

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

20 October 2009

Attendance:

Committee Members:

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Beckett (P)

Pearson (P)

Coates (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Busher (P)

Jefferies (P)

Pines (P)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Barratt, Bell, Humby, Learney and Ruffell

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held 25 March 2009 be approved and adopted.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no comments made or representations received.

3. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2009**

(Report [CAB1905\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Legal Services clarified that the Committee's recommendations would be referred to Cabinet as determination of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) document was not a matter that came within the remit of the Committee's terms of reference.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained the relationship between advice received from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and the Planning Inspectorate. In essence, GOSE represented the Government and advised on Government advice, whereas the Planning Inspectorate was an

independent body which would examine the Council's Core Strategy with a view to determining its soundness. The Planning Inspectorate would normally expect Government advice to be followed, but could also take account of special local circumstances (if the Council could demonstrate these should be taken into account). However, he emphasised that the Report contained the Revised Local Development Scheme which was a programme for the production of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) for the next three years and required approval by GOSE.

The Committee was also advised that the Core Strategy was proposing a number of strategic allocation sites and the Planning Inspectorate advice was that more detail of these should be included because the Council was not planning to produce further development plan documents prior to planning applications. Therefore, the Core Strategy needed to establish the requirements for these developments in some detail, to enable the policies to be used in the decision making process on any applications which might be received.

The Committee discussed the matters raised by the Planning Inspector (who had been appointed by the Inspectorate to provide initial advice) in relation to the Council's Core Strategy, as summarised in Paragraph 2.5 of the Report. In particular, Members requested further clarification in relation to the required treatment by the Council of the proposed Hedge End SDA.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the Inspector had raised concerns that delay in bringing forward policies to allocate adequate land for development, could result in the Council being at risk of planning applications for development not being determined by itself, but instead on appeal. He confirmed that the delay in approving a policy on the Hedge End SDA did however potentially offer the opportunity to align more closely with Eastleigh Borough Council's LDF programme. The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) had appointed an officer for each of the SDAs and the Hedge End SDA officer was undertaking feasibility work, due to be completed in the summer of 2010. The timing of the work and Eastleigh Borough's Core Strategy meant that the detail of any allocations that might need to be made for the SDA in Winchester District, would need to be included within the Development Management and Allocations DPD, rather than the Core Strategy. However, the Inspector had emphasised that the Council must take reasonable steps to plan for the potential of a SDA in its Core Strategy, as far as it affected Winchester District, as it was a South East Plan requirement, regardless of the position of Eastleigh Borough Council.

The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the consultants appointed to undertake the transport assessment would evaluate the impact of the possible developments proposed in the Core Strategy on relevant routes.

A Member expressed concern that the Government's policy which stated that windfall developments could not be taken into account, might result in the Council releasing too much land for development. The Head of Strategic

Planning responded that the Government would justify its policy by arguing that, if the Council was sure such development would take place, it should be identified in the SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment). However, he acknowledged this was practically very difficult in the case of small developments, which were difficult to predict. In addition, he did not consider that the numbers of possible windfall developments would be large enough to address the shortfall in housing numbers overall. The Inspector also suggested that the Council might want to consider utilising reserve sites and/or phasing of developments to address the potential problem of over-supply of land.

One Member highlighted that, as the housing targets currently stipulated for the District were included in the South East Plan (which was part of Government policy), this might be different should there be a change in Government, following the 2010 General Election. He sought reassurance that the LDS timetable would not result in the Council committing to proposals which could be changed in the light of possible new Government policy. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the proposed timetable would not result in the Council making any firm decisions on the next stage of the Core Strategy until October 2010.

The Committee acknowledged that there was a requirement for housing within the District to meet current and future need, but Members disputed the current numbers required under the South East Plan.

The Committee thanked the Head of Strategic Planning and team for their work in preparing the Report.

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

RECOMMENDED:

- 1. That the revised Winchester District Local Development Scheme, attached at Appendix A to the Report, be approved for submission to the Government Office for the South East (GOSE).**
- 2. That the Head of Strategic Planning be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, to agree any minor changes which may be needed to address issues raised by GOSE, prior to the LDF being brought into effect.**

4. **CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION (CHAPTERS 1 - 3)**

(Report [CAB1908\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item, due to his membership of Swanmore Parish Council, which had made representations on the Core Strategy. However, he had no involvement in the formulation of those representations and therefore remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Head of Strategic Planning highlighted that a number of comments received regarding Chapter 3 of the Core Strategy related to the view that it was not sufficiently 'locally distinctive', and this accorded with the Inspector's advice. Therefore, the Council would undertake a redraft of some Policies to ensure that they were more specific to the requirements of the Winchester District, including examining the questions: "What? Where? When? How?"

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the next step in the LDF process involved reporting back to the Committee on comments received. The actual redrafting of the Core Strategy would not commence until after this feedback had been concluded and the Committee had agreed its approach for each issue, later in 2010.

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

RESOLVED:

That the responses to comments received to Chapters 1 -3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Option consultation be noted and the Recommended Approach be agreed, to enable matters raised to be taken into account when preparing the next stage of the Core Strategy.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.15pm

Chairman