

Chapter 7 - Spatial Strategy – Market Towns and Rural Area

- 1.1 This is the third spatial area designated across the District through Policy SS1, and covers the remainder of the District dominated by smaller towns and villages. A large part of the rural area lies within the recently designated South Downs National Park and the attractiveness of the countryside has been influential on how places have evolved and now function. Government guidance (PPS7) aims to ensure that communities are and remain sustainable, this matter has received recent emphasis in the Taylor Review (2008), on the 'Rural Economy and Affordable Housing' and revised PPS4 published in December 2009.
- 1.2 Government guidance advises that in rural areas most new development should be focused in or near local service centres, with some limited development in rural settlements to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities. Significant development should not be directed to settlements which are remote from, or with poor public transport links to, service centres. Policies BE4 and BE5 of the South East Plan follow this general guidance and stress that rural settlements should be the focus mainly for development to meet local needs.
- 1.3 The preferred approach within the market towns and rural area is to define a settlement hierarchy which promotes development that serves local needs in the most sustainable and accessible locations, whilst respecting and improving the physical and community identity of settlements. This strategy reflects the diversity of the many rural settlements within the District. The settlement hierarchy categorises the rural settlements across the District into a number of levels based on a range of criteria, including population, access to public transport, catchment areas and service provision. This includes not only shopping facilities but also health, education, other community uses, and employment opportunities. This hierarchy will then be used to determine the amount and types of growth and change to be allowed in each of the Districts' settlements according to their position in the hierarchy.
- 1.4 The issue of the settlement hierarchy and options for categorisation were subject of much debate at the Issues and Options stage of Core Strategy preparation, given the diversity of the District and the development requirements it needs to deliver. Four 'categories' of settlement were considered to be appropriate (see CAB 1772 (LDF) 16 Dec 2008) to provide enough guidance and direction for the 50 or so settlements within the District, as required by SE Plan policies and government advice:-

Level 1 ; Bishops Waltham, New Alresford

Development Strategy = New development will be accommodated through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s) for housing (including 40% affordable housing) of about 500 new dwellings in each settlement (averaging 25 dwellings per annum). A corresponding level of economic growth will also be supported and there may be scope to relocate existing employment sites. Modest greenfield releases may be appropriate where they would achieve this and broaden the economic base of these settlements to provide a greater range of employment opportunities for local people. Facilities and services should be retained and improved to serve the settlements and their catchment areas.

Level 2 : Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham

Development Strategy = New development will be accommodated through infilling, redevelopment and greenfield release(s) for housing (including 40% affordable housing) for about 300 new dwellings in each settlement (averaging 15 dwellings per annum). A corresponding level of economic growth will also be supported which could include a small greenfield release where this would help improve the balance between jobs and working residents and provide a greater range of employment opportunities for local people.

Level 3 : Bramdean, Cheriton, Curdrige, Droxford, Durley, Hambledon, Headbourne Worthy, Hursley, Itchen Abbas, Knowle, Littleton, Lower Upham, Corhampton/Meonstoke, Micheldever, Micheldever Station, North Boarhunt, Otterbourne, Shedfield, South Wonston, Southwick, Sparsholt, Sutton Scotney, Twyford, West Meon

Development Strategy = Limited new development for housing and/or employment purposes will be accommodated through infilling and redevelopment within existing settlement boundaries and built-up areas (including 40% affordable housing).

Level 4 : Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Compton Down, Compton Street, Crawley, Curbridge, Durley Street, East Stratton, Easton, Itchen Stoke, New Cheriton/Hinton Marsh, Newtown, Old Alresford, Otterbourne Hill, Owslebury, Shawford, Shirrell Heath, Soberton, Soberton Heath, Southdown, Tichborne, Upham, Warnford, Wonston, Woodmancott

Development Strategy = New development will be limited to small scale 'Local Connections Homes' (see Policy CP20) only with 'enabling' market housing permitted where necessary (no more than 20%) to meet demonstrable local needs.

- 1.5 In general, there seems support for this approach and the creation of a four tier settlement hierarchy covering the range of rural towns and villages that exist in the District, to ensure that any development that occurs is proportionate.
- 1.6 Given the significant level of response to this part of the Core Strategy, the comments received fall into the following broad categories :-
1. The position of particular settlements in the hierarchy;
 2. the corresponding level of residential development proposed;
 3. the release of greenfield sites and revisions to settlement boundaries

The following schedules list all respondents to this part of the plan together with a brief summary of matters raised, plus an officer response and recommended way forward where appropriate. Given the number of responses all common/similar matters have been grouped together.

- 1.7 The position of particular settlements in the hierarchy - CAB 1772 (LDF) 16 Dec 2008 detailed the criteria against which each settlement was considered. This involved collecting a range of data for each settlement (population, service and facility provision, catchment area/rural hinterland of settlement) etc, this was then collated to assess the role and function of each settlement with regard to these characteristics and in relation to its existing status in the adopted local plan. This 'package' of features was then used to place settlements within one of the four levels of the hierarchy, taking a balanced pragmatic approach to ensure the 'best fit' for each settlement. There has generally been a good level of support for the placing of various settlements at certain levels of the hierarchy. While there has been some objection, this has been largely from developer/landowner interests who wish to see the policy changed to improve the chances of development on their particular sites.
- 1.8 The corresponding level of residential development proposed – the proposed development strategies for each settlement raised the most responses particularly with reference to the specific suggestions of about 500/300 new dwellings for level 1 and 2 settlements which could involve greenfield releases. The 500/300 development levels correspond to past levels of growth over the previous plan period which averages out at about 25/15 dwellings per annum for the settlements within levels 1 and 2 of the hierarchy . However, the Planning Inspector advising the Council during summer 2009, specifically referred to the proposed settlement hierarchy and the approach being taken in the Preferred Option and advised that the Core Strategy must concentrate on dealing

with the high level strategy for the District, setting out the broad development principles in terms of broad locations and amounts but leaving the detail to lower order development plan documents. He commented “*I think your attempt to set out exact housing figures for each level of settlement is too detailed.....*” and that more evidence would be needed to justify the figures if they were retained. In addition, GOSE advise that it will be necessary to set out the quantum for various types of uses within this spatial area. Given this advice it is considered that the specific application of a proposed housing strategy for each level of the hierarchy, is a matter that requires more detailed evidence and consultation particularly with regard to its delivery and the need to identify and allocate the sites required, whether for housing or other purposes. On this basis it is considered that the way forward would be for the suggested housing numbers expressed for level 1 and 2 of the settlement hierarchy to be deleted and Policy MTRA2 amended to provide strategic advice as to the overall development strategy expected for each level of the hierarchy. In addition, since publication of the Preferred Option revised PPS4 ‘Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth’ has been published by the Government, this sets out current thinking on economic development in both urban and rural areas. There are many references in it to the rural economy and countryside activities, this revised guidance will also need to be taken into account.

- 1.9 The Council in partnership with East Hampshire District Council has recently been successful in bidding for funds under the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) ‘Rural Masterplanning’ programme. This will provide £15 000 of consultancy advice over the period 2009/2010 – 2010/2011 to help define the scale, nature and form of development which would be most appropriate for the various rural settlements, across both Districts. It is anticipated that this work will provide the evidence that is needed to justify retaining the detail of development proposed for each level of the settlement hierarchy.
 - 1.10 The release of greenfield sites and revisions to settlement boundaries:- whilst there may well remain a requirement to release greenfield sites during the plan period, these will be identified through the SHLAA process which is underway and then subsequently allocated through the Development Management and Allocations DPD, which will follow once the Core Strategy is adopted. The need to identify land for housing or other purposes may also require the boundaries of some settlements to be revised, but given the advice from the Planning Inspector for the Core Strategy to focus at a strategic level any non-strategic allocations and amendments or creation of settlement boundaries will be undertaken at a later stage. A number of respondents have suggested sites for consideration and allocation. These are listed in the following schedules where relevant, but will however, be considered under the SHLAA process (or similar for employment sites) and then allocated where appropriate through the Development Management and Allocations DPD if required.
- 2 Outcomes of Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.1 The Sustainability Appraisal highlights the potential for this part of the Plan given its geographical coverage to encourage dispersed development and to contribute to increased carbon emissions etc, through additional traffic movements. This is however offset by the strategy and draft policies which support both economic and social inclusion through the recognition of affordable housing and the potential for various economic opportunities given the diverse nature of this spatial area. The issue of traffic movements within a rural area is complex given the diminishing public subsidy of rural transport provision and increasing car ownership, not to mention increasing choice and flexibility of rural residents in terms of shopping and employment opportunities. The Matthew Taylor Review (2008) recognised that there is a balance to be established which allows for small scale development in such locations which by its nature promotes and maintains sustainable rural communities as promoted through South East Plan Policies BE4 and BE5, and revised PPS4, which expresses the Governments response to the economic development elements of the Taylor Review. Revisions to both the strategy and draft policies for this spatial area will be subject to further assessment under the sustainability appraisal process at the next stage of Core Strategy production.

3 Conclusion and Recommended Approach

- 3.1 Given the diversity of the District and the extent of its geographical coverage, a settlement hierarchy and corresponding development strategy is an important tool to deal with the numerous local variations that exist. This allows strategic level guidance to inform the general direction of growth and change for the range of towns and villages within the rural area taking into account recent guidance and advice.

Recommended Approach :-

1. To update MTRA 1 to take into account the comments made and revised guidance (PPS4) and advice (PINS/GOSE) issued.
2. To delete references to housing numbers in Policy MTRA2 (subject to the outcome of the study funded by DCLG under its Rural Masterplanning bid to be undertaken by CABE).and replace if necessary these with a broader indication of the scale, nature and form of development proposed (for a variety of uses).
3. To amend the Core Strategy in line with Policy CC5 of SE Plan with regard to an aging population.
4. To amend Policy MTRA2 to cross reference to Policy CP4, CP9 and CP20 and any other relevant policies

5. To include Policy CP4 within the Market Towns and Rural Area section of the Core Strategy.
6. To review the need for Policy MTRA4 given the revised guidance in PPS4 and references in Policy MTRA3.
7. To amend MTRA3 to include reference to affordable housing provided in accordance with Policy CP20.

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:		
<p>Read in isolation the policy promotes dispersed development which has the potential for adverse impacts on the landscape, the tranquillity of the countryside through light and noise pollution and on climate change through increased carbon emissions. Cumulative impacts on water quality from incremental development will also have to be monitored as the sites will probably not be of a scale to require EIA or AA. Policies will not be used in isolation and the plan does incorporate policies which mitigate the effect of this policy. Policy MTRA 2 clarifies the scale of development which will be allowed and sets out a clear settlement hierarchy and a clear signpost and link in the text of this Policy MTRA 1 would clarify the intent of this policy and remove the doubts over the potential impacts. (Is this policy needed or could it be amalgamated with Policy MTRA 2 ?)</p>		
10438; 33 (South Wonston PC); 10440 (Winchester Lib Dem City Council Group); 2273; 3071	<p>Comments on paras –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify the meaning and intent of terms such as ‘significant development’ and ‘small scale’ • Para 7.8 refers to homeworking – this can be hampered by poor broadband services and other infrastructure • If the allocations were based on previous levels of growth as suggested by paras 7.13 and 7.16 then both Denmead and Knowle would be set at higher levels 	See comments below
2107, 2117, 10247, 10284, 10289, 10401, 10407,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the vision which directs growth to the most accessible and sustainable locations but the scale of housing in the market towns and villages should reflect local needs. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The scale of development</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
10409, 10411, 10426, 10427, 10441; 10244; 10252; 2273	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend MTRA1 to refer to meeting local and sub-regional needs, commensurate with the size, character and services of the settlement • Support directing development to settlements with existing services, but the approach is too 'top-down' and concentrating development in the more urban areas will not meet local needs. 	<p>suggested in MTRA2 will be reassessed given the advice received from the Planning Inspector in 2009 with regard to leaving the detail to lower order DPDs to resolve.</p> <p>The policies expressed within this section of the Plan are intended to address the issues of local needs across the range of settlements that exist within the rural parts of the District, rather than providing the direction for strategic levels of growth, which are promoted through those policies focussing development within and adjoining the urban areas of the District in accordance with the South East Plan.</p>
4 (Bishops Waltham Parish Council)	Support MTRA1. There is a need to address the problem of long term parking within Bishop's Waltham to promote BW as a tourist attraction and maintain vitality and viability of the centre.	Support noted

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
13 (Denmead Parish Council)	The vision is supported by DPC which considers that all five elements are appropriate to Denmead	Support noted
2362, 3107, 3116, 3147, 10253, 10277, 10278, 10279, 10280, 10281, 10282, 10283, 10285, 10286, 10287, 10288, 10290, 10291, 10292, 10293, 10294, 10295, 10296, 10297, 10298, 10300, 10303, 10305, 10307, 10311, 10314, 10318, 10331, 10428, 10429, 10430, 10431, 10433, 0434, 10435, 10436; 10236	No confidence that the 'vision' will be achieved, which relies on housing completions within the defined settlements.	The purpose of the vision is to set out a broad strategy for the level and direction of development in the Market Towns and Rural Area spatial area over the 20 year plan period. MTRA1 whilst referring to housing provision also refers to economic activity, green infrastructure and local services, to set out the general parameters that are to be achieved to deliver sustainable development and to ensure the continued vitality and viability of existing communities.

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
10253; 140; 2670; 90 (English Heritage); 2229; 2430; 87 (GOSE) ; 3071; 3057; 3198; 3199; 3224; 2592; 10243; 10392; 10408; 10413; 1994; 2116; 2118; 2121; 2175; 10042; 10058; 10241; 10029; 1994; 2430; 10035; 1316	<p><u>General comments:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Policy is adequate for the settlements but does not cover the rural area adequately. • The vision and hierarchy criteria that MTRA1 is based on are contrary to the SE Plan. They do not take proper account of minimising journey lengths, maximising use of non-car modes, potential for renewable energy, local housing and other needs, or providing flexibility for future • The rural economy needs to be sustained, farm diversification allowed and rural tourism promoted, provision for rural sports such as shooting and MTRA1 should be modified to encourage outdoor recreation activities needing a countryside location • Policy refers to uses such as housing, economic activity, etc, but there is no indication of the quantum figures and it appears to be set out as a “development management” policy rather than a “delivery” policy – this needs to be amended prior to publication (GOSE) • The Core Strategy should include a clear long-term vision for each settlement, aimed at enhancing sustainability. This could be done through the existing mechanism of Parish Plans. • The levels of development expressed should be more in proportion to the existing housing stock • The vision for the market towns and rural area should include the need to provide sport, leisure and recreational opportunities for 	<p>The strategy expressed in MTRA1 needs to be amended to take on board the comments of PINS and GOSE in terms of the quantum of development and their spatial distribution. This will also need to pick up detailed comments received in terms of specific elements to be included in MTRA1, including the need to refer to the function and role of the more rural area in addition to the settlements located within it.</p> <p>Given that the Core Strategy is a strategic level document it will not set out in detail a long-term vision for each settlement – it must meet the requirements of PPS12 to set out a general strategy and development framework through the settlement hierarchy in MTRA2.</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	<p>existing and future residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development should be focused on the settlements that will benefit from support for the services that they already have • must be sufficient flexibility in the policies for growth around the larger settlements (Colden Common) to ensure that provision is made for a balance of housing employment retail and other services • Reducing the need for travel seems most appropriate for communities for which travel is most expensive or difficult if traffic restraint policies are actually effective the market will return for village shops or some equivalent (e.g. mobile shops). Encouraging non-car-based rural employment is more difficult. • that development that supports the delivery of key infrastructure/facilities including green infrastructure in woodlands such as, rural car parking, children and young peoples facilities, all weather/disabled/ strategic network paths and tracks, toilets facilities, visitor centres etc. 	<p>The hierarchy is based on a range of data and is aimed at guiding development to the most sustainable locations – generally those settlements that have the greatest levels of population and service provision including public transport, and therefore does follow the principles of reducing the need to travel etc.,.</p> <p>Development within the rural settlements will be required to be supported by the necessary infrastructure etc, however with regard to elements of more strategic infrastructure, mechanisms to fund this via developer contributions will need to be investigated with regard to the latest CIL proposals.</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	<p><u>Employment issues:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and policy approach must be amended to reflect the current economic circumstances • There is a need to provide a wider range of employment if communities are to be sustained with a mix of age and socio-economic types, and therefore consideration should be given to amending the wording to allow all appropriate economic activity, with perhaps an emphasis on “green collar” industries which may be appropriate due to the likely small scale and lack of impact. • Needs to be more support for locally produced food and local farmers • that the policy should make reference to Policy CP4 	<p>Revised PPS4 provides specific guidance to economic development in the rural areas and this advice will need to be incorporated into any revisions of the Core Strategy. (See response to MTRA 3 with regard to cross reference with CP4). The issue of broadband connections is beyond the remit of the Core Strategy, the infrastructure providers have been consulted on the Core Strategy and the Council has entered into various dialogues with specific providers to ensure that the levels of development proposed can be supported by the necessary infrastructure. The levels of development proposed within the Market Towns and Rural Area have not received any adverse comments from providers.</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	<p><u>Scale of development/alternative locations</u> :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While MTRA1 states that its strategy is to provide for local development needs, this is not reflected in the spatial strategy which concentrates development on a few large sites • Object to the 3rd bullet point of MTRA1 which does not distinguish between market towns and smaller settlements and should be amended to refer to the 'hierarchical function' of the settlement. This would reflect MTRA2 which identifies the higher level settlements. • alternatives have not been properly assessed (promoting land at Top Field, Kings Worthy) • Smaller allocations such as land north of Wickham should take precedence over large scale allocations at Whiteley and Waterloooville which are very slow to be developed. These would respond better to local needs. • there is the opportunity to provide significant development in Level 3 and 4 Settlements which cumulatively could improve and save some services. a Masterplan should be prepared to determine the location of sustainable and brownfield sites in the rural area in order to optimize the use of land and minimize the use of greenfield sites elsewhere. • MTRA1 fails to acknowledge proximity of some market towns and rural areas to proposed MDAs and urban areas. MTRA1 should allow for additional development in market towns in proximity to 	<p>Agree there needs to be consistency of terminology through the document in terms of what is meant by 'small scale' or 'significant'.</p> <p>Alternative options for development within the rural part of the District were explored at the Issues and Options stage. The strategy presented in the Preferred Option was and remains the most appropriate given the diverse nature of the District and the various policy constraints that exist . MTRA1 reflects the complex nature of the settlements within the District and their locational and functional relationships with settlements outside, particularly along the southern fringes of the</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	<p>South Hampshire Urban Areas and should specify this for Denmead and Wickham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to retail expansion in the 'market towns', especially Bishops Waltham, as this would damage their special character. <p><u>Environmental issues:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needs to refer to environmental considerations (English Heritage) • The character of the District's rural areas and settlements must be maintained and protected • object to settlement hierarchy needs to take account of the National Park designation and settlements within it, cannot adopt a one-size-fits all approach need to assess each settlement to determine its character and level of development. 	<p>District, which lie within PUSH. The subsequent hierarchy also recognises the 'catchment' areas of the larger rural towns and has been expressed so that the role of the larger settlements serves a wider area including level 2,3 and 4 settlements and those in the more remote locations.</p> <p>Given that this spatial area covers all the District beyond Winchester and South Hampshire urban areas, the term Market Towns and Rural area seems appropriate to best summarise its geographical extent.</p> <p>The Core Strategy follows an urban focus development strategy in accordance with the SE Plan, accordingly the policies within the Market Towns and</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
		<p>Rural Area comply with policies BE 4 and BE 5 of the SE Plan which focus on addressing local development provision, rather than strategic growth.</p> <p>The designation of the National Park has occurred since publication of the Preferred Option document and is covered by policy CP 9, which will need to be updated. In terms of the settlement hierarchy, settlements within the National Park all fall within levels 3 and 4 of the hierarchy and will accordingly be subject to development proposals that are aimed at meeting local needs – this approach complies with the SE Plan and the findings of the Taylor Review to ensure that communities remain sustainable.</p>

Policy MTRA1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
		<u>Recommended Approach</u> :- To update MTRA 1 to take into account the comments made and revised guidance and advice issued. Specifically to take the findings of the SA process into account and to emphasise within the policy the local nature of growth and development to ensure that the Districts' rural settlements remain viable and sustainable.
2588; 10045	Concern that given the little gap between the settlements around Bishops Waltham there will be an increase of some 1100 houses (500 –Bishops Waltham; 300 Swanmore and 300 Waltham Chase) this is far too many to retain the character of the rural area	See comments on MTRA2 below.
10059	Object - the proposed Level 1 development of 500 properties is too large for a village given lack of public transport , doctors facilities including NHS Dentists and the road infrastructure to cope with such large scale development.	See comments on MTRA2 below.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
2116; 2107; 2117; 10407; 10409; 10411; 2107; 2117; 2991; 10236; 10253; 10284; 10289; 10401; 10407; 10409; 10411; 10426; 10427; 10439; 3411; 2324; 2341; 2362; 3107; 3116; 3147; 10112; 10247; 10277; 10278; 10279; 10280; 10281; 10282; 10283; 10285; 10286; 10287; 10288; 10290; 10291; 10292; 10293; 10294; 10295; 10296; 10297; 10298; 10300; 10301; 10302; 10303; 10305; 10307; 10310; 10311; 10313; 10314; 10318; 10321; 10324; 10331; 10342; 10344; 10347; 10350; 10351; 10355; 10356; 10357; 10358; 10359; 10360; 10362; 10363; 10364; 10365; 10366; 10367; 10368; 10369; 10370; 10371; 10372; 10373; 10378; 10379; 10380; 10381; 10382; 10383; 10428; 10429; 10430; 10431; 10433; 10434; 10435; 10436; 87(GOSE)	<p>Comments on paras –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • para 7.16 – over reliance on SHLAA sites – housing levels should not be based on the SHLAA assessment and recent completions and permissions it should take into account the needs of local communities and the availability of suitable sites – para 7.16 should be deleted • para 7.17 – need to clarify that Greenfield sites <u>will</u> be allocated in level 1 and 2 settlements to give certainty • concern that para 7.17 leaves level 1 and 2 settlements open to development proposals • need to commit to reviewing settlement boundaries in level 3 and 4 settlements and whether there is a need for Greenfield releases • not acceptable to allocate sites through the Development Management and Allocations DPD • need to extend settlement boundaries to 	<p>Given the housing requirements for the District set out in the SE Plan it will be necessary for residential allocations to be made in the most sustainable locations within the District to cover the plan period and to ensure that there is an adequate supply of available and deliverable sites as required by PPS3. The SHLAA process has identified a number of potential development sites across the District, however it is not for the Core Strategy to allocate smaller ‘non-strategic’ sites, PPS12 is clear that sites allocated</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	<p>include brownfield sites that are currently defined as countryside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denmead has few employment opportunities more housing will therefore create a dormitory settlement with potential encroachment into the greenspace to the east/west of the settlement – changes to the settlement boundary are unacceptable • Para 7.18 – reference is made to development in the countryside being strictly controlled, guidance in revised PPS4 needs to be taken into account (GOSE) 	<p>in the Core Strategy should be strategic and essential for the delivery of the development strategy for the District over the plan period.</p> <p>The PINS advice received in 2009 which stresses that the role of the Core Strategy is to provide high level strategy and development principles for the whole District rather than detailed guidance for each settlement within it, and that this level of detail should be set out in lower order DPDs to resolve. It is therefore, considered appropriate that the reference to</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		<p>housing numbers in Policy MTRA2 should be deleted and for this level of detail to be set out in the Development Management and Allocations DPD. Preparation of this DPD will also provide the opportunity to examine the settlement boundaries and for these to be reviewed if required and for smaller non-strategic sites (for residential and other purposes) to be allocated, in accordance with the role and function of the settlement as determined by its position in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		Revised PPS4 needs to be taken into account when the policies in this section of the Plan are revised.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:</p> <p>This policy lends clarity over the scale of development but detailed impacts will still inevitably be site specific. The policy promotes a level of development across the rural parts of the District mostly in settlements with a certain level of facilities. Concern is expressed about the cumulative impact on biodiversity and the landscape, and also over the ability of small scale developments to meet the social needs generated by this overall quantum of development. There is not necessarily a correlation between new development and maintaining existing services as lifestyle patterns are changing, however, by encouraging limited levels of growth this provides opportunities for using local shops and schools. All new development will bring about an increase in vehicle related emissions and this will necessarily be more marked in smaller settlements with poorer rail and bus links. Alternatively benefits will be found in the provision of affordable housing in smaller communities and the potential to provide a greater mix of dwellings in a wide range of settlements. The policy also recognises and facilitates the need to maintain and increase the diversity and location of employment opportunities across the District.</p>		

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
Policy MTRA2 (General Comments)		
86 (Environment Agency)	Comment that there is a possible need for some improvements made on Waste Water Treatment Works serving the various settlements – particularly Level 1 and 2 settlements. Welcome limited development in Level 3 settlements	Comment noted – the Council is engaged in a continuing dialogue with the EA and its advice will be necessary when determining the precise amounts of development and potential sites to be allocated in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.
87 (GOSE); 10060; 10062; 10063; 10261; 10417; 2670; 10253	Levels 1 and 2 refer to 300/500 dwellings and economic growth but lack quantum figures making the spatial strategy unclear. Level 3 refers to limited new development for housing and employment uses but how much is expected in the locations set out? Level 4 - see comments on CP20 re “local connections homes”. Paragraph 7.15 refers to applying the appropriate level of development, but Policy MTRA2 only provides details on housing.	Comment noted – GOSE has requested that the Core Strategy be more explicit in terms of stating the quantum of all types of development that are likely to occur across the District during the Plan period –this follows the concept of expressing

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	Need to update the figures associated with MTRA2 to take account of the recent economic downturn.	<p>each policy as 'what, where, when and how' as suggested by PINS and applies equally to the rural part of the District as it does to the urban areas.</p> <p>In addition given the PINS advice it is proposed that the suggested number of dwellings for the Level 1 and 2 settlements is deleted and that this level of detail is set out in the Development Management and Allocations DPD to follow the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The hierarchy will therefore set out the</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		<p>strategic role and function of the settlements in accordance with the role of the Core Strategy, leaving the detail for a future more detailed DPD.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:</u></p> <p>To delete references to housing numbers in Policy MTRA2 (subject to the findings of the CABA study to be undertaken as part of the DCLG Rural Masterplanning programme) and express in broad terms the settlements that will be expected to provide for more development for a</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		range of uses in accordance with the hierarchy.
2273; 3224; 3411; 10232; 10270; 10403; 2229; 2116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recategorisation of settlements is logical and an improvement on previous hubs. • Allocation of settlements is also well justified – although Wickham's smaller size and particular balance of population need to be taken into account in any future planning decisions. • Support the 4-level hierarchy and inclusion of Bishops Waltham and Alresford as areas that should retain and improve their facilities and services. • Support MTRA2 which allows settlements to grow commensurate with their size and character. • support encouragement for economic growth • should be flexibility for development in Level 2 settlements to cope with shortfalls elsewhere. 	Comments noted - the categorisation of different settlements into the different levels of the hierarchy has taken into account a range of data available together with local knowledge of the settlement in terms of its role and function.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
38 (Twyford Parish Council); 2169; 2173; 1963; 3411; 10403	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to development in villages needs to be re-thought. Settlement boundaries are inherited from an earlier type of plan and may allow harmful infilling and redevelopment but prevent sympathetic additions to the form of the village. Affordable housing will always be required • Policy needs to be clarified with regard to level 3 and 4 settlements and the need for defined settlement boundaries - all existing boundaries should be reviewed and new ones defined to give clarity as to whether sites fall within or outside a boundary • Need to allocate land within level 3 settlements • support approach for level 3 settlements - promotion of infilling within existing boundaries 	Settlement boundaries and the need to either create them or redefine them and allocate land for development is not a matter for the Core Strategy and will be dealt with in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.
1045; 1923	New development should not take place until viable infrastructure is in place, including the provision of local jobs	Comment noted – provision of appropriate infrastructure is a

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		common concern with development in the smaller settlements – at present the Council has not received any adverse comments from the infrastructure providers with regard to the broad levels of development proposed.
3071	The vision and hierarchy criteria that MTRA2 is based on are contrary to the SE Plan and do not take proper account of minimising journey lengths, maximising use of non-car modes, potential for renewable energy, etc. The over-provision of housing means that MTRA2 does not need to make greenfield allocations. The development requirements do not have regard to local needs	The proposed hierarchy is fully in accordance with SE Plan which generally recognises the role of small rural towns (market towns) in terms of reinforcing their role as local hubs for employment, retailing, community facilities and services as they play a key part in the economic and social functioning of

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		<p>the area and the need to ensure that sufficient housing is provided to meet their needs.</p> <p>Whilst settlements within this spatial area will not be required to include sites for strategic levels of growth at this stage, it may be necessary to allocate smaller sites to ensure their continued viability and sustainability and to meet locally generated needs whether for housing, employment or other purposes – this is not however a role for the Core Strategy.</p>
10425	There should be a revision to the settlement boundary of Whiteley to include this site (land at Whiteley Lane currently outside settlement	Whiteley falls within the South Hampshire Urban Areas spatial definition

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	boundary) The issue of local landscape designations needs to be reviewed in light of the way in which the area around the property has developed .	and is consequently covered by policy SH1, and the proposed strategic allocation at North Whitely Policy SH3 - see report CAB1944 (LDF) Appendix C for detailed comments on Policies SH1, SH2, SH3, SH4 and SH5 and the development strategy for the South Hampshire Urban Area.
3199	Object to this policy as it makes no reference to new leisure, indoor and outdoor sports facilities within the settlements. It should be amended to support the need for new sports facilities.	Comment noted – MTRA2 sets out the broad development principles for the range of settlements within the rural area of the District – it refers in general terms to development and service provision, it does not preclude sports

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		facilities however these would need to be of a scale commensurate with the role and function of the settlement and its position in the settlement hierarchy.
10178; 10407	MTRA2 carries forward Local Plan policy rather than being a step change. It should allow changes to settlement boundaries in Level 3 and 4 settlements, to help meet SE Plan housing requirements. The hierarchy does not attempt to weight the importance of different facilities or looking at networks of facilities across several settlements. There is not sufficient development allowed in Level 2 & 3 settlements to meet local needs	MTRA2 does to some extent carry forward existing policy for the rural settlements within the District, this is in response to the numerous comments received at the Issues and Options stage which suggested a 'step change' for a number of the larger settlements but which was rejected by those communities. MTRA2 follows the SE Plan guidance on this

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		<p>issue of proportionate development for principally local needs within rural areas to ensure communities remain viable and sustainable. The hierarchy does not 'weight' different elements of facilities or service provision, rather it takes a balanced view and the 'package' on offer to determine the best fit in the hierarchy for specific settlements. It does however consider 'catchment' areas for the larger settlements recognising that they serve a wider more rural hinterland.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		Boundaries around Level 3 and 4 settlements are not an issue for the Core Strategy - this will be dealt with in the Development Management and Allocations DPD.
10229	<p>Level 4 settlements - concerned about policy CP20 in relation to level 4 settlements: lack of evidence; 20% is too low to secure sufficient rural exception schemes to meet local affordable housing need; Although more research will need to be done to justify the final figure expect it to be more in the region of up to 50%.</p> <p>The size of schemes likely to be acceptable under the Local Connection Homes policy has not been set out in the consultation document but we expect that such schemes will be relatively small so that they do not significantly extend the Level 4 settlements. Smaller schemes of say 5 dwellings would only be able to include 1 market housing unit</p>	See response to CP20 elsewhere on this agenda.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	<p>which is unlikely to be sufficient to enable the remaining affordable units. It should therefore be recognised in the Core Strategy that the smaller schemes may require a larger proportion of market housing.</p> <p>Recommend that the Council engages in some more research on the viability of affordable housing schemes in the District before finalising the maximum percentage of market housing that could be permitted on a Local Connections Homes policy site.</p>	
10408; 10441	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the concept of a hierarchy but Level 2 should be subdivided so as to prioritise development close to MDAs: Level 2A - Denmead, Wickham, 400 dwellings, etc; Level 2B - Colden Common, Waltham Chase, 300 dwellings, etc; Level 2C - Kings Worthy, Swanmore, 200 dwellings, etc • The levels of housing allocated to Levels 1 and 2 do not seem to reflect MTRA1 (1st bullet point). Suggest a proportion of new 	The suggested amendments would over-complicate the settlement hierarchy. There was much debate over the number and range of levels to introduce (see CAB 1772(LDF) Appendix B, 16 December 2008) where it

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	<p> dwellings to each, e.g. Denmead 450, Kings Worthy 350, Colden Common 250 and Wickham 150. Development should be organic and spread over the plan period - development of small sites would help this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>was concluded that 4 levels offered a pragmatic solution to the range and variety of settlements within the District.</p> <p>See comments above as to the housing numbers suggested for each level.</p>
10438; 10440 (Winchester Liberal Democrat City Council Group)	<p>The settlement hierarchy seems to suggest that no development for economic purposes can take place at all in Level 4 settlements.</p> <p>MTRA2 should be clearer that greenfield releases for economic development will only be permitted where compatible with policy SS1, in locations that are well served by transport and well related to existing communities.</p>	<p>PPS4 has been revised and was finalised in December 2009. This gives specific advice on the rural economy which will need to be taken into account when this part of the Plan is revised.</p>
2176	<p>Request that Denmead and Waltham Chase enjoy similar sustainability qualities to Bishops Waltham and Alresford and be included within the list of Level</p>	<p>See above for response to definition of the settlement hierarchy and</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	1 settlements in recognition of their ability to accept further housing and employment development in a manner that respects the identity of settlements.	categorisation of settlements within it.
Policy MTRA 2 Comments on Specific Settlements		
New Alresford :		
2174; 10455; 2672; 10058;	<p>Support the general objectives of Policy MTRA 2 to provide additional growth at New Alresford and agree it should be identified as being suitable to accommodate further growth to support the viability and vitality of the existing community and potentially to contribute to the District's wider housing needs. Given the size of the town we believe that it is possible to accommodate more than the 500 dwellings, sites should be allocated to give certainty.</p> <p>The definition of the National Park will enhance this role as opportunities for development within its wider catchment area are now more restricted. Accordingly, planning for any less than 500</p>	<p>Comment on acceptance on the level of development of 500 dwellings noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Sites suggested for development will be considered during the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	<p>dwellings over the Plan period would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Sites suggested for development:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land to west of Alresford. • Perins School site • Land to east of Sun Lane 	
25 (New Alresford Town Council); Alresford Society	<p>Alresford villages should be developed sustainably to prevent their demise, with some infilling, whilst ensuring gaps remain between settlements.</p> <p>There should be a plan for the relocation of industrial units to the edge of Alresford and there should be an emphasis on infrastructure (more open space is needed, lorries detract from the fabric of the town, and medical facilities need to be looked at).</p> <p>Accept the strategy for Level 1 settlements but disappointed it is so unspecific. Alternative sites are needed if any businesses relocate.</p>	<p>Comment noted – a number of villages around Alresford fall within level 3 of the proposed hierarchy which allows for some development within existing boundaries – the need to review these is not the role of the Core Strategy. Similarly the need to relocate industrial estates and/or allocate new sites will need to be considered within the</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
		Development Management and Allocations DPD.
Bishops Waltham :		
4 (Bishops Waltham Parish Council); 2121	<p>Support MTRA2 and welcome 40% affordable housing. Development should be phased to prevent overload on infrastructure. Houses should be a maximum of 3 beds and restrict the number of flats.</p> <p>Need to identify light industrial sites to relocate industry for Claylands and free up site for housing. Relocate Council waste recycling site.</p> <p>Sites suggested for development:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the south-west of B Waltham 	<p>Comments noted in relation to the settlement hierarchy. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to identify non-strategic sites for development or redevelopment - this will take place through the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
2274	The Bishops Waltham/ Swanmore/ Waltham Chase/Wickham area has too large a proportion of the housing as these towns practically merge. Bishops Waltham has many unique features. The area surrounding Winchester has too small a proportion of the proposed housing quota.	Noted – however these settlements given their population and service provision have a role to play in providing opportunities for future growth and change albeit at a local level. This part of the District also lies within the south Hampshire sub-region and any residential development will contribute to the District's housing targets for PUSH. Notwithstanding this there are few similar sized settlements in the northern part of the District and part of this area also now lies within the South Downs National Park, limiting its

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
		potential for significant growth.
Denmead :		
2117; 2175; 13 (Denmead Parish Council); 10388; 10404; 10389; 10421	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support MTRA2 in principle and the inclusion of Denmead within Level 2. However, it should be amended to refer to meeting local needs and an element of sub-regional growth. The figure of 300 extra dwellings should be a minimum, the annual average figures should be removed. • Denmead should be Level 1 settlement because of the size of its population • A major concern for Denmead is to try to reduce the carbon producing travel miles for people in employment, and support for local employment and shopping opportunities. <p>Sites suggested for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Hambledon Road • land at Anmore Lodge 	<p>With regard to the request to include Denmead as a level 1 settlement – the categorisation of settlements was extensively considered and debated in December 2008 (CAB 1772 (LDF)). Given the size of Denmead and its level of services currently provided it is considered appropriate that it remains as a level 2 settlement.</p> <p>See previous response re</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Anmore Road • land at Forest Road/Furzeley Road for development either as a housing site or for a retirement village to accommodate the ageing population. 	reference to housing numbers in Policy MTRA2 and in respect of defining settlement boundaries and allocating smaller sites for development through the Development Management and Allocations DPD.
841; 2349; 2354; 2359; 2360; 2361; 2362; 3107; 3116; 3118; 3119; 3129; 3132; 3133; 3147; 3223; 10070; 10103; 10104; 10106; 10107; 10109; 10110; 10275; 10277; 10278; 10279; 10280; 10281; 10282; 10283; 10285; 10286; 10287; 10288; 10290; 10291; 10292; 10293; 10295; 10296; 10297; 10298; 10299; 10300; 10301; 10302; 10303; 10304; 10305; 10306; 10307; 10308; 10309; 10310; 10311; 10312; 10313; 10314; 10315; 10316; 10317; 10318; 10319;	If greenfield sites are released consideration should be given to the impact on local businesses, horse/pony riding, cycling, walking and running in the lanes around the village plus impact on sense of place, biodiversity and detriment of tranquillity.	The selection and allocation of greenfield sites if required will be undertaken during the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD. Any sites allocated will be subject to assessment in terms of their impact on a range of matters including

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
10320; 10321; 10322; 10323; 10324; 10325; 10326; 10327; 10328; 10329; 10330; 10331; 10332; 10333; 10334; 10335; 10336; 10337; 10338; 10339; 10340; 10341; 10343; 10345; 10346; 10348; 10349; 10352; 10353; 10354; 10374; 10375; 10376; 10385; 10428; 10429; 10430; 10431; 10433; 10434; 10435; 10436; 10111; 10253; 10275		biodiversity, open space etc.
2362; 3042; 3107; 3116; 3147; 10277; 10278; 10279; 10280; 10281; 10282; 10283; 10285; 10286; 10287; 10288; 10290; 10291; 10292; 10293; 10295; 10296; 10297; 10298; 10300; 10303; 10305; 10307; 10311; 10314; 10318; 10324; 10331; 10428; 10429; 10430; 10431; 10433; 10434; 10435; 10436; 10236; 2386; 10028	Denmead should not be a Level 2 settlement as its continued growth will lead to encroachment into the countryside and the eventual loss of the Denmead gap. The development of greenfield sites will detrimentally affect the character of Denmead, quality of life for its residents and impact on wildlife. There are few employment opportunities in Denmead so new housing will create a dormitory settlement, encroachment into green space to the east / west of Denmead has a detrimental effect on the narrow lanes	Given the size and level of facilities within Denmead it is appropriately designated as a Level 2 settlement. Any release of greenfield sites will be subject to assessment and potential impact on wildlife and open space. Policy MTRA2 and designation as a Level 2 settlement provides for appropriate

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		employment development .
10437	Recent development has left the village short of open space. For this reason the Local Reserve Site policy is supported and should be continued.	Comment noted.
Colden Common:		
10449; 10452; 10413; 10244; 10410	<p>Support Colden Common as level 2 settlement.</p> <p>Colden Common, should be permitted to grow in a manner and at a rate which responds to the needs of its community, the requirements of sustainability and existing facilities and infrastructure. The settlement boundaries should be amended by the Core Strategy</p> <p>Sites promoted for development :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land north of Main Road (up to 200 houses) • include the builders yard to the rear of the Apex Centre • land at Church Lane 	<p>The purpose of Policy MTRA2 is to allow growth that is proportionate to the size of the existing settlement to ensure its continued viability and sustainability.</p> <p>The selection and allocation of greenfield sites if required will be undertaken during the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD. It is not</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		the role of the Core Strategy to allocate non-strategic sites.
8 (Colden Common Parish Council); 3186; 38 (Twyford Parish Council) ;	Object to the proposed additional 300 dwellings. Note that development from 2006 is counted but concerned that most development will be infilling, which is urbanising the village, also parking is a particular issue. Infrastructure is inadequate, particularly the primary school, roads and drainage and should be addressed before further development.	See responses above in relation to the deletion of suggested housing development numbers. Infrastructure providers consulted have not raised any adverse comments in relation to the growth of Colden Common, as suggested by Policy MTRA2.
Kings Worthy:		
1920	Object to the release of greenfield sites for development, particularly in Kings Worthy.	See previous response in relation to greenfield sites and settlement boundaries
10412; 2229	The settlement boundary at Kings Worthy should be amended to ensure the settlement can accommodate the proposed 300 new homes.	

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	Sites suggested for development :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land to the West of Springvale Road • Land at Top Field 	
Wickham :		
2107; 1463; 2273; 10069; 10392	<p>Support MTRA2 in principle and the inclusion of Wickham within Level 2.</p> <p>Issue of Wickhams' population size when compared to other similar settlements.</p> <p>New development must NOT contain 40% affordable housing. Wickham already has far more affordable housing than any other settlement</p>	<p>See previous comments in relation to the deletion of the specific housing requirement in Policy MTRA2.</p> <p>The matter of designating Wickham as a level 2 settlement was explored in detail in Cabinet paper CAB 1772(LDF) December 2008, where it was concluded that it is a 'package' of measures that contribute to a settlement falling within one level or another</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		rather than a specific element of evidence. 40% affordable housing requirement has been established through the Housing Market Assessment as a District wide requirement, notwithstanding the existing high provision of affordable housing in Wickham. See also comments in Chapter 13.
952; 953; 956; 957; 962; 975; 979; 982; 994; 1014; 1015; 1017; 1026; 1028; 1037; 1040; 1041; 1044; 1048; 1053; 1070; 1073; 1084; 1085; 1087; 1093; 1094; 1095; 1098; 1099; 1101; 1103; 1104; 1113; 1114; 1119; 1125; 1126; 1127; 1130; 1135; 1136; 1137; 1142; 1158; 1165; 1168; 1176; 1185; 1186; 1189; 1190; 1191; 1197; 1204; 1206; 1209;	Support the definition of Levels 1-4 for rural settlements and classification of Wickham as a Level 2 settlement	Support noted.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
1210; 1213; 1217; 1220; 1229; 1234; 1236; 1237; 1238; 1239; 1242; 1245; 1247; 1249; 1250; 1251; 1253; 1256; 1257; 1261; 1264; 1269; 1270; 1279; 1287; 1293; 1314; 1321; 1322; 1323; 1329; 1332; 1339; 1345; 1349; 1355; 1357; 1359; 1360; 1366; 1368; 1372; 1373; 1379; 1382; 1383; 1384; 1385; 1389; 1391; 1395; 1397; 1406; 1407; 1411; 1412; 1414; 1426; 1429; 1431; 1432; 1433; 1438; 1439; 1443; 1444; 1445; 1449; 1454; 1455; 1456; 1457; 1458; 1459; 1460; 1465; 1471; 1482; 1484; 1492; 1494; 1504; 1511; 1512; 1514; 1521; 1533; 1536; 1547; 1551; 1563; 1573; 1584; 1595; 1602; 1628; 1630; 1633; 1643; 1644; 1648; 1660; 1664; 1666; 1667; 1675; 1679; 1682; 1694; 1698; 1703; 1706; 1710; 1714; 1720; 1729; 1734; 1738; 1740; 1744; 1748; 1751; 1757; 1761; 1773; 1777; 1780; 1781; 1784; 1790; 1792; 1793; 1795; 1796; 1802; 1806; 1809; 1820;		

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
1822; 1823; 1829; 1831; 1912; 1913; 1918; 1924; 2039; 2267; 2281; 2284; 2405; 2477; 2487; 2876; 2929; 3084; 10049; 10051; 10052; 10053; 10054; 10055; 10056; 10065; 10066; 10067; 10071; 10072; 10073; 10074; 10075; 10076; 10078; 10079; 10080; 10081; 10082; 10083; 10084; 10086; 10087; 10088; 10089; 10090; 10091; 10092; 10093; 10094; 10095; 10096; 10098; 10099; 10100; 10100; 10102; 10113; 10114; 10115; 10116; 10117; 10118; 10119; 10120; 10121; 10122; 10123; 10124; 10125; 10126; 10127; 10128; 10129; 10130; 10131; 10133; 10134; 10135; 10136; 10137; 10139; 10140; 10141; 10142; 10143; 10144; 10145; 10146; 10147; 10148; 10149; 10150; 10151; 10152; 10153; 10154; 10155; 10156; 10157; 10158; 10159; 10160; 10161; 10162; 10163; 10164; 10165; 10166; 10167; 10168; 10169; 10170; 10172; 10173; 10174; 10175; 10176;		

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
10179; 10180; 10181; 10182; 10183; 10184; 10185; 10186; 10187; 10188; 10191; 10192; 10193; 10194; 10195; 10197; 10198; 10199; 10200; 10201; 10202; 10203; 10205; 10207; 10209; 10210; 10211; 10215; 10216; 10217; 10218; 10219; 10220; 10221; 10222; 10223; 10224; 10225; 10226; 10227; 10228; 10234; 10235; 10239; 10240; 10384; 10396; 10398; 10414; 10415; 10432;		
2121; 10386; 10424	Support the inclusion of Wickham within Level 2 and the scale of development proposed. Sites promoted for development :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the north of the town • example Land between Forest Gate and Park View, Forest Lane, Wickham Common • Land at Grig Ranch, Titchfield 	Support noted. See previous response in relation to greenfield sites and settlement boundaries
42 (Wickham Parish Council); 952; 953;	Object to Policy MTRA2 for one of more of the	See previous response in

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
956; 957; 962; 975; 979; 982; 994; 1014; 1015; 1017; 1025; 1026; 1028; 1037; 1040; 1041; 1044; 1048; 1053; 1070; 1073; 1084; 1085; 1093; 1094; 1095; 1098; 1099; 1101; 1103; 1104; 1113; 1114; 1119; 1125; 1126; 1127; 1130; 1135; 1136; 1137; 1142; 1158; 1165; 1168; 1176; 1185; 1186; 1189; 1190; 1191; 1197; 1204; 1206; 1209; 1210; 1213; 1217; 1220; 1229; 1234; 1236; 1237; 1238; 1239; 1242; 1245; 1247; 1249; 1250; 1251; 1253; 1256; 1257; 1261; 1264; 1269; 1270; 1279; 1287; 1293; 1294; 1314; 1321; 1322; 1323; 1329; 1332; 1339; 1345; 1349; 1355; 1357; 1359; 1360; 1366; 1368; 1372; 1373; 1379; 1382; 1383; 1384; 1385; 1389; 1391; 1395; 1397; 1406; 1407; 1411; 1412; 1414; 1426; 1429; 1431; 1432; 1433; 1438; 1439; 1443; 1444; 1445; 1449; 1454; 1455; 1456; 1457; 1458; 1459; 1460; 1465; 1471; 1482; 1484; 1492; 1494; 1504; 1511; 1512;	<p>following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal for 300 houses which is proportionally larger than other Level 2 settlements as Wickham is the smallest Level 2 settlement and should have a smaller housing allocation. • Wickham's strong identity should not be lost by allowing it to grow significantly beyond its current boundaries. • Any development should be spread over the plan period to meet housing needs, not all be developed at one time. 	<p>relation to greenfield sites and settlement boundaries and the deletion of the specific housing requirements in Policy MTRA2..</p> <p>The amount of new development (residential and other) will be determined through the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD to follow the Core Strategy. This will need to take into account the form and function of the settlement, including its particular character, and its position in the hierarchy as established in the Core</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
1514; 1521; 1533; 1536; 1547; 1551; 1563; 1573; 1584; 1595; 1602; 1624; 1628; 1630; 1633; 1643; 1644; 1648; 1660; 1664; 1666; 1667; 1675; 1679; 1682; 1694; 1698; 1703; 1706; 1710; 1714; 1729; 1734; 1738; 1740; 1744; 1748; 1751; 1757; 1773; 1777; 1780; 1781; 1784; 1790; 1792; 1793; 1795; 1796; 1802; 1806; 1809; 1820; 1822; 1823; 1829; 1831; 1912; 1913; 1918; 1924; 2019; 2039; 2267; 2281; 2284; 2293; 2405; 2477; 2487; 2876; 2929; 3078; 3084; 10049; 10051; 10052; 10053; 10054; 10055; 10056; 10065; 10066; 10067; 10071; 10072; 10073; 10074; 10075; 10076; 10078; 10079; 10080; 10081; 10083; 10084; 10086; 10087; 10088; 10089; 10090; 10091; 10092; 10093; 10094; 10095; 10096; 10098; 10099; 10100; 10101; 10102; 10113; 10114; 10115; 10116; 10117; 10118; 10119; 10120; 10121; 10122; 10123; 10124; 10125; 10126; 10127; 10128;		Strategy.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
10129; 10131; 10133; 10134; 10135; 10136; 10137; 10139; 10140; 10141; 10142; 10143; 10144; 10145; 10146; 10147; 10148; 10149; 10150; 10151; 10152; 10153; 10154; 10155; 10156; 10157; 10158; 10159; 10160; 10161; 10162; 10163; 10164; 10165; 10166; 10167; 10168; 10169; 10170; 10172; 10173; 10174; 10175; 10176; 10179; 10180; 10181; 10182; 10183; 10184; 10185; 10186; 10187; 10188; 10192; 10193; 10194; 10195; 10197; 10198; 10199; 10200; 10201; 10202; 10205; 10207; 10209; 10210; 10211; 10214; 10215; 10216; 10217; 10218; 10219; 10220; 10221; 10222; 10223; 10224; 10225; 10226; 10227; 10228; 10231; 10234; 10239; 10240; 10384; 10397; 10398; 10414; 10415; 10432; 10256, 10455; 2273; 10256		
Swanmore :		

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
10252	Support the designation of Swanmore at Level 2, the scale of development proposed and the intention to allocate sites through the Development Management and Allocations DPD.	Support noted.
36 (Swanmore Parish Council)	<p>The Level 1 and 2 development aims of MTRA 2 are greatly in excess of the South East Plan's targets. In the case of Swanmore – a Level 2 settlement – building development within that part of the settlement which is within the South Downs National Park is likely to be limited. The MTRA 2 “target” of 300 dwellings will therefore need to be largely met from within the PUSH part of the settlement.</p> <p>Lack of availability of greenfield sites - constrained by the settlement gaps between Swanmore, Bishop's Waltham, and Waltham Chase.</p>	<p>Comment noted – see response above in relation to the deletion of proposed housing numbers for level 1 and 2 settlements.</p> <p>Any greenfield sites required for housing or other purpose will be assessed as part of the preparation of the Development Management and Allocations DPD. Work on potential greenfield sites which is being carried out as part of the SHLAA will identify the</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		constraints and potential around the various settlements.
10390; 10391; 10411	<p>Support the designation of Swanmore as a Level 2 settlement but suggest a higher level of development is needed to enhance sustainability.</p> <p>Sites suggested for development :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Belmont Lane • land at Lower Chase Road 	Comments noted. Any greenfield sites required for housing or other purpose will be assessed as part of the preparation of the Development Management sand Allocations DPD
Waltham Chase:		
31 (Shedfield Parish Council)	<p>Waltham Chase, Shedfield, Shirrell Heath – oppose ‘infilling; as a policy for future development as this spoils the character of an area. More ‘brownfield’ development should be promoted.</p>	<p>The 2009 SHLAA identifies a number of sites within the existing settlement boundaries that could have redevelopment potential. Given that these are not strategic in nature they will not be allocated</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		through the Core Strategy but identified, if required, through the Development Management and Allocations DPD. The development strategy in general promoted through the Core Strategy recognises the value of brownfield sites in sustainable locations such as level 1 and 2 settlements.
2591	Object to the reference to allowing greenfield development for businesses. Such development would harm the amenities of residents, road infrastructure is inadequate, and they would not be likely to employ local people. There needs to be proper enforcement of environmental and traffic restrictions.	Economic development opportunities will be required to be assessed in accordance with revised PPS4 and Policy MTRA2 as amended.
Level 3 – Micheldever	Support MTRA2 as it applies to Micheldever and Micheldever Station, including retention of the	Comment noted – the Core Strategy promotes

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
24 (Micheldever Parish Council)	existing boundaries. A mechanism is needed that allows the housing needs of local elderly residents to be met.	housing for a range of needs (Policy CP.16) but does not include a mechanism to deal explicitly with elderly persons accommodation, this is a detailed matter for the Development Management and Allocations DPD. However, there is a need to include strategic reference to the aging population of the District in accordance with Policy CC5 of the South East Plan.
South Wonston 10248	Support South Wonston as a level 3 settlement, particularly to allow limited development within existing boundaries	Comments noted, however there is a need to address local housing requirements through

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
33 (South Wonston Parish Council) 1269	<p>South Wonston as a Level 3 settlement it is noted however, the Village Plan consultation showed a clear majority of respondents objecting to “building on existing plots and infilling”.</p> <p>The MOD notes that South Wonston village (close to Worthy Down) and Southwick village (close to Southwick Park) are proposed as Level 3 settlements. The MOD has no land ownership interest at South Wonston, however it does own land at Southwick village and, depending on the nature and scale of redevelopment proposals for Southwick Park, it may wish to extend the provision of Service Families Accommodation on land adjoining this site within the village – this policy should therefore allow not only for the provision of affordable housing but also for key worker housing such as SFA in settlements close to MOD establishments which are likely to undergo redevelopment and possible expansion.</p>	<p>opportunities such as infilling and redevelopment of existing plots the alternative being to release greenfield sites. The SHLAA process will identify potential brownfield and greenfield sites that can be subsequently allocated through the Development Management and Allocations DPD if required.</p> <p>The specific request by the MOD is not a matter for the Core Strategy and will be covered by the Development Management and Allocations DPD if</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
		justified.
Itchen Abbas 20 (Itchen Valley Parish Council)	Object to inclusion of Itchen Abbas in Level 3 as there has been significant recent development and key services are inadequate,	Objection noted - See CAB 1772 (LDF) December 2008 for the definition and classification of settlements within the hierarchy.
Twyford 38 (Twyford Parish Council)	The classification of Twyford as a Level 3 settlement does not recognise its location in the SDNP. The SE Plan requires additional protection for settlements in the SDNP, which should all be included within a sub-category of Level 3.	The development strategy for Level 3 settlements is to allow infilling and redevelopment within existing boundaries. This does not necessarily conflict with the National Park designation and complies with the recent findings of the Taylor Review to maintain sustainable rural communities.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		<p>Recommended Approach</p> <p>To create an additional sub-category to the settlement hierarchy would make it overly complex given its purpose it to provide strategic level guidance– MTRA2 will need to cross reference to the Policy CP9 which covers the South Downs National Park.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach</u></p> <p>To amend Policy MTRA2 to cross reference to Policy CP9.</p>
<p>Littleton</p> <p>10212; 10409; 10422</p>	<p>Support the designation of Littleton as a Level 3 settlement, but MTRA2 should explicitly allow for greenfield development.</p> <p>Site promoted for development :</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>See comments above in relation to the allocation of greenfield sites.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> land at Main Road 	
Otterbourne 2101; 10427	<p>Support MTRA2 in principle and the inclusion of Otterbourne within Level 3. However, it should be amended to refer to meeting local needs and to allow for greenfield sites in Level 3 settlements for both housing and employment purposes</p> <p>Promote land at Southern House in Otterbourne</p>	See above
Droxford 10426	<p>Support MTRA2 in principle and the inclusion of Droxford within Level 3. However, it should be amended to refer to meeting local needs and to allow for greenfield sites in Level 3 settlements</p>	See above
Curdridge 2106; 10401	<p>Support MTRA2 in principle and the inclusion of Curdridge within Level 3. However, it should be amended to refer to meeting local needs and to allow for greenfield sites.</p>	See above

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
	Concern that the designation could prevent the development of the current Local Plan allocation S7 for employment adjoining the existing Hilsons Road Industrial Estate in Curdridge parish on the outskirts of Botley .	Local Plan Policy S7 has been 'saved' and will remain in place until reviewed by the Development Management and Allocations DPD. The Core Strategy will not make/delete non-strategic allocations but the proposals map to accompany the Core Strategy will be required to reflect any 'saved' policies from the Local Plan that remain extant.
North Boarhunt 3414; 3415	North Boarhunt should be provided with a settlement boundary to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Merryvale, Southwick Road. • Land adjacent to Fairways Trampers Lane 	The Development Management and Allocations DPD will determine matters such as whether it is necessary for North Boarhunt to have a

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
		defined settlement boundary or the allocation of any sites for development.
Hursley 10406	Propose a small allocation of up to perhaps 100 units adjacent to the IBM facility near Hursley .	Hursley is a level 3 settlement which allows for limited development within defined boundaries. The use of major commercial establishments in the countryside is covered by Policy CP4, however this policy does not envisage residential development in such locations.
Corhampton and Meonstoke 10 (Corhampton and Meonstoke PC) 10247	Object to the joint classification of Meonstoke and Corhampton as a level 3 settlement – request Corhampton should be classified as level 3 and Meonstoke as level 4.	The matter of designating Meonstoke and Corhampton as Level 3 settlements was explored in detail in Cabinet paper CAB 1772(LDF) December 2008, where it

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response
		Recommended Approach
	Support the inclusion of Corhampton at Level 3 to retain a viable community, but MTRA2 should be amended to refer to meeting the needs of local settlements and allow for greenfield development in Level 3 settlements.	<p>was concluded that it is a 'package' of measures that contribute to a settlement falling within one level or another, rather than a specific element of evidence. The differences in the character and form of development between the settlements can be reflected in the more detailed policies which will be included within the Development Management and Allocations DPD.</p> <p>See above re greenfield development in level 3 settlements.</p>

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response Recommended Approach
Level 4 – Curbridge 2173	Regarding Level 4 settlements we note that Curbridge is included, this is a linear settlement along the B3051 which could become coalesced with the North Whiteley Strategic Development Area	The relationship of Curbridge with the North Whiteley development area is a matter that will need to be taken into account during the masterplanning process for the site.
Easton 20 (Itchen Valley Parish Council); 2550	Object to inclusion of Easton within Level 4 as it has no key service and no public transport.	The matter of designating Easton as a Level 4 settlements was explored in detail in CAB 1772 (LDF) December 2008 relating to the definition and classification of settlements within the hierarchy.
Compton Down 10241	Compton Down. Support designation of Compton Down within Level 4 and would object to any expansion of the settlement boundary.	Comment noted

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:		
<p>The appraisal identified no significant impacts, although it is recognised that potential impacts will be site and location dependant. It is assessed that there is the benefits will accrue for rural communities and through allowing work places to be centred where they are required and thereby reducing the need to travel. The policy will progress SA Objectives, particularly in relation to communities/ rural communities.</p>		
4 (Bishops Waltham PC); 2273; 3136; 10241; 10269	<p>Support MTRA3 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the limit on development outside the level 1-4 settlements • Support concept of allowing development with an operational need • Need to cross reference to CP4 	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Agree that there is a need for other policies which affect the rural area to be cross referenced in this part of the plan. In particular, CP4 only applies to that part of the District designated as countryside and it would therefore be logical to include it within this section rather than the core policies.</p> <p><u>Recommended approach</u> :- To include Policy CP4 within the</p>

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
		Market Towns and Rural Area section of the Core Strategy.
38 (Twyford PC); 3071; 3199; 10243; 10244; 10253; 10409; 10410	<p>Object MTRA3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The countryside (including settlements) has not been sufficiently studied in terms of population, rural employment, etc so that the information base is inadequate • Policy conflicts with CP20 that only allows 'local connection homes' outside of MTRA2 defined settlements • Policy is overly restrictive with regard to new buildings for tourism/leisure uses • Policy needs to be amended to be more positive and to provide for appropriate economic growth and diversification - is contrary to PPS7 and draft PPS4 as drafted • Policy needs to distinguish between remote and more sustainable rural areas • Policy will fail to protect and enhance the countryside given the development requirements of the SE Plan. • Contradiction between MTRA 3 and CP3 - which policy takes priority? Need to clarify the locational coverage of policy MTRA3 	<p>A significant amount of local data including population, employment and service provision and catchment areas has been collected and analysed in formulating the proposed settlement hierarchy and the MTRA policies. This information can be viewed on the Councils website under the evidence pages for the LDF. This data will be required to be updated as necessary to inform any review to the plan/policies.</p> <p>Revised PPS4 was published in December 2009 and will need to be taken into account when the policies in the Core Strategy are assessed with regard to the PINS</p>

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
		<p>advice in terms of policies being expressed as 'what, where, when and how'. In general revised PPS4, whilst promoting economic development in rural areas, states that LPA's should "strictly control economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans." It does not, however, preclude uses which genuinely require a countryside location.</p> <p>Policy MTRA 3 is clear in that it applies to the countryside outside the built-up areas of the urban area and Level 1-4 settlements, and therefore does distinguish between remote and more sustainable locations. CP3 however, refers to the use of previously developed land in</p>

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
		<p>sustainable locations and therefore would not necessarily apply to the countryside outside of the built up areas or Level 1-4 settlements.</p> <p>The policy is clear in that it only applies to development that requires an operational need to be located within the countryside and this does not necessarily apply to the requirements of the SE Plan which focus on housing provision.</p> <p>It is accepted that current drafting does give rise to uncertainty.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the policy is amended to include reference to affordable housing provided it is in accordance with Policy CP20.</p>

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
		<u>Recommended approach</u> :- Amend policy to include reference to affordable housing provided in accordance with Policy CP20.

Policy MTRA 4 Re-use of Rural Buildings		
Response No./Organisation	Summary of Key Issues	WCC Officer response and Recommended Approach
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – extract of SA/SEA report on Core Strategy Preferred Option:		
Socially and economically the policy performs well against the SA objectives. There are concerns raised over the environmental impacts of the policy but these can be mitigated and managed through the implementation of guidance, policy and conditions regulating traffic generation, noise and light pollution and surveys to determine the ecological value of disused or under used buildings. The character and landscape impact of conversions can also be controlled in the same way.		
4(Bishops Waltham PC); 1972; 2273; 3136; 10269	Support Policy MTRA4	Support welcomed
87(GOSE); 91(Natural England); 1994; 3071; 3198; 3199; 10243; 10242; 10244; 10247; 10270; 10289; 10401; 10409; 10410; 10426; 10427; 10438	Object to Policy MTRA4:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy reflects Government guidance and therefore does not need to be included in the Core Strategy (GOSE) • policy needs to refer to the protection of species protected by law which may inhabit rural buildings – expand policy to take this into account (Natural England) • farm buildings are needed and farmers should not be bullied into converting them into offices • amend policy to read ‘...the character of the building or neighbouring uses’ • need to encourage innovative approaches to conversion of buildings which may be poor quality buildings so that they can 	The point raised by GOSE that there is not a requirement for this level of policy within the Core Strategy is an issue that will be assessed alongside the advice received from the Planning Inspector in reviewing the draft policies with regard to ‘what, where, when and how’ and the need to make them more locally distinct. This will also provide the opportunity to include the point made by Natural England,

	<p>reach the required energy standards for new buildings elsewhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy should include reference to converting buildings for indoor sports and recreational uses, and to tourism, live-work uses • policy should allow for replacement of existing rural buildings and for residential uses if other uses are not viable • need to clarify meaning of 'local connection homes' • need to give greater thought to the sustainability of these sites and the generation of additional traffic • policy is too restrictive 	<p>although this raises an issue which may be too detailed for the Core Strategy policy.</p> <p>Policy CP20 clarifies the meaning of 'local connection homes'.</p> <p>The policy is permissive and does not seek to force farmers or others to convert farm buildings. Policy MTRA3 allows for the development of new farm buildings.</p> <p>The policy does not preclude the reuse of buildings for recreational/tourism uses providing that they comply with the spirit of the policy to provide employment or community uses. Given the advice expressed in revised PPS4 this policy will need to be reviewed to take this recent guidance into account. PPS4 specifically refers to planning for tourism in rural areas and also refers to residential conversions that may be more appropriate in some</p>
--	---	---

		<p>locations and for some types of buildings.</p> <p>This strategic level policy only allows those buildings that are of permanent construction to be converted and detailed matters such as design and construction standards will be covered by the Development Management and Allocations DPD or alternative guidance.</p> <p>This policy specifically refers to the re-use of buildings, however revised PPS4 refers to the need to set out the permissible scale of replacement buildings where the replacement of buildings for economic development would not be acceptable.</p> <p><u>Recommended Approach:-</u> To review the need for Policy MTRA4 given the revised guidance in PPS4 and potential to combine it with Policy MTRA3.</p>
--	--	--