

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE**15 July 2008**Attendance:Committee Members:

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Beckett (P)

Pearson (P)

Coates (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Busher (P)

Jeffs (P)

Pines

Others in attendance addressed the meeting:

Councillors Spender

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Humby, Stallard and Weston

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held 2 April 2008 be approved and adopted.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr R Gentry (Vice-Chairman of New Alresford Town Council), Mr A Weeks (Winchester City Residents' Association) and Mr D Simmonds all spoke regarding Report CAB1696(LDF). Their comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

3. **MEETING THE ACCOMMODATION NEEDS OF GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE**

(Report [CAB1693\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Councillor Busher queried who the current Council's representative was on the Joint Authorities Gypsies and Travellers Panel as the previous representative had been former Councillor Mrs Sutton.

Councillor Beckett advised that he was representing the Council, as part of his role on the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Joint Committee.

In response to questions, Councillor Beckett reported that the working relationship between the District Councils who made up the "South Hampshire Group" was good. As a consequence, he believed that decisions on the allocation of sites could be achieved through negotiation, rather than being imposed upon the Council.

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

RESOLVED:

That the proposed consultation by SEERA be noted and officers report on the consultation in autumn 2008.

4. **OLIVER'S BATTERY AND OTTERBOURNE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS – RECOMMENDED ADOPTION**

(Report [CAB1694\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Councillor Beckett declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of his financial interests within and adjoining the area covered by the Otterbourne Village Design Statement. He left the room and took no further part in the debate or decision thereon.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Spender spoke in support of the Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement, as a Ward Councillor for the area. He emphasised the importance of the strategic gap between Oliver's Battery and Compton, marking the edge of the Winchester town settlement. He also drew the Committee's attention to the unique features of Oliver's Battery, as set out on page 9 of the draft statement.

The Chairman thanked all those involved for their work in the preparation of the two Village Design Statements.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the 'Design Guidelines' of the Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement and 'Guidelines' of the Otterbourne Village Design Statement, as proposed to be amended, be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents.

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

3. That the relevant Village Design Statement Groups be thanked for their work.

5. REVISIONS TO PPS12 AND NEW LDF REGULATIONS

(Report [CAB1695\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning gave a presentation summarising the changes outlined in the Report (copy of presentation appended to minutes).

The Committee noted that the "Preferred Option" was no longer a formal stage of the LDF process and that it might also be renamed. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that, although no longer a statutory requirement, it was proposed that further consultation would be carried out at the "Preferred Option" stage.

Councillor Beckett emphasised that it was important some form of consultation was carried out as consultees from the 'issues and options' stage had already been advised that it would take place. However, he believed it should take the form of inviting comments on the "Preferred Options", rather than a formal and extensive consultation period. This approach was agreed.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Council were seeking clarification about to what extent, if any, the Core Strategy could be changed after the submission stage. This would inform the level of consultation carried out at this stage of the process.

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the stakeholder events in Key Hubs referred to in Paragraph 3.5 of the Report were not public meetings but would involve invited stakeholders, such as parish councils, infrastructure providers and key amenity groups.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the changes to the guidance on producing Local Development Frameworks and the implications for Winchester District be noted.

2. That officers work towards publication of a non-statutory Core Strategy Preferred Options stage in early 2009 and revise the Council's Local Development Scheme for presentation to a future meeting.

3. That a report be made to Cabinet on amendments to the Constitution which might be required as a consequence of the new Regulations.

6. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS – INITIAL FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION**

(Report [CAB1696\(LDF\)](#) refers)

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the Report was an interim examination of work in progress and consequently it was not possible to form definitive conclusions from it at this stage.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that initial analysis regarding the key and local hubs had indicated that the majority of responses were not in support of them as currently set out. However, further examination of the detail of the replies was required to ascertain the reasons behind this.

The Committee noted that it was anticipated that the meetings with stakeholders regarding the key and local hubs would be completed by the end of September 2008. Further meetings of the Committee would be arranged in October and November to consider elements of the "Preferred Option" stage.

Mr R Gentry (Vice-Chairman of New Alresford Town Council), Mr A Weeks (Winchester Residents' Association) and Mr D Simmonds spoke during public participation on this item and their comments are summarised below.

Mr Gentry wished to encourage the Council to continue consultation and involvement with local people regarding the proposals, particularly regarding the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Report CAB1697(LDF) below refers). For example, he reported that the consultations in New Alresford had resulted in different proposals being put forward to those contained in the 'Issues and Options' paper.

Mr Weeks sought the following three points of clarification:

- Had the comments of stakeholders, such as the Winchester Residents' Association or Save Barton Farm Group, been taken in account?

- Were the flipcharts completed at the workshops available for inspection?
- That, with regard to the option for development at Barton Farm, there appeared to be a conflict between the Council's stance and strategic view.

Mr Simmons spoke in opposition to the proposed Hedge End Strategic Development Area (SDA). His detailed points had been sent to Members of the Committee prior to the meeting. In summary, he stated that the Leader of Southampton City Council had indicated his opposition to the SDA. He argued that the SDA selection process was unsound. He considered that the requirement for up to 9,000 homes had not been demonstrated and was impractical to deliver. He highlighted the local residents' action groups being formed in opposition and requested the Council's support.

In response to the comments made by Mr Gentry, the Chairman confirmed that the public would be kept informed, but the extent of the consultation would not be as wide as previously undertaken. In addition, Councillor Beckett commented that although the Council would have regard to alternative opinions raised, it had to balance this against Government requirements for the provision of new homes.

In response to Mr Weeks's comments, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that individual "yes/no" type responses to specific questions had been collated, including those from the groups mentioned. However, it had not yet been possible to analysis further the detailed written comments. The entire contents of the flipcharts had been included, although similar responses had been combined under subject headings to prevent duplication.

With regard to Barton Farm, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the County Council had decided that it was not necessary to release this area of land for development to meet current Structure Plan targets. However, the timescale for the LDF was longer (20 years) than the Structure Plan targets and the Council considered that there was likely to be a requirement to release the land for development in the longer term.

In response to Mr Simmons, Councillor Beckett highlighted that the majority of the proposed SDA was within the boundaries of Eastleigh Borough Council. He also highlighted that the proposal was for *up to* 9,000 houses. He did not consider it appropriate for the Council to state its position regarding the SDA before Eastleigh BC had given its response. In addition, a letter had been sent clarifying the position of Southampton City Council, which had not opposed the SDA. Councillor Beckett advised Mr Simmons that matters relating to the proposed SDA would be debated at meetings of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), which were open to the public.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted, pending further analysis of the consultation responses and assessment against the evidence and the sustainability appraisal.

7. **STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (SHLAA) UPDATE REPORT**

(Report [CAB1697\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the purpose of the SHLAA was to determine how much housing land was expected to come forward in the future on identified sites, which were both deliverable and developable.

Councillor Jeffs queried the practicality of assessing land available for housing without considering what employment/industrial land would be required. In response, the Head of Strategic Planning stated that as the assessment process progressed, issues such as possible alternative uses of land would be examined, and consequently areas needed for other uses would be disregarded.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Council would contact directly the owners of properties identified as having potential for development, but that notification of neighbours would only occur in the event of a planning application being submitted.

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

RESOLVED:

That the progress of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment be noted.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.30am

Chairman

2004 Process

< Mid 2007
Evidence Gathering
and Front loading

Late 2007
Issues
and Options

Spring 2008
Preferred
Options

Autumn 2008
Submission
Document

2009
Independent
Examination

Late 2009
Adoption

< Public Consultation >

< Public Consultation >

< Public Consultation
Notification >

Binding
< Recommendations >

< Notification >

2008 Process

< Early 2009
Production &
Preparation
• Front-Loading,
• Issues & Options,
• Preferred Options

Summer 2009
Proposed
Submission
Document

Late 2009
Submission
Document

2010
Independent
Examination

Early 2011
Adoption

