



BJC PLANNING

**ADDENDUM TO PLANNING STATEMENT
ADDRESSING THE
NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK
PUBLISHED 17th AUGUST 2026**

**Land to the South West of Witt Road Winterslow,
(opposite Thyme Cottage) SP5 1PL**

For Kents Oak Ltd

LPA Ref: PL/2025/10022

BJC Planning
The Gallery
3 South Street
Titchfield
Hampshire
PO14 4DL

Tel : 01329 842668

23rd September 2026

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 17th August and it immediately became effective.
- 1.2 This Addendum to the Planning Statement has been prepared to comment upon the effect of the recent changes to the NPPF on the application proposal.
- 1.3 The submitted Planning Statement references the adopted NPPF of December 2024. Specifically, it references paragraph 11d the need to boost housing provision and the importance of sustainability. This part of the previous NPPF is now deleted and replaced by a new Section 4 'Achieving sustainable development' which is discussed below.

2.0 The Significant Factors

- 2.1 Paragraph 1 on page 1 underlines that this NPPF is a material consideration of 'critical importance'. This statement raises the significance of the NPPF and its policies. Paragraph 3 advises that the planning system continues to be plan-led and that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.2 Paragraph 17 sets out that to achieve sustainable development for society the planning system provides for homes, commercial development, facilities and infrastructure. The new NPPF continues to promote three interdependent objectives to secure this development which are: an economic objective, a social objective and environmental objective.
- 2.3 The NPPF now highlights Achieving Sustainable Development in Section 4 where Policies S3, S4 and S5 are pertinent to this application. Sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- 2.4 S3 addresses the 'Presumption in favour of sustainable development' and identifies Policy S4 where development proposals are within a defined settlement and Policy S5 where development is outside of a settlement boundary. In the case where development falls partly within and partly outside the boundary then both policies should be assessed before a decision is made.
- 2.5 In the case of the proposal at Witt Road the proposed houses are on land outside the settlement boundary, but the access to the development lies within the boundary. Both policies, S4 and S5 are therefore relevant and are discussed below.

- 2.6 Turning firstly to Policy S5 it is considered that the proposed development meets S5j. This requires that:

Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test), and where the development would:

- i Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; or**
- ii Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy E3.**

- 2.7 This proposal seeks residential development in a situation where the Council does not have a five-year housing land supply. Whilst the current housing land supply is claimed to be in the region of 2.42 years by the Council a recently determined appeal considered it to be at 2.03 years. It is evident that there is a significant housing land supply deficit whichever figure is accepted

- 2.8 In terms of sub paragraph i) above the site is well related to the existing settlement and is of an appropriate scale given the available infrastructure. The site both adjoins the existing settlement boundary and is partially within it as the access is within the defined boundary.

- 2.9 Policy S4 places emphasis on approving development within defined settlements. It states at paragraph 1:

Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

- 2.10 The site access falls within the settlement boundary. The development proposals should be approved as there are no adverse effects which weigh substantially against the proposal.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 In respect of the current proposed development the most significant change arising from the publication of the new NPPF is the introduction of policies S4 and S5 in the context of the assessment of 'Achieving sustainable development'. It remains the case that where there is a housing land shortfall there is a strong case for permitting sites outside of the settlement defined boundary.
- 3.2 The Council has a housing land supply deficit. In this proposed development the site can contribute two new houses which fall both within and outside of the settlement boundary. It is evident that the proposal is sustainable due to its proximity to the village as defined by the existing boundary. There are no adverse impacts to be weighed against the proposal. The development should be permitted.