

**CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE****1 April 2011****Attendance:****Committee Members:**

Councillors:

Learney (Chairman) (P)

Bell (P)  
Collin (P)

Evans (P)

**Other invited Councillors:**Beckett (P)  
Jefferies (P)  
Johnston**Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:**

Councillors Clear, Mitchell and Stallard

---

**1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held 23 February 2011 be approved and adopted.

**2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mrs C Dibden (CPRE South Hampshire), County Councillor Allgood and Mr M Carter (Wickham Parish Council) spoke regarding Report [CAB2148\(LDF\)](#) and their comments are summarised below. Mrs G Busher spoke regarding item [CAB2149\(LDF\)](#) and her comments are outlined below.

**3. FEEDBACK ON REMAINDER BLUEPRINT RESPONSES**

(Report [CAB2148\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that it was intended to discuss the "Plans for Places" document at the next Committee meeting, scheduled for Monday 6 June 2011 at 10am.

During the public participation period, Mrs C Dibden (CPRE South Hampshire), County Councillor Allgood and Mr M Carter (Wickham Parish Council) spoke regarding Paragraph 2.12 of Report CAB2148(LDF) which

related to the North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) and their comments are summarised below.

Mrs Dibden expressed concern about the wording of a response issued by City Council Officers to Fareham Borough Council (FBC) in January 2011, which she believed suggested that some of the green infrastructure relating to the North Fareham SDA could be located within the Winchester District. She stated that South East Plan Policy SH2 stipulated that all the SDA, including green space, should be located in the FBC District. In addition, the proposed SDA had been reduced in size to 7,000 dwellings and consequently there should be less pressure on any of the SDA being located within the Winchester District.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the letter referred to was in response to a consultation from FBC on the Pre-Submission version of their Core Strategy. The letter was intended to set out the Council's agreed position and reflected the decision of Council in 22 April 2009 which agreed wording for Policy SH5 of the Core Strategy, incorporating an amendment moved by Councillor Evans, and its explanatory text. This allowed for the possibility of some 'green infrastructure' if this would help to secure an effective long-term gap between the development, Wickham and Knowle. This was the position reflected in the letter.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that there was a duty on both Councils to work together on the SDA and there might be benefits for locating some of the "green infrastructure" of the SDA within the Winchester District in order to maintain natural gaps and protect existing landscapes.

County Councillor Allgood (representing Southern Parishes Division) stated that he supported development of up to 3,000 dwellings to the North of Whiteley and that the County Council were working to provide primary schools to service this. It was also an aspiration that a secondary school would be provided, if possible. However, the North of Whiteley Major Development Area (MDA) should be conditional upon the connection of Whiteley Way with Botley Road.

With regard to the Fareham SDA, County Councillor Allgood also expressed concern about any intention for any of the SDA to be located within the Winchester District. He believed that the City Council should request that FBC include the necessary green infrastructure within its District, but located near the boundaries so as to protect the gaps next to Wickham and Knowle.

Mr M Carter (Wickham Parish Council) concurred with views expressed by the other speakers that the entire Fareham SDA, including green infrastructure, should be located within the FBC District.

In response to comments made, the Chairman confirmed that it was the Council's intention to protect the land around Wickham and Knowle from development. She also expressed concern about the lack of consultation undertaken by FBC with residents affected by their proposals.

The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that the Council's policy was clear that, if any of the SDA's green infrastructure was included within the Winchester District, it would only be acceptable if it did not alter the current rural landscape. The Council's Policy was intended to protect the gaps between settlements and it would not accept any attempt by FBC for the built development elements of the Fareham SDA to be located closer to the boundary. The Corporate Director also emphasised that the Localism Bill would introduce a duty of cooperation between Councils to promote growth and ensure the economic development requirements were addressed.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that 'green infrastructure' could include a vast variety of uses, including countryside, woodland and informal recreation.

Councillor Beckett agreed with concerns raised by the public speakers above that the response to FBC might imply a weakening in the Council's stance towards ensuring the entire SDA was located within FBC area. He referred to a Portfolio Holder Decision Notice ([PHD132](#) refers) 'Fareham Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation', signed by the former Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport in March 2008, which agreed, inter alia: "*That Winchester City Council writes to Fareham Borough Council to support Option 2b on condition that this option will ensure that all of the SDA, including the built development, required open space, natural greenspace, etc. is contained within the Fareham Borough. Also, in accordance with the draft SE Plan, a sufficient gap is maintained between Wickham and the SDA and Knowle and the SDA. We would anticipate that an amount of the SDA's open space will be situated to the north of the built development within Fareham Borough, to help provide the gap the draft plan seeks.*"

Councillor Beckett stated that the decision of this PHD was incorporated within Policy SH5. He also emphasised that the proposed reduction in the size of the SDA from 10,000 to 7,000 dwellings would reduce pressure for any of its size to be accommodated within the Winchester District. Councillor Beckett reported that he had submitted a Notice of Motion to Council on 13 April 2011 to enable debate by all Members on this matter. However, he would consider withdrawing the Motion if the matter could be resolved at the meeting today.

Councillor Evans highlighted the decision of Council on 22 April 2009, which included her amendment as mentioned above, which outlined the Council's latest formal position.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Corporate Director (Operations) noted the concerns raised by some Members and emphasised that there was no intention in the response submitted by Officers to consultation on FBC's Core Strategy to alter or weaken the approach agreed by the Council (at its 22 April 2009 meeting) in relation to the Fareham SDA.

The Chairman noted this, but suggested that the Committee agree a formal resolution to clarify the Council's stance. This was agreed, as follows:

"That, the "Plans for Places, *after Blueprint*" consultation should reiterate the Council's policy as stated in the Core Strategy Preferred Options policy SH.5, that land between the Fareham boundary and Wickham & Knowle should be retained in its current landscape form in perpetuity, and Council's desire to ensure part of the gap between the proposed Fareham SDA and Wickham should be located within the Fareham Borough area, to maintain gaps between settlements".

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Planning and the Rural Economy Informal Scrutiny Group had been requested to give an indication of their conclusions by the end of May 2011, in order that its conclusions could, if relevant, be incorporated into the "Plans for Places" process.

The Committee thanked the Head of Strategic Planning and other officers involved in the Blueprint consultations for their work.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That, the "Plans for Places, *after Blueprint*" consultation should reiterate the Council's policy as stated in the Core Strategy Preferred Options policy SH.5, that land between the Fareham boundary and Wickham & Knowle should be retained in its current landscape form in perpetuity, and Council's desire to ensure part of the gap between the proposed Fareham SDA and Wickham should be located within the Fareham Borough area, to maintain gaps between settlements.

2. That the comments summarised in the Report and the issues raised be taken into account in producing "Plans for Places, *after Blueprint*" along with the other results of Blueprint, further discussions with representatives of local communities and further technical work.

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

(Report [CAB2149\(LDF\)](#) refers)

During the public participation period, Mrs G Busher expressed some concern that the Report appeared to be re-introducing a "top-down" style of decision making and imposing decisions on small communities. She believed that smaller towns and villages could be concerned about the Report's contents.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that this was not the intention and that the Blueprint consultation had included consultations with smaller communities about their needs. The Rural Masterplanning project, referred to in the Report, had resulted in the production of a checklist to enable assessment of the sustainability of settlements. The Council had explained that it would be re-examining settlement priorities at the Blueprint follow up and briefing sessions held during March, and parish councils had been asked to assist with the collation of data etc.

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 Rural Masterplanning project Final Report on the Council's Web site be agreed.

5. **LDF INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY**  
(Report CAB2150(LDF) refers)

One Member reported that there was now a mobile dental service in Bishops Waltham. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Study would be updated to reflect this.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning to make the amendments set out in Appendix 1 of the Report (including removal of the sections on Strategic Allocations), make any further minor factual and editorial changes to the Study if required and to publish the revised Study. Any further significant changes which may be needed prior to publication should be agreed in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Winchester and Surrounds and the Portfolio Holder for the Rural Areas and Market Towns.

2. That a detailed delivery plan be developed for inclusion in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy, including any strategic site allocations.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.55am.

Chairman