston. They are either completely unsuitable (03 and 05) for residential development or hampered by practical issues which could badly affect the amenities of the village.*