

**CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE****7 February 2007****Attendance:****Committee Members:**

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Beckett  
Hollingbery (P)

Pearson

**Deputy Members in attendance:**

Councillors Allgood

**Other Invited Councillors:**Beveridge (P)  
Busher (P)  
Cook (P)De Peyer (P)  
Jeffs (P)  
Sutton (P)**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Beckett and Pearson.

**2. MINUTES**

With regard to the discussions on the Core Strategy (CAB1359(LDF) refers), Councillor Allgood commented that the South East England Regional Assembly Plan (and not the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area) contained implications for Whiteley.

The Chief Executive confirmed this, and also advised that a consultation event had been arranged to take place in Whiteley (further details contained in Report CAB1405(LDF) below).

**RESOLVED:**

That, subject to noting the above point of clarification, the minutes of the meeting held 6 December 2006, be approved and adopted.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Four people addressed the Committee under the public participation procedure and their comments are summarised under the appropriate items below. In addition, the Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the content of an email from Mr J Hayter which had been copied to all Members present.

4. **DENMEAD VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT AND ST BARNABAS (WEST) NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGN STATEMENT – RECOMMENDED ADOPTION**  
(Report CAB1408(LDF) refers)

Mr B Gibbs (Vice-Chairman of Denmead Parish Council Planning Committee), spoke in general support of the Denmead Village Design Statement (VDS) and thanked the Denmead Future Group for their work in its preparation. He advised that since the consultation draft was published last year, the Parish Council were proposing two further amendments as summarised below:

- The VDS should include some wording expressing concerns about the 'Hatchmore' development, and emphasise lessons that should be learnt for any future developments;
- With regard to boundary hedges, the intention to retain existing soft boundaries and hedges should be strengthened.

In response, the Chief Executive advised that the schedule of amendments set out in Appendix 1 to the Report included revised wording regarding boundary hedges, which was along the lines of the amendment proposed by the Parish Council. However, regarding the Parish Council's first point, the Chief Executive advised that a VDS should be used to offer positive guidelines rather than criticise previous developments. The proposed amendments to the VDS did recommend additional text regarding density levels, with specific reference to PPS3, parking, etc (page 6 of Appendix 1 to the Report refers).

Councillor Beveridge welcomed the proposed amendments to the VDS set out in Appendix 1 to the Report. However, he considered that the VDS would be more useful to Members in considering planning applications in Denmead if it contained a greater level of detail in the guidelines, rather than primarily restating Local Plan policies. This point was generally supported, although the amount of work in the preparation of the VDS and the level of detail about the history and description of the village was also recognised.

The Chief Executive confirmed that both the Denmead and St Barnabas Groups had received advice from the same consultant regarding their Statements, but inevitably different groups have interpreted this guidance in slightly different ways. He advised that the Design Statements were likely to remain in force until the Local Plan Review was replaced by the relevant part of the LDF (about four years) and the reviews could build on experience gained.

One Member highlighted that "World's End" should include an apostrophe and this correction was agreed.

The Chairman emphasised that the Committee had also received the St Barnabas Neighbourhood Design Statement (NDS) and considered it to be a very useful and informative document. He thanked the Groups involved in the preparation of the NDS and the Denmead VDS for their work.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

## RESOLVED:

1. That, subject to the amendment outlined above and contained in Appendix 1 to the Report, the 'Guidelines' of the Denmead Village Design Statement (VDS) be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

2. That, subject to the amendments outlined in Appendix 1 of the Report, the 'Guidelines' of the St Barnabas Neighbourhood Design Statement (NDS) be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

3. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport, to agree the detailed wording of any minor changes that are needed to update the VDS/NDSs.

4. That an offer of up to £1,000 for each Design Statement be authorised as a contribution towards the costs of publication of the final documents.

5. That the relevant design statement groups be thanked for producing the Design Statements.

5. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY**  
(Report CAB1405(LDF) refers)

Mrs P Edwards (City of Winchester Trust) made a number of comments as summarised below:

- the Report was difficult to understand and in particular the phrase "front loading" was confusing;
- the slogan "Live for the Future ..." did not give a clear indication of the subject of the Council's consultation. More guidance should be made available so interested parties could prepare for the consultation meetings;
- inadequate provision had been made for consulting Winchester Town and its immediate outlying areas, such as Oliver's Battery and Harestock;
- she queried whether there would be opportunity to comment on the 'Urban Potential Study' and what was covered by the Winchester Housing Market Assessment;
- she queried why the study "Winchester City and its Settings" was listed against the 'Retail Study' topic as it was more relevant to issues such as sustainability.

Mrs A Matthews (Itchen Valley Parish Council) also highlighted the confusion around the use of the phrase "front loading". She understood that one meaning related to the requirement for developers to consult with local residents etc at an earlier stage of their planning proposals than previously. Mrs Matthews also commented that the dates of consultation meetings had not been circulated with sufficient notice to be included in parish magazines.

Mrs C Slattery (Winchester District – Council for the Protection of Rural England) queried which groups would be invited to attend the stakeholder event proposed for 22 March 2007. She expressed concern that the Winchester Town area had inadequate representation compared to the parished areas of the District and queried whether information could be sent to every household in the Town.

In response, the Chief Executive clarified that the term 'front loading' in relation to the Local Development Framework, generally referred to early involvement of the public in discussions, before draft documents were produced. It was also defined under the Statement of Community Involvement and, in relation to planning applications, did include encouraging developers to consult the local public, parish councils etc at an early stage in their proposals.

The Chief Executive explained that the slogan "Live for the Future ..." had developed from discussions between the Council's Strategic Planning and Corporate Communications Officers. Its intention was to emphasise the shift from a land-use based document to one encompassing wider issues. Publicity material had already been distributed but a launch for the campaign was proposed in Winchester for Friday 9 February 2007.

In response to Mrs Edwards' specific queries, the Chief Executive clarified that one Housing Market Assessment had been prepared by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) and the other was being commissioned by the Central Hampshire and New Forest authorities. Both these and the Urban Potential Study would be submitted to a future Committee as part of the evidence base.

In response to questions about how the consultation would reach 'hard to reach' groups, the Chief Executive acknowledged the difficulties involved, and advised that the research to be undertaken as part of the 'evidence base' would pick up the particular needs of any specific sections of the community, although efforts are being made to make contact with them too.

Councillor de Peyer considered that the phrase "sustainable community" was not easily understandable by the public in general and should not be used in promotional material. In addition, he requested that the consultation meetings should emphasise the various constraints faced by the Council in planning for the future.

The Chief Executive agreed that the parameters of Council decision-making would be highlighted. However, the phrase "sustainable community" had already been used in publications, with a brief explanation of its meaning.

In response to questions, the Chief Executive confirmed that a 'crib sheet' had been circulated to all City Councillors and parish councils to assist in their understanding of the consultation process. All the consultation meetings were open to people from any part of the District to attend. Specific invite letters had been sent to local residents' and community groups, etc. In addition, Councillor Hollingbery (as Portfolio Holder for Performance and Communications) stated that he would ensure the meetings were publicised in the relevant local newspapers.

The Chief Executive stated that unfortunately it had not been possible to secure a Winchester Town Forum meeting date for the consultation.

The Committee noted the report and agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

6. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB1395(LDF) refers)

Mrs C Slattery (Winchester District – Council for the Protection of Rural England) queried why the Report contained an exempt appendix.

The Chief Executive explained that the appendix was exempt because it contained financial details regarding the tenders received from four consultants for the work of preparing the Sustainability Appraisal.

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to an email from Mr J Hayter which had been circulated to Members. In summary, Mr Hayter believed that it had not been demonstrated that the Sustainability Appraisal conformed to the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and as such, the scope of the consultant's work and costs could not be agreed. The Chief Executive replied that the report dealt with the appointment of consultants to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal and that the SA report would be published alongside the appropriate stage of the Core Strategy for consultation. This was in accordance with the SCI.

The Committee noted the report and agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

7. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE**

(Report CAB1399(LDF) refers)

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to an email from Mr J Hayter which had been circulated to Members. In summary, Mr Hayter queried whether the period of consultation was adequate and conformed to the requirements of the SCI.

The Committee noted the report and agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the current Affordable Housing Development Guide be used to form the basis for the Supplementary Planning Document.

8. **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

RESOLVED:

That the date of the next meeting be agreed for Tuesday 17 April 2007 at 10.00am in the Walton Room, Guildhall, Winchester.

9. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Winchester District ) Development Framework ) – Sustainability Appraisal ) (exempt appendix) )	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)

10. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB1395(LDF) refers)

The Committee noted the report and agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the information contained in the Exempt Appendix to the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.55am

Chairman