

**CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE****6 October 2010**Attendance:Committee Members:

Councillors:

Learney (Chairman) (P)

Collin (P)

Evans (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Beckett (P)

Jefferies (P)

Johnston (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Pearson and Stallard

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Bell, Humby, Pearce, Tait and Weston

---

**1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held 22 July 2010 be approved and adopted.

**2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr N Lander-Brinkley (Denmead Parish Council) and Mrs G Busher spoke regarding Report CAB2060(LDF). Mrs K Macintosh (WinACC) spoke regarding Report CAB2064(LDF) and Mr V Hatch spoke regarding Report CAB2063(LDF). All their contributions are summarised under the relevant agenda items below.

Mr M Evans (Whiteley Parish Council), Mr M Carter (Wickham Parish Council) and Mrs C Slattery spoke during the general public participation period and their comments are summarised below.

Mr M Evans generally welcomed the “localism” agenda and stated that Whiteley Parish Council supported the proposed development of up to 3,000 dwellings North of Whiteley (but no more than this number) in order to achieve the required improvements to existing infrastructure. He also had concerns regarding the proposal for a minimum of 40% affordable housing, as it was believed this would not result in the required level of developers’ contributions to achieve the necessary infrastructure.

Mr M Carter also expressed concern about the requirement for a minimum of 40% affordable housing, as it was considered that Wickham Parish Council already had a relatively high proportion of social housing within its area. He highlighted that the proximity of the proposed North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) could lead Wickham residents to consider that there was no need to develop their village further. He also expressed concern about the impact of additional traffic flow along northern routes from the proposed SDA.

Mrs Slattery welcomed the emphasis on ‘localism’ and the proposals for consultation as outlined in Report CAB2060(LDF), including the proposals to consider the Winchester Town area as a distinct area. She also welcomed the proposals regarding affordable housing provision and emphasised the growing requirement for this. She queried the remit of the Winchester Town Forum and also expressed concern about the apparent inclusion of sites at Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp within the current proposals.

The Corporate Director (Operations) clarified that those two sites were not allocated for development and there was no presumption on the part of the Council as to their inclusion.

With regard to the concerns raised about increased traffic through Wickham as a result of the proposed SDA, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed he expected that the Council’s response to the proposed North of Fareham SDA Transport Strategy would seek to minimise this and work towards an infrastructure first approach.

Councillor Learney confirmed that, as a member of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), she would continue to represent the interests of Winchester residents neighbouring the proposed North of Fareham SDA. This included opposing any section of the SDA being included within the Winchester District, apart from an element of green infrastructure (but not to include any built development).

### 3. **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION**

(Report [CAB2060\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the ‘Blueprint’ consultation data packs were in the process of being issued and had been supplied to all Parish Clerks. Other interested groups were able to request the packs and the

information was also available on a dedicated Web page: [www.community-blueprint.co.uk](http://www.community-blueprint.co.uk)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that all Parish Councils had a nominated 'link officer', with the larger parishes being allocated a dedicated link officer at the Council to offer assistance. The deadline for responses was 10 December 2010, although a degree of flexibility would be allowed, provided comments were received in time to enable work to begin on the consultation results in January 2011.

The Head of Strategic Planning drew the Committee's attention to an email received from Mr J Hayter which highlighted a number of queries and he responded to the points raised.

Mr N Lander-Brinkley (Denmead Parish Council) and Mrs G Busher spoke during the public participation period and their comments are summarised below.

Mr Lander-Brinkley confirmed that the Parish Council would participate in the 'Blueprint' consultation, but highlighted that the short time-frame allowed would make this difficult, particularly having regard to the wide range of interest groups it was expected to involve. He also queried whether there was any budget available to assist parish councils, as the short notice meant that no provision had been made for the extra spending required. He concurred with concerns raised by Wickham and Whiteley Parish Councils regarding the minimum requirements for affordable housing and the potential detrimental effect on developers' contributions.

Mrs Busher welcomed in general the consultation proposals, but also highlighted the practical difficulties faced by Parish Councils in seeking to engage with the various groups within their area. She queried what publicity would be given by the Council and also how the Council would seek to adjudicate between opposing views.

The Chairman confirmed that the Council had issued a press release, together with links to the blueprint website from the front page of the Council's website. In addition, all Councillors were being encouraged to promote and assist with the consultation process. However, there were no additional funds available to Parish Councils.

The Corporate Director (Operations) confirmed that the Council would have to consider how differing views resulting from the consultation would be dealt with. This would also be in the light of more wide-reaching issues such as housing need and tackling climate change.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Pearson addressed the Committee and queried the effect of the consultation on emerging parish plans. He also raised the issue of developers contacting local communities to suggest new developments, including on land currently designated as local

gaps. In general, he raised concerns about how 'localism' would work in practice if unrealistic proposals were put forward.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised it would be for parishes to decide whether their Parish Plan provided an answer to the 'Blueprint' consultation and that the consultation could be linked into any proposed Parish Plan production or update. Under the 'localism' proposals, communities could suggest that a local gap be removed or request that it be retained. In general, the Council would have to take a view on all proposals received as the resulting Core Strategy would still have to be assessed for "soundness" by an Inspector.

Councillor Beckett suggested that the 'Blueprint' process should emphasise that, in some circumstances, additional development was beneficial to smaller local communities, as it could lead to additional amenities and facilities. The Head of Strategic Planning agreed that this could be highlighted through the link officers, although it was often not possible to set out an exact correlation between development levels and new facilities.

The Committee generally welcomed the proposals for consultation to enable smaller communities to put forward their requirements.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the 'Blueprint' consultation process that commenced on 4 October 2010 be endorsed.
2. That all Members be encouraged to liaise with their local communities and interest groups to promote this opportunity to contribute.

4. **ADOPTION OF INTERIM POLICY ASPIRATIONS**  
(Report [CAB2064\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning noted the various concerns raised in public participation above, regarding the proposal to seek 40% affordable housing provision on all housing sites. He confirmed that individual sites could be considered on merit, but emphasised the levels of affordable housing need that the Council was trying to address.

Mrs K Macintosh (WinACC) spoke during the public participation period and, in summary, expressed concern that the proposed policies regarding climate change/sustainability were neither specific nor strong enough. She requested that the Policy stipulate the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 as a minimum and also remove reference to "having regard to the economics of development".

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Pearson also expressed disappointment about the proposed climate change/sustainability policies not going far enough in promoting carbon reduction. He also did not agree with the proposal to allow contributions to off-site carbon reduction measures.

The Chairman advised that she was proposing that the Policy be amended to stipulate the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 as a minimum. She was satisfied that allowing off-site carbon reduction measures might, in some circumstances, offer the better option (for example, where it was not possible due to site restrictions to achieve a lower level of energy use on-site).

The Corporate Director (Operations) explained that the economic viability of a development was a material planning consideration, whether or not included in the proposed policy wording. However, the Committee agreed that the proviso “(having regard to the economics of development)” be removed from the interim policy aspirations relating to Climate Change and also Affordable Housing.

The Committee also requested that a Report be submitted to a future (Cabinet) meeting on the operation of the proposals to allow a financial contribution to off-set provision to deal with up to 30% of regulated emissions. This was agreed.

Councillor Evans raised concerns that the map set out in Appendix A was unclear and contained out-of-date information. The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged this and explained that it was only intended as a diagrammatic illustration of sections of the District. For example, it aimed to indicate that, although the PUSH Urban Areas were mainly outside Winchester District these did have an impact around its southern edges. It also highlighted the sections of the District within the South Downs National Park area.

The Chairman stated that although only informal, she would encourage any planning applications that did not comply with the policies to be tested through the Planning Development Control Committee and if necessary, the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor Beckett queried the relationship between the proposed aspirational policies and the ‘Blueprint’ consultation. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the policies had resulted from the Core Strategy consultation already undertaken and were intended to act as interim policy guidance until the Core Strategy process had been completed (of which the “Blueprint” consultation formed a part).

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

**RECOMMENDED (TO CABINET AND COUNCIL):**

**1. THAT, SUBJECT TO 2 BELOW, THE COUNCIL ADOPTS AND PUBLISHES INTERIM POLICY ASPIRATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING AREAS:**

- **SPATIAL POLICY AREAS – ADOPTION OF THE 3 SPATIAL AREAS REFERRED TO AT PARAGRAPH 3.2 AND ILLUSTRATED DIAGRAMMATICALLY AT APPENDIX 1 OF REPORT CAB2064(LDF);**
- **CLIMATE CHANGE/SUSTAINABILITY ASPIRATIONS – ADOPTION OF THE ASPIRATIONS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.7 OF REPORT CAB2064(LDF), SUBJECT TO AMENDMENTS TO REMOVE THE PHRASE “(HAVING REGARD TO THE ECONOMICS OF DEVELOPMENT)” AND STIPULATING CODE FOR SUSTAINABLE HOMES LEVEL 5;**
- **AFFORDABLE HOUSING/HOUSING MIX ASPIRATIONS – ADOPTION OF THE ASPIRATIONS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 5.6 OF REPORT CAB2064(LDF), SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF THE PHRASE “(HAVING REGARD TO THE ECONOMICS OF DEVELOPMENT)”.**

**2. THAT AUTHORITY BE GIVEN TO THE CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE TO AMEND (WITHIN THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES APPROVED UNDER 1 ABOVE) THE WORDING OF SUCH INTERIM POLICIES PRIOR TO PUBLICATION.**

**RECOMMENDED (TO CABINET):**

**3. That a Report be submitted to a future meeting regarding the operation of a fund for financial contributions, taken in lieu of on-site renewable energy provision, to deal with regulated emissions.**

**5. DRAFT LDF INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY**

(Report [CAB2063\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Mr V Hatch (Whiteley resident) spoke during the public participation period. In summary, he requested that the areas covered by the Study should include provision of cemeteries and allotments. He highlighted the current difficulties facing Whiteley residents regarding the lack of facilities, including primary schools. He also expressed concern about the apparent reference to more than 3,000 dwellings being included within the North of Whiteley MDA.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that cemeteries could be included within the Study, and that allotments were already included under 'green infrastructure.'

The Corporate Director (Operations) explained that with the removal of Government housing numbers, there was no requirement for the North Whiteley development to be a specified size. However, the figure of 3,000 was therefore approximate and might increase or decrease slightly. The Committee noted the comments made by Whiteley Parish Council expressing concern about any proposals for more than 3,000 dwellings within the MDA.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the delegated authority proposed in Recommendation 2 of the Report was to allow for any factual or minor editorial changes, but that if more significant changes were raised before publication (e.g. factual updates by infrastructure providers) these would be considered in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders.

Councillor Beckett requested that himself and the other two Councillors specifically invited to attend the Committee (Councillors Jeffs and Johnston) be advised of any significant changes to the Study, prior to their agreement. This was agreed.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the draft Infrastructure Study be published for consultation to coincide with the proposed 'Blueprint' public participation exercise.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning to make minor factual and editorial changes to the Study, with any significant changes being agreed in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Winchester and Surrounds and the Portfolio Holder for the Rural Areas and Market Towns (and that other invited Committee Members be notified).

**6. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: UPDATE ON EVIDENCE STUDIES**

(Report [CAB2062\(LDF\)](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Stallard highlighted that the Housing Market and Housing Need Assessment Update emphasised the requirement for affordable housing: however, concerns had been expressed by various parish councils above regarding the minimum provision of 40%. There was consequently an issue about where this additional affordable housing could be provided. She queried whether the Council would adopt

policies to support the privately rented sector to offer accommodation at a mid-priced level.

The Chairman noted the comments made regarding privately sector rented accommodation as a matter for future consideration. However, she expressed some disappointment regarding the apparent opposition to affordable housing in some areas.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the further evidence-gathering work programme referred to in the Report be noted and the publication of the recently completed studies (Section 4 of the Report) on the Council's web site be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 12.35pm.

Chairman