COUNCIL

21 October 2015

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Steve Opacic Tel: (01962) 848101 sopacic@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB2429(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Launch and Next Steps – Cabinet (LDF) Committee 17 December 2012

CAB2530(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Update Report – Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 27 Nov 2013

CAB2615 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, publication and consultation - 22 September 2014

CAB2656(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, update following consultation 9 February 2015

CAB2670(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses 12 March 2015

CAB2676(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses 30 March 2015

CAB2711(LP) Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations – Approval of Plan for Publication, 16 September 2015

CAB2721(LP) Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations – Approval of Plan for Publication, 6 October 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall strategic planning framework and development requirements are set out in Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (LPP1). The Local Plan Part 2 -Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) complements the LPP1 by allocating sites for development and providing detailed development management policies to replace the remaining policies saved from the Local Plan Review 2006. The LPP2 forms part of the 'Development Plan' for the District outside of the South Downs National Park.

The Draft LPP2 document was the subject of a six week consultation period during the autumn of 2014. Initial feedback reports were presented to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee in March 2015 (CAB2670 and CAB2676 refer), summarising the comments received on the different sections of the Plan. Following further work, including the commissioning of additional evidence reports, liaison with a number of respondents, key agencies and Parish Councils, responses to the representations, and changes to the Plan where needed, were presented to meetings of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September and 6 October (CAB2711(LP) and CAB2721(LP) refer). These are appended as Appendices 1 and 3 to this Report.

The Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee meeting on 6 October agreed the recommendations to Council as set out below. The meetings of the Committee considered the detail of the whole of the Plan, and recommended responses to the various representations received, taking public participation at both meetings. The detailed responses and recommended revisions to the Plan were set out in a series of appendices to the reports to each meeting (Appendices A – Q. These are available through the Background Documents weblink, below). The Minutes of the meetings are appended as Appendices 2 and 4 and illustrate the key changes that were recommended, which are summarised as:

- Policy CC1 (Appendix C) insertion of requirement for a master plan;
- Policy WC4 (Appendix F) change to clarify require open space and infrastructure on each site;
- Policy WK1 (Appendix G) reword to reflect concerns regarding preventing development until flooding issues had been addressed and to refer to a multiagency strategy throughout;
- Policy WK2 (Appendix G) amend to include requirements for sports provision and the requirement for a master plan;
- Amendments to the following Policies/Paragraphs:
 - Paragraphs referring to travellers;
 - o DM11, explanatory text;
 - o DM12, explanatory text;
 - o Paragraph 6.4.2;
 - DM16 (iii);
 - o DM17 (iii);
 - o DM20;
 - o Paragraph 6.4.68;
 - Paragraph 6.4.77;
 - DM33/DM1 and DM33 explanatory text 6;
 - o DM34.

The Publication version of the Local Plan circulated separately to all Members incorporates the above changes, along with various other editorial changes and corrections which have been made by officers and agreed with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment. The Publication Plan is, therefore, the version which it is recommended be published, subject to agreement by Council, including all the changes since the Draft Local Plan was published in October 2014. If Members wish to see the draft tracked changes in detail that were available to the Cabinet (Local

Plan) Committee, including those to the Policy and Inset Maps, these are included in the Appendices attached to reports CAB2271(LP) and CAB2272(LP) (see weblink under Background Documents).

The above reports set out the next steps needed to publicise the revised Plan before it is submitted for independent examination. The recommendations from Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee below are that the Plan, as amended, be published for the statutory period for representations on its 'soundness', prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination. Following this, the Plan would be examined for 'soundness' by an independent planning Inspector who would report on their findings. If the Inspector recommends the Plan is sound (possibly subject to various modifications) it should be possible to adopt it as a statutory document in late 2016.

RECOMMENDED (TO COUNCIL):

- 1. THAT THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS BE APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION (PRE-SUBMISSION) AND SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TOGETHER WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND THE HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.
- 2. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO SUBMIT THE PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION PERIOD, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.
- 3. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TO CORRECT ERRORS AND FORMAT TEXT WITHOUT ALTERING THE MEANING OF THE PLAN.
- 4. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT /LEADER, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLAN BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION PROCESS, IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO MATTERS RAISED THROUGH THE CONSULTATION AND EXAMINATION PROCESS.

5. THAT APPROVAL BE GIVEN TO APPOINT A PROGRAMME OFFICER AND UNDERTAKE OTHER WORK AS NECESSARY TO PREPARE FOR AND UNDERTAKE THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION (INCLUDING AGREEING TO MEET THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE'S FEES), PROVIDED THIS IS WITHIN THE ALLOCATED LOCAL PLAN BUDGET/RESERVE.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. <u>COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO)</u>

5.1 The Local Plan is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Community Strategy and implementing several aspects of Portfolio Plans. That the Plan has had regard to the Community Strategy is a requirement for legal compliance.

6. <u>RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</u>

6.1 The key resources for undertaking work on LPP2 have been approved as part of the budget process, consisting primarily of an annual sum of £36,700 and an earmarked reserve which stood at £172,759 at 1 April 2015. This budget and earmarked reserve are used for ongoing consultancy requirements and ensuring resources are available to deal with major expenditure at key stages, e.g. examination which is estimated at up to £155,000 to include the Planning Inspectorate's fees and the appointment of the Programme Officer. This funding is expected to be adequate for the foreseeable future, subject to progress with LPP2, any changes in government requirements and the need to review plans.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 7.1 The steps undertaken in preparing the Plan have all been done with consideration for minimising the risks that the Plan may not pass examination or could be delayed in its adoption. This is to ensure that the development plan is up to date, that a five year supply of housing sites can be demonstrated and not put the Council at risk of development being determined through the appeal process. The Local Development Scheme sets out a more detailed risk assessment of the Local Plan Part 2.
- 7.2 The Government recently announced its intention to require that local plans are put in place quickly, so it is important that progress is maintained on adopting LPP2. The revised timetable for the LPP2, which envisages adoption of the Plan by November 2016, should avoid the risk of government intervention. While the threat by the government to arrange for a plan to be written where no local plan has been produced by 2017 is unclear, Winchester City Council has already adopted the LPP1 since the National Planning Policy Framework came into force. The LPP1 was considered by the Inspector at the Local Plan Examination to be compliant with the NPPF.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

8.1 Appendices A-Q of Reports CAB2711(LP) and CAB2721(LP):

Appendix A Chapters 1 & 2 - Introduction & Background and Meeting Development Needs

Appendix B Bishops Waltham

Appendix C Colden Common

Appendix D Kings Worthy

Appendix E Swanmore

Appendix F Waltham Chase

Appendix G Wickham

Appendix H Denmead

Appendix I Smaller villages and rural area

Appendix J South Hampshire Urban Area

Appendix K Chapter 7 – Implementation & Monitoring

Appendix L Habitat Regulations Assessment Scoping Report Summary

Appendix M Winchester

Appendix N New Alresford

Appendix O Development Management Policies

Appendix P Proposed Revised Policy Wording for Site Allocations Where a Masterplan is Needed

Appendix Q Policy Map Insets for Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy (illustrating revised DM5 notations)

9. <u>APPENDICES</u>

Appendix 1 CAB2711(LP) Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, approval of Plan for Publication - 16 September 2015

Appendix 2 Minutes - Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee - 16 September 2015

Appendix 3 CAB2721 (LP) Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, approval of Plan for Publication - 6 October 2015 Appendix 4 Minutes - Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee - 6 October 2015

The Publication Version of the Local Plan Part 2 has been circulated separately to all Members, who are requested to bring their copy to the meeting. It can be viewed online at

http://www.winchester.gov.uk/meetings/details/1490

CAB2711(LP) FOR DECISION WARD(S): ALL

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

16 September 2015

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Linda Jewell Tel: (01962) 848086 ljewell@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB2429(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Launch and Next Steps – Cabinet (LDF) Committee 17 December 2012

CAB2530(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Update Report – Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 27 Nov 2013

CAB2615 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, publication and consultation - 22 September 2014

CAB2656(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, update following consultation 9 February 2015

CAB2670(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses 12 March 2015

CAB2676(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses 30 March 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall strategic planning framework and development requirements are set out in Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (LPP1). The Local Plan Part 2 -Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) complements the LPP1 by allocating sites for development and providing detailed development management policies to replace the remaining policies saved from the Local Plan Review 2006. The LPP2 forms part of the 'Development Plan' for the District outside of the South Downs National Park.

Work began on the LPP2 in December 2012. Throughout 2013 and into 2014 Council officers worked with Parish Councils, communities and others to assess background data and evidence and to consider the issues and options for development allocations to meet the needs set out in the LPP1. The resulting Draft LPP2 document was the subject of a six week consultation period during the autumn of 2014.

Following an initial feedback report (CAB2656(LP) refers) on the number and range of responses received, this Committee considered reports on 12 March (CAB2670 refers) and 30 March (CAB2676 refers), summarising the comments received on the different sections of the Plan. In some cases the recommended responses to the comments were agreed and in others it was acknowledged that further consideration of the issues raised was needed and that these would be reported back to a future meeting. Following further work, including the commissioning of additional evidence reports, liaison with a number of respondents, key agencies and Parish Councils, responses to the representations, and changes to the Plan where needed, are now set out for consideration.

This report summarises the process followed in preparing the LPP2; the key changes recommended in response to the representations, and the outcome of further supporting evidence studies.

The appendices to this report examine the responses received on some general parts of the Plan together with those for the settlements of Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham, the South Hampshire Urban Areas, and the Smaller Villages and Rural Area (Appendices A-L) refer.

The next meeting on 6 October will consider reports relating to New Alresford, Winchester Town and the Development Management policies.

The report (at recommendation 4 below) also indicates the recommendations to full Council that the Committee will be asked to consider at the next meeting, at the end of its deliberations on various sections of the Plan. However, it is important to note that the contents of individual sections will be considered at the meeting when the individual sections are on the agenda – so the debate on the contents of Appendices A-L will take place at today's meeting and will not be subject to further debate at the next meeting.

This report also sets out the next steps needed to publicise the revised Plan before it is submitted for independent examination. The Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee is asked to agree the responses and to recommend to the Council that the Plan, as amended, be published for the statutory period for representations on its 'soundness', prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1 That the responses to the representations, as set out in the attached papers, together with the outcome of the further evidence studies, be noted and taken into account in considering the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management and Site Allocations.

- 2 That subject to any changes made at the meeting, the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, as recommended in Appendices A to L of this report, be approved for submission to full Council.
- 3 That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to update the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying documents prior to presentation to the Council and publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.
- 4 That it be noted that at the next meeting of the Committee, it will be asked to consider the following recommendations to full Council:

"To Council:

5 That the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations be approved for Publication (Presubmission) and subsequent Submission to the Secretary of State, together with supporting documents including the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

6 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to submit the Plan and accompanying documents to the Secretary of State following the publication period, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

7 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to make editorial amendments to the Local Plan and accompanying documents prior to submission to the Secretary of State, to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

8 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment /Leader, be authorised to make proposed changes to the Plan before, during and after the public examination process, in order to respond to matters raised through the consultation and examination process.

9 That approval be given to appoint a Programme Officer and undertake other work as necessary to prepare for and undertake the public examination (including agreeing to meet the Planning Inspectorate's fees), provided this is within the allocated Local Plan budget/Reserve."

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

16 SEPTEMBER 2015

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

DETAIL

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report seeks approval for the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations, to be recommended to the Council for publication for representations on 'soundness' prior to submission for examination. This is a 'formal' stage of local plan preparation as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 Following the period for consultation on the Draft LPP2, which took place from 24 October to 5 December 2014, this Committee received an update report and initial feedback on matters raised during the consultation at its meeting on 9 February 2015 (CAB2656(LP) refers). At its meeting on 12 March (CAB 2670(LP) refers), comments received in relation to Colden Common, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham and South Hampshire Urban Areas were considered and the meeting on 30 March (CAB2676(LP) refers) considered comments in relation to Winchester Town, Bishop's Waltham, New Alresford, Denmead, smaller villages and the rural area, development management policies, Chapters 1 & 2, general comments and those on the maps, appendices, sustainability appraisal, implementation and monitoring.
- 1.3 Many representations related to the site allocations; suggesting alternative sites for development and/or changes to settlement boundaries, or raising issues with the proposed allocations or policy wording. The Committee agreed that those comments would require further work to assess the matters raised in detail and to seek further advice as necessary, and for officers to report back to future meetings. This work is now completed and the results are set out in the reports attached as Appendices A-K to this paper.
- 1.4 Also attached within appendices A-K are revised chapters of the Plan and Policies Map insets, indicating the changes that are recommended following further work. NB Members may find it helpful to compare these with the Consultation Draft version of the Plan and are advised to bring their copy to the meeting. The Plan is divided into sections for ease of Members' consideration, with the appendices to this report covering Chapters 1 & 2 Introduction & Background and Meeting Development Needs, Chapter 4 Market Towns and Rural Area (except for New Alresford), Chapter 5 South Hampshire Urban Areas, and Chapter 7 Implementation and Monitoring. The next meeting on 6 October 2015 will consider Chapter 4 (New Alresford only), Winchester Town (Chapter 3) and the Development Management policies (Chapter 6).

- 1.5 The Plan is supported by a considerable number of background reports and studies which have been updated and supplemented where further evidence is necessary to respond to the issues raised in the representations. The housing supply data is updated to take account of the completions and permissions as at 31 March 2015 and the latest position regarding the deliverability of other available sites within the settlement boundaries. NB the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is being finalised and will be available by the next meeting (6th October) so the housing data tables may yet be subject to minor changes. Various other supporting documents are already published on the Council's website or will be available by the 6th October meeting.
- 1.6 The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (and Strategic Environmental Assessment), which has been updated to take account of amendments made to policies, and also a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report. These assessments are important requirements which Members should take into account in considering the revised Plan and can be viewed here: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/
- 1.7 Following the formal publication period for representations the Plan, together with supporting documents, will be submitted for independent examination. Council will, therefore, also be recommended to give delegated authority for officers, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to submit the Plan for examination, to draft modifications to suggest minor changes if necessary in response to representations, and to respond to queries and draft modifications to assist the examination Inspector where necessary.
- 2 The Local Plan Process, Supporting Documents and Evidence Base
- 2.1 Previous reports (CAB2530(LDF) and CAB2615) refer to the extensive work that has been undertaken with local communities, particularly in identifying the sites to meet the development requirements of the larger villages and the involvement of the Town and Parish Councils, also the work on the Winchester Town area including the Town Forum and residents. The details of this, including the many and varied events that have been held to involve the local communities, are set out in the Consultation Statement (Parts 1 and 2) which is published on the Council's website: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/
- 2.2 The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (and Strategic Environmental Assessment), which has informed the amendments made to the policies and been updated itself to take account of these. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is an appraisal of the economic, environmental, and social effects of the Plan from the outset of the preparation process to inform policy development and ensure that the Plan accords with sustainable development. It also ensures that the formal requirements for an 'environmental report' (under Regulation 12 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004) are met.
- 2.3 The Plan is also accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report. Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive. An 'appropriate

assessment' is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site, either individually or in combination with other projects. The Screening Report concludes that none of the policies/allocations in the Local Plan Part 2 are likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in combination, on the identified European sites; therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required (see summary at Appendix L)

- 2.4 The Local Plan evidence base is already extensive and continues to be expanded and refined to provide updates and is supplemented by new reports to address matters raised through the representations. A full list of the key background documents and evidence studies was included within Appendix C of the draft Local Plan. Specific mention is made here of the additional studies which have since been commissioned to support the recent revisions to the Plan.
- 2.5 It should be noted that as the LPP1 sets out the requirements in terms of the housing numbers that need to be met by the LPP2 it has not been necessary to undertake any further assessment of housing needs for the LPP2. The SHLAA considers the suitability of the sites that have been promoted for housing development to meet those needs, setting out those that are deliverable and developable (available and viable now or within the lifetime of the Plan). These were assessed in developing the draft Local Plan and the appendices to this report include updated evaluations of the sites proposed as allocations in the larger villages and others that have been put forward by their promoters ('omission' sites).
- 2.6 One of the 'tests of soundness' of the Local Plan is that it should be 'effective', including that the sites allocated for development are deliverable. In order to confirm the viability of the site allocations, 'light touch' viability studies have been undertaken. These have been produced for sites which have not been subject to planning applications or requests for pre-application advice where these proposals have been put forward they have helped to confirm the viability of the sites involved and interest in developing them. Some of the studies have been undertaken by external consultants and others by the Council's Estates Team. The outcome of these studies has been taken into account in considering policy revisions and they are referred to in the reports of the responses; as necessary, and summaries of the studies are appended to the relevant reports for the main settlements.
- 2.7 Some representations have raised the issue of the accommodation needs of older persons and suggested that specific site allocations should be made for uses such as extra care homes. A specific study 'Specialist Housing for Older People in Winchester District', has been commissioned from consultants to examine the issues raised by these representations. It concludes that sufficient flexibility for developers to bring forward specialist housing for older people, including extra care schemes, already exists within LPP1 and LPP2. Indeed, greater flexibility for provision of all types of residential accommodation can best be maintained by keeping housing allocations non-specific with regard to residential use classes. The study is being finalised and will be available for the next meeting of the Committee.

- 2.8 Following the introduction of new national technical standards for housing a further study was also commissioned from the same consultants to consider the need to set local standards. These standards relate primarily to minimum, dwelling sizes and ensuring that new dwellings are accessible and adaptable and replace those for the former 'Lifetime Homes'. The new Nationally Described Space Standards deal with the internal space within new dwellings. The study therefore assesses whether and how to adopt the new technical standards in relation to space and accessibility within new build homes. The study found evidence from the scale and growth of the older population to indicates a need for about 20% of the housing stock to be accessible and adaptable in the future and that the vast majority of homes on the market (new properties and existing stock) already meet the national minimum space standards so that there may be a case for applying minimum standards to affordable housing and small flats. The study is relevant mainly to the Development Management policies so will be addressed in the relevant report to the next meeting of the Committee.
- 2.9 The LPP2 pages of the Council's website contain sections for each of the larger settlements with various studies, assessments and reports that were used to determine the requirements and proposed site allocations for each settlement. The Transport Assessments for the larger settlements (except Winchester, as new greenfield site allocations are not proposed there) have been updated to relate to the scale of development proposed by the draft Local Plan or alternative site promoters. The updated Assessments have bene added to those pages.
- 2.10 Several of the larger settlements where site allocations are proposed are located close to the B2177 / B3354 / A334 transport corridor. This was raised as a concern in various comments on the draft Local Plan and in order to better understand the potential impact of the proposed level of development on this corridor, the consultants SYSTRA were commissioned to undertake a study to assess the cumulative impacts. The resulting 'B2177 / B3354 / A334 Corridor Cumulative Traffic Impacts' study concludes that this corridor generally has sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast growth up to 2031, including that expected at Welborne and on sites within Eastleigh Borough. Some specific junctions were identified where capacity is predicted to be reached or exceeded and where mitigation measures are likely to be required. Specific implications for site allocations in Wickham and at Colden Common are addressed in the relevant site allocation policies.
- 2.11 The Wickham Flood Investigation Report (2015) was commissioned by Hampshire County Council and has recently been published. It concludes that the causes of flooding in Wickham are complex, affect various parts of the village, and are caused by a combination of factors. The report makes a large number of recommendations for improvement options and areas for further study, both for specific parts of Wickham and more generally, rather than identifying a single 'solution'. Where these are specific to planning requirements, the study's recommendations have informed changes to the Wickham drainage infrastructure policy.

- 2.12 The Open Space Strategy 2014 has been reviewed in the light of representations received, in particular in relation to Policy DM5 Protecting Open Areas. As Policy DM5 will be considered at the next meeting the updated Open Space Strategy will be reported on 6 October. The Policies Map Inset Maps for the settlements included with the appendices to this report, which show the locations to which Policy DM5 applies, may need updating as a result, and any significant changes will be propertied to the next meeting.
- 2.13 The study to identify sites for permanent pitches for Travellers within the Winchester District, to meet the requirements identified in the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013), is being undertaken jointly with the South Downs National Park Authority and East Hampshire District Council. The Study has not been completed in time for sites to be included in the LPP2, as these must also be subject to consultation and sustainability appraisal. In addition, the Government issued a revised 'Panning Policy for Traveller Sites' on 31 August 2015, including a change to the definition of gypsies and travellers for the purposes of planning policy. The implications of this change require further consideration and they may require reconsideration of the level of need for traveller pitches. So that the LPP2 can progress to examination without further delay it is recommended that a separate development plan document (DPD) be prepared to cover this issue - details will be included in the revised 'Local Development Scheme' to be reported to the next meeting on 6 October.
- 3 Content of LPP2, key matters raised and changes made to Plan
- 3.1 **Chapters 1 & 2 Introduction & Background and Meeting Development Needs.** These chapters set out the context for the Plan, explaining the LPP2's relationship with the LPP1 and other plans (the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan) which together form the 'development plan'. Chapter 2 explains the process, including the technical methodology and engagement with the local communities that led to the proposed sites for allocation, also the settlement boundary review. The comments made on these two chapters do not require any changes to the Plan other than amendments to bring Chapter 1 up to date regarding the evidence base, the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan (now adopted), the next stages and revised timetable. It is proposed that these Chapters are subject to general updating - see **Appendix A**.
- 3.2 **Chapter 4 Market Towns and Rural Area.** This Chapter deals primarily with the site allocations at the market towns and larger villages to meet the housing targets set in LPP1 (Policy MTRA2). Each of the 8 larger rural settlements has a separate section, as described below. (NB New Alresford will be reported to the next meeting on 6 October). Some formatting changes have also been made to this section, with explanatory text moved to precede the relevant policy for consistency, and the background details of the evolution of policies removed as this is explained in the supporting documents.

- 3.3 **Bishop's Waltham.** There are four housing site allocations proposed along the southern edge of the settlement and an employment site to the west. The representations focused on the allocation of these sites for development, particularly in terms of access via existing residential streets, and raised concerns about the capacity of Winchester Road to accommodate more traffic. Landscape impact is raised by many, given the distribution of sites along the southern edge of Bishops Waltham, together with impact on open space and wildlife sites. Some refer to the lack of supporting infrastructure to accommodate more development. The key changes made to the policies and supporting text relate to clarification of the provision of green infrastructure to protect biodiversity interests and safeguarding of the Park Lug. Changes are also made to the uses and phasing references in the policy for the Tollgate Sawmill site. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Bishop's Waltham are set out at Appendix B.
- 3.4 **Colden Common.** There are now two recommended policies allocating proposed housing development at Colden Common. Most of the representations received related to the proposal to allocate a site on Main Road for permanent occupation by gypsies and travellers. As reported previously, this site is no longer available, therefore it is recommended that the proposed allocation is removed from the Plan. The other representations concentrated on the housing allocation at the former Sandyfields Nurseries with some questioning the capacity of the site and offering other sites as alternatives. Some amendments to the policy and supporting text are made to overcome concerns. A new policy is also added to confirm and clarify the contribution to meeting development needs of the sites at Clayfields and adjoining Avondale on Main Road. An amendment is also proposed to one of the changes to the settlement boundary, which has been reconsidered in response to representations. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Colden Common are set out at Appendix C.
- 3.5 **Kings Worthy.** Only one site allocation is proposed at Kings Worthy for housing and open space. Representations covered a range of matters, including significant support for the site at Lovedon Lane. Comments against the site expressed concerns regarding access and traffic, the impact on the Eversley Park recreation area and on the settlement gap; alternative sites were also suggested. The outcome of consultation on options for the layout of the site has resulted in revisions to the Policies Map regarding the location of the proposed housing and to the settlement boundary, to avoid any loss of playing fields at Eversley Park while protecting the settlement gap with Abbots Worthy. The number of dwellings proposed on the site is also justified by an updated assessment of the housing potential of other sites within the existing settlement boundary. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Kings Worthy are set out at **Appendix D**.
- 3.6 **Swanmore.** This section now includes two policies rather than three, as development at Swanmore College has commenced and the policy for the allocation of housing and replacement playing pitches can be deleted.

Representations were made to the scale of development proposed at Swanmore and its impact, especially when combined with that proposed at Waltham Chase and Bishop's Waltham. Encroachment into the gap between settlements and impact on the adjacent countryside were included in the issues raised, in addition to more site specific comments relating to proposed development at The Lakes concerning access and transport, flooding and drainage, and impact on the Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation. Some changes are proposed to strengthen the policy and supporting text regarding these issues. The settlement boundary also generated representations that some minor proposed changes should not be made, or that changes should be made where none were proposed. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Swanmore are set out at **Appendix E.**

- 3.7 Waltham Chase. Four policies at Waltham Chase propose five site allocations, including one on previously developed land within the existing settlement boundary. Some representations challenged the scale of development proposed for the village and objections to all the proposed allocations refer to access and traffic impact. Other comments refer to specific sites and raise concerns such as the impact on wildlife and drainage. Alternative sites are promoted, including one for extra care accommodation. Following reassessment of the proposed and alternative sites the only changes to policies that are considered necessary, other than a requirement regarding drainage, are clarification of the requirement for employment uses at Morgan's Yard being subject to viability, and some changes to the Forest Road allocations policy to overcome site specific objections concerning a Site of Special Scientific Interest and the Lower Chase Stream. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Waltham Chase are set out at Appendix F.
- 3.8 **Wickham.** There are three policies; one concerning drainage infrastructure due to previous flooding issues and two allocating land for housing and open space. Many comments raise objection to the two housing sites proposed, with alternatives suggested. There are also many representations concerning transport, drainage and flooding issues, including the cumulative impact of the Welborne development. The Wickham Flood Investigation Report, commissioned by Hampshire County Council, has informed changes to the drainage infrastructure policy (WK1) including the need for a flood mitigation and management strategy. The B2177 / B3354 / A334 transport study has assessed the cumulative impact of development on transport, including Welborne. The housing allocation policies are amended to include requirements for improvements to the Winchester Road/ Titchfield Lane junction (Policy WK2) and archaeological investigation (Policy WK3). The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for Wickham are set out at Appendix G.
- 3.9 **Denmead.** The LPP2 does not make any development allocations for Denmead as housing requirements and other issues are set out in the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan, which was adopted as part of the 'development plan' on 1 April 2015. Only a few representations were submitted in relation to

Denmead, primarily relating to alternative sites for development, but these are not an issue for the LPP2. The LPP2 does, however, set out various Development Management policies that apply in Denmead, including defining the village centre boundary and protected open spaces. The revised section of the Plan for Denmead to cover the making of the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan is set out at **Appendix H.**

- 3.10 **Smaller villages and rural area.** Representations were mainly concerned with promoting sites for development and / or questioning the lack of review of settlement boundaries and settlement gap boundaries to allow more development in some locations. This section of the Plan explains that there are no development allocations required in the smaller settlements, hence no need to review boundaries where these exist, and policies already allow for development to meet local needs where identified and supported by communities. Representations requesting the inclusion of Botley Bypass in LPP2 are considered under Chapter 5 South Hampshire Urban Areas. The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for the smaller villages and rural area are set out at **Appendix I.**
- 3.11 Chapter 5 – South Hampshire Urban Areas. Most of the development proposed in this spatial area is already committed through the LPP1 strategic allocations at West of Waterlooville (permitted) and North Whiteley (planning application pending), hence no further policies on these developments are needed and few representations were received. Of the issues that were raised, a key concern was the need for employment land to be protected and/or more to be allocated. Policies therefore cover areas and proposals remaining undeveloped from the 2006 Local Plan Review allocations, including two new policies safeguarding the Solent 1 and Solent 2 Business Parks as employment areas and an amendment to the Whiteley Green site regarding access, in response to representations. A policy safeguarding the route for the Botley Bypass is also added in this section of the Plan following representations from Eastleigh Borough Council and advice from Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority, arising from changed circumstances, Representations were also received for land to be allocated for development adjoining the bypass route, but it is not accepted that this is needed. These and other representations, the responses to them and the revised section of the Plan for the South Hampshire Urban Area are set out at Appendix J.
- 3.12 **Chapter 7 Implementation and Monitoring**. This brief Chapter refers to the Monitoring Framework, which is included in the appendices to the Plan, also matters such as developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Changes to the section covering the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project and the need for contributions are updated to reflect the latest position on the associated Strategy. This is set out in **Appendix K**.
- 3.13 **Local Plan Appendices.** A series of appendices accompanied the draft Local Plan. These will need to be updated and corrected to address the few matters that were raised in the representations. It is proposed to delete Appendix B listing the remaining saved policies from the 2006 Local Plan Review since

these will all be deleted upon adoption of the LPP2. Delegated authority is sought to complete the minor updates needed for inclusion of the remaining appendices in the published LPP2, as follows:

- Appendix A Glossary update terms, abbreviations and explanation.
- Appendix C (change to B) update the list of Plans and Policies the key policy, guidance and evidence documents supporting the LPP2.
- Appendix D (change to C) Criteria for Local Listing of Heritage Assets – as referenced in Policy DM31.
- Appendix E (change to D) update Monitoring Framework as necessary to reflect new, deleted, changed policies.
- 3.14 **Maps.** The Plan must be accompanied by a 'Policies Map' which shows on an Ordnance Survey map base where the policies apply. The Policies Map consists of an overall District map with inset maps at a larger scale for those settlements with settlement boundaries. At this stage it is also helpful to indicate how the adoption of the LPP2 will make changes (deletions and additions) to the existing Policies Map and these are illustrated by the inset maps attached to each of the settlement reports (Appendices B J below).
- 4 <u>Next Steps</u>
- 4.1 A further meeting of this Committee is scheduled for 6 October 2015 to cover the remaining issues relating to New Alresford, Winchester Town and the Development Management policies.
- 4.2 The Development Plan Regulations require that before submitting a Plan to the Secretary of State the local planning authority (LPA) must make a copy of the Plan and other supporting documents available for inspection and invite representations for a period of not less than 6 weeks. Subject to the agreement of the Council at a special meeting on 21 October, this period will commence as soon as practicable following the printing of final versions of documents and issuing of public notices and be concluded prior to the Christmas and New Year holidays. It is anticipated that the period for representations will run from Friday 6 November to Monday 21 December 2015.
- 4.3 The earlier stages of plan preparation included a considerable amount of public consultation on the proposals of the Plan and the wording of the policies. Representations made at the forthcoming stage must relate to whether they consider the Plan is legally compliant, sound and complies with the Duty to Cooperate. This is explained in guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate that will be made available along with the representation forms. Therefore the priority is to publicise the opportunity to make formal representations and there is no need for exhibitions or public meetings at this stage.
- 4.4 Legal compliance refers to matters of process and includes: whether the preparation of the Plan has followed the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme and the requirements of the Regulations; whether public consultation has generally accorded with the strategy for involving the community as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement and whether

the policies of the plan reflect the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal; also that the Plan has had regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy.

- 4.5 "Soundness" means that the Plan is:
 - Positively prepared based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 - Justified the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 - Effective deliverable and based on effective joint working on crossboundary strategic priorities;
 - Consistent with national policy delivers sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.6 The publication of the Plan will therefore be accompanied by a raft of documents that demonstrate this compliance and that the Plan is considered by the Council to be sound. Following the close of the period for representations the Council must submit the Local Plan and supporting documents for examination, together with the representations received and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations.
- 4.7 As the Plan that is published for representations should be the one that the Council would expect to adopt, i.e. it should be the Council's final version of the Plan, there is no requirement to comment on the representations and further changes to the Plan should not be necessary. However the statutory provisions allow for modifications to be made under certain circumstances provided they are subject to appropriate consultation and sustainability appraisal. These may be needed before the Plan is submitted for examination but are more likely to emerge during the course of the examination through discussion and debate at the hearings. Delegated authority is sought to enable officers to respond to these matters, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, as necessary. Formal approval would be sought for any significant modifications if the timescale of the examination allows for this.
- 4.8 Once the Plan is submitted for examination the Inspector will begin the examination by looking at legal compliance, and by reference to the representations will decide what matters he/she considers would merit discussion at hearing sessions. The Inspector will set the agenda for the hearings and who may be invited to participate in the round table debate led by the Inspector. Everyone who has made representations, including those who are not invited to participate at the hearing sessions (anyone can attend to hear the debates) are able to make written representations. This report therefore also seeks delegated authority for officers to submit the Plan for examination and to prepare for the examination, including any written statements, and to suggest changes to assist the Inspector.

- 4.9 The examination concludes when the Inspector submits their report to the Council. The time taken for this will depend on a number of factors including the need for any further evidence, the need for modifications and consultation on these and the need for a Pre-Hearing Meeting. A Pre-Hearing Meeting may be held to explain the procedures associated with the examination, but may not be needed if written explanatory notes of the process are considered sufficient.
- 4.10 Throughout the examination the arrangements for the hearings and all liaison with the Inspector is undertaken by a Programme Officer appointed by the Council but independent from the Council's officers. Authority is therefore sought for the appointment of the Programme Officer to carry out these tasks.
- 4.11 The Local Development Scheme refers to the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 being programmed for publication in June 2015, which was the original intention. Due to the need for further work, including the commissioning of additional evidence reports in order to fully consider and respond to the representations, that timetable has not been met. Although changes to the plan preparation timetable have been published on the Council's web site and in the LDF e-bulletin, the Local Development Scheme must be revised to also include the timetable for a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD (development plan document). Although it was intended that the LDS be brought to this meeting, due to the need for more time to consider the implications of the revised 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', a separate report on the revised Local Development Scheme will be included on the agenda for the next meeting on 6 October.
- 4.12 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies, and their degree of consistency with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Planning Practice Guidance that accompanies the NPPF states that refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination. However it indicates that there are circumstances where it might be justified, i.e. where the granting of planning permission may undermine the plan-making process by pre-determining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to the emerging local plan. Thus as the emerging Plan indicates the direction of travel and is more up to date with regard to consistency with the NPPF, especially where policies have little or no objection raised to them, the Plan can be regarded as a material consideration in decision making.
- 4.13 It is not possible to give a definitive guide as to how much weight the emerging Plan will have in comparison to saved policies or other guidance, so each case will need to be considered on its merits. Planning and legal officers will advise Planning Development Control Committee as appropriate, having regard to the stage of the process reached, the level of objection to particular policies, and other material considerations.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. <u>COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO)</u>

5.1 The Local Plan is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Community Strategy and implementing several aspects of Portfolio Plans. That the Plan has had regard to the Community Strategy is a requirement for legal compliance.

6. <u>RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</u>

6.1 The key resources for undertaking work on LPP2 have been approved as part of the budget process, consisting primarily of an annual sum of £36,700 and an earmarked reserve which stood at £172,759 at 1 April 2015. This budget and earmarked reserve are used for ongoing consultancy requirements, ensuring resources are available to deal with major expenditure at key stages, e.g. examination which is estimated at up to £155,000 to include the Planning Inspectorate's fees and the appointment of the Programme Officer. This funding is expected to be adequate for the foreseeable future, subject to progress with LPP2, any changes in government requirements and the need to review plans.

7. <u>RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES</u>

7.1 The steps undertaken in preparing the Plan have all be done with consideration for minimising the risks that the Plan may not pass examination or could be delayed in its adoption. This is to ensure that the development plan is up to date, that a five year supply of housing sites can be demonstrated and not put the Council at risk of development being determined through the appeal process. The Local Development Scheme sets out a more detailed risk assessment of the Local Plan Part 2.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 8.1 None.
- 9. <u>APPENDICES</u>

Due to their size, the appendices have been attached for Cabinet and invited Councillors only, together with the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillors for the Wards covering the settlements listed in Appendices B – H & J have also been supplied with the Report and relevant appendix.

A complete copy is available in the Members' Library and can be viewed online: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/meetings/ou/4/

Appendix A Chapters 1 & 2 - Introduction & Background and Meeting Development Needs

Appendix B Bishops Waltham

- Appendix C Colden Common
- Appendix D Kings Worthy
- Appendix E Swanmore
- Appendix F Waltham Chase
- Appendix G Wickham
- Appendix H Denmead
- Appendix I Smaller villages and rural area
- Appendix J South Hampshire Urban Area
- Appendix K Chapter 7 Implementation & Monitoring
- Appendix L Habitat Regulations Assessment Scoping Report Summary

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

16 September 2015

Attendance:

Committee Members:

Councillors:

Read (Chairman) (P)

Godfrey (P) Weston (P)

Pearson

Other invited Councillors:

J Berry (P) Evans (P) Hutchison (P) Ruffell (P) Tait (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Izard

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Susan Cook, Dibden, McLean, Miller, Power, Rutter and Weir Mrs Steventon Baker (TACT)

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2015 be approved and adopted.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of the following items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

He also mentioned a possible disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Winchester College, if any Winchester College matters were to arise during

the Committee's deliberations. However, no such matters arose during the Committee.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Questions and statements were made under the following item.

4. WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 (LPP2): DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

(Report CAB2711(LP) refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting about 15 members of the public, some of whom addressed the Committee on the appendices, as set out within the report. A summary of their comments are outlined under the relevant appendices below.

The Head of Strategic Planning introduced the Report and explained that this was the first of two meetings examining the responses to the LPP2 consultation (the second to be held on 6 October 2015). The purpose of the meetings was to recommend final changes to the Plan for approval at Council on 21 October 2015. There had been extensive consultation on the Draft LPP2 and the detail of this was set out in a separate consultation statement.

The Committee noted that its next meeting would consider reports relating to New Alresford, Winchester Town, and the Development Management policies, in addition to a revised version of the Local Development Scheme.

The Committee then discussed each Appendix/settlement area, as contained in Appendices A to L of the Report.

Appendix A – Chapters 1 and 2 – Introduction & Background and Meeting **Development Needs**

In response to questions about employment provision, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Inspector would expect to see a degree of flexibility in the Plan. If, for example, more employment sites were required over the course of the Plan, this could be achieved either within the policies of the Local Plan or, if not, by Local Development Documents on specific issues.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the South Downs National Park (SDNP) had their own Plan in development and it would not be appropriate to link to this directly in the introduction of the Local Plan Part 2, although where allocations were situated close to the boundaries of the SDNP this was taken into account.

The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the calculations of housing supply just referred to numbers of dwelling and not types. An update on housing supply numbers for Winchester Town would be reported to the next Committee meeting.

The Committee noted that a reference to the introduction of "green belts" to protect gaps between some settlements had been included within the Council's recent submission to Government on devolution.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that, where appropriate, settlement boundaries had been amended to ensure all allocated sites were included within the new boundaries. The appendices included maps indicating the existing (2006 Local Plan) boundaries (shown as blue dotted lines) and the proposed new boundaries (shown as solid blue lines).

In response to concerns about whether Policy CP17 should be strengthened following recent flooding incidents, the Head of Strategic Planning advised it was not possible to change policies within LPP1. In addition, he emphasised Government advice in this area had not changed and the Environment Agency had commented that CP17 was a strong policy regarding flooding.

Appendix B – Bishops Waltham

During public participation, Robert Shields (Bishops Waltham Parish Council) addressed the Committee and, in summary, stated that there were no major issues of concern regarding the intended sites. As site development plans came forward, the County Council would be requested to address traffic issues along the B2177. He thanked the Strategic Planning Team for their help through the LPP2 process.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that as part of the LPP2 process, a full assessment of different categories of open space had been undertaken. Allotment allocations had not been included within Bishops Waltham as this study had not indicated any deficiency of allotment space in the area.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that some inconsistency of approach to whether or not a master plan was required had been found and this would be addressed. The intention was for a masterplan, establishing key development principles, to be required for larger housing developments (over 100 dwellings) or more complex mixed use developments.

Appendix C – Colden Common

Four people spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Richard Osborn (Pro Vision, agent for Bargate Homes) spoke in support of two alternative sites promoted by Bargate Homes at Main Road and Lower Moors Road as the most sustainable option with no objections from any statutory consultees or many members of the public. He emphasised that Bargate Homes had engaged with the local community at an early stage and that both sites could deliver the housing numbers required. In his opinion, the Sandyfields site could not deliver the number of houses required and should be rejected in favour of the Bargate sites. Richard Cutler (Bloombridge Development Partners) stated they had an option on land at Church Lane and agreed with the previous speaker that the Sandyfields site be rejected. He emphasised it was adjacent to SDNP and queried whether meaningful engagement with the Park authority had been undertaken. He believed the Church Lane site was preferable as it was closer to the school and that the Sandyfields site would require children to walk further to school along the Main Road. He queried why the proposal was for 165 dwellings on the Sandyfields site, rather than the 120 originally proposed.

Steve Carrington (Foreman Homes Group) spoke in support of the Sandyfields site which was the preferred option locally. He confirmed that the number of units was deliverable, it would provide public access into woodland, there are few public views into the site, the access is already in place and arrangements for its improvement are proposed.

Margaret Hill (Colden Common Parish Council) emphasised that the proposed sites in LPP2 had resulted from extensive consultation with local residents who had expressed a clear preference for the Sandyfields site. She added that site 1874 (land east of Highbridge Road) was the site least favoured by local residents.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Izard addressed the Committee as a local Ward councillor and Chairman of the Parish Council in support of the proposals in the Appendix. He also emphasised the local consultation on the alternative sites that had taken place and that Sandyfield had been the most favoured site. He thanked officers for adjustments made to the settlement boundary at Main Road and queried how changes had come about along Church Lane and whether it was possible to make further minor adjustments to settlement boundaries?

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that some realignment of the boundary along Church Lane to the east of Nobbs Crook was proposed so as to be consistent with the principles in the Settlement Boundary Review regarding the inclusion or otherwise of rear gardens.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that more housing had been allocated to the Sandyfields site following discussions with the potential developer. The view was taken that if additional numbers could be allocated to this site it would not be necessary to allocate site 2494 (one of the Bargate greenfield sites) to meet the numbers required. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that SDNP had been consulted at an early stage and had supported the draft Local Plan proposals. It was acknowledged that there had been delays with the planning application for the Sandyfields site, but in terms of LPP2 Officers were satisfied that the whole area covered by Policy CC1 (some of which was outside the control of Foreman Homes) could accommodate 165 dwellings.

The Committee requested that Policy CC1 be amended to include a requirement for a masterplan. This was agreed.

Appendix D – Kings Worthy

The Head of Strategic Planning reported that three sites were shortlisted for public consultation in Kings Worthy which were all fairly evenly balanced in terms of their respective merits. However, on balance and having regard to the views of the public and Parish Council it was concluded that the Lovedon Lane site should be selected in the draft Local Plan and this remained the officers' recommendation.

He highlighted that Paragraph 52 of Appendix D should have recommend inclusion of reference to a Groundwater Protection Zone within the Policy itself, rather than the explanatory text (the revised policy does include this change).

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that a recent development at Hookpit Farm Lane had been permitted as a rural exception site. Exception sites were not able to be included within housing numbers under Policy CP4. 25 units had already been developed in this area, with an application for a further 25 units to be considered at Planning Committee on 17 September 2015. The Committee noted that an application for development at Lovedon Lane was also due to be considered at the same Planning Committee meeting.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that the Lovedon Lane site was sensitive in terms of landscape, but the setting of Kings Worthy meant this was the case for any sites around its outskirts. Landscape setting was only one criteria used in selecting sites and he confirmed that, although it was finely balanced, the Lovedon Lane site was considered to be the preferred site under the LPP2.

Appendix E – Swanmore

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the site area proposed in Policy SW2 was approximately 0.2 hectares and it could therefore only accommodate approximately 5 dwellings. Policies aimed at retaining the character of the area would prevent a significantly larger number of dwellings being approved.

Members commented that the numbering used in Policies was confusing and should be clarified throughout (e.g. by referring to 'former' Policy SW1).

The Committee asked whether the wording of new Policy SW1 should be strengthened to acknowledge that the area did flood. In response to questions about the suitability of such land for development, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Environment Agency had not raised any objections, and the Plan already referred to drainage requirements.

Appendix F – Waltham Chase

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that a number of sites had come forward as alternatives to the preferred site. In particular he referred to

Savills' promotion of Van Diemens field which had initially been assessed as part of a larger area with regard to its potential to meet housing requirements and had been rejected. Subsequently Savills had put forward a smaller site, submitted after all the site assessment work had been completed. This had been assessed but the conclusion remained that it would not be a more suitable site than those proposed for allocation. The Head of Strategic Planning stated that he believed that the Parish Council remained in favour of the sites as set out.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the consultation on housing allocations had been Parish Council led and the results favoured splitting development up onto smaller sites. To achieve this, it was recognised that site allocations would encroach into gaps and there had not been any objections from Swanmore Parish Council regarding this.

With regard to policy WC3, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that site constraints had limited the scale of development being proposed.

Following some concerns raised by Members, it was agreed that Policy WC4 be amended to clarify that both sites should provide their own open space and infrastructure elements.

Appendix G – Wickham

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the decision as to site allocation had been finely balanced between a number of sites. However, local consultation had indicated a wish for development to be spread around a number of smaller sites if possible.

A traffic study had been commissioned on the impact along the whole corridor between Wickham and Twyford and this had included the impact of the Welbourne development and other proposed developments within Eastleigh Borough Council area. This had concluded there was sufficient capacity generally, although some junctions would require improvements as they would reach capacity by 2031. References to off-site contributions were proposed in the Winchester Road site allocation to enable this.

The Head of Strategic Planning also drew the Committee's attention to revisions to Policy WK1 regarding drainage and flooding to reflect the conclusions of the Wickham Flood Investigation Report.

Three people spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Anton Hanney (Wickham Residents' Association & Wickham Society) expressed concern about the impact of the development proposals on Wickham and in particular about the impact on traffic. He disputed the results of the traffic study, especially regarding the significant impact of the Welbourne development which he believed would result in large increases of traffic travelling through the village. He welcomed the proposed amendments to not permit new development until the drainage plan had been approved. Michael Carter (Wickham Society) spoke in support of the Mill Lane site rather than the proposed site at The Glebe. He stated that Mill Lane was closer to important facilities, such as the school and doctors' surgery whereas The Glebe was further away and would necessitate crossing the A32. Mill Lane could be connected to cycle paths and remove the need to use the A334.

Sarah Foster (Bloor Homes – Mill Lane site) did not agree with the conclusions of the report in relation to Wickham and distributed plans to the Committee. She believed that the Council had overly relied on the views of the Parish Council and that Mill Lane should be the preferred site as it was not separated from Wickham by the A32. The developers could provide a large area of public space dedicated to the parish council, allotments, a mixture of housing types and 40% affordable housing.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that although the above speakers had concentrated on accessibility to the school, etc., this was only one factor which had been considered. Pedestrian crossings would have to be provided for The Glebe site, which could also benefit existing residents. He also highlighted that the views of the Parish Council had been taken into account.

He acknowledged the scepticism regarding the traffic study but emphasised that this had been challenged at the Welbourne Local Plan examination and was stated to be the best evidence available and accepted by the Inspector for that Plan.

As a member of Wickham Parish Council and the Plan Steering Group, Councillor Evans highlighted that the proposals were supported by 60% of respondents. She highlighted that during the LPP1 process, Wickham had opposed the allocation of 250 homes but this had been a requirement introduced by the Inspector in order to meet affordable housing needs. She welcomed that Bloor Homes had kept the local community informed about their alternative proposals and also acknowledged the views of the Wickham Society. She agreed with comments made regarding the underestimation of the impact on traffic within the study.

During discussion of Policy WK1 there was some concern expressed that the wording should be strengthened to prevent development before the DAP was completed. The Corporate Director emphasised that it was important not to be overly restrictive in the wording as development might be necessary to help provide the infrastructure improvements required. It was agreed that amended wording be agreed by the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Chairman.

With regard to WK2, it was agreed that wording be included under "nature and phasing" to clarify the requirement for sports pitches, a pavilion and parking, and that the requirement for a masterplan also be added.

Appendix H – Denmead

The Committee noted the contents of Appendix H.

Appendix I – Smaller Villages and rural area

Eleanor Bell (Hursley Parish Council) spoke during public participation and in summary highlighted that although Hursley was designated as a settlement under MRTA3, the parish boundary stretched to the outskirts of Winchester, at Pitt roundabout. However, as Pitt village was not a designated settlement it did not have the protection of a gap around it and she believed the area between Winchester and Pitt village was therefore more vulnerable to speculative development.

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that Mrs Bell had promoted this gap for inclusion within LPP1, but as it was not agreed, it could not be introduced at the LPP2 stage. However, he emphasised that the area referred to was covered by countryside policies which offered a reasonable level of protection.

Appendix J – South Hampshire Urban Area

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the County Council had now agreed there was justification for a Botley by-pass and it was likely to be deliverable and, on this basis, the route was proposed for safeguarding within a new Policy.

<u>Appendix K – Chapter 7 – Implementation and Monitoring</u> <u>Appendix L – Habitat Regulations Assessment Scoping Report Summary</u>

The Committee noted the contents of Appendices K and L.

The Committee noted that during the meeting, a number of changes to the Appendices had been requested as detailed above and summarised below:

- Policy CC1 (Appendix C) insertion of requirement for a master plan;
- Policy WC4 (Appendix F) change to clarify require open space and infrastructure on each site;
- Policy WK1 (Appendix G) reword to reflect concerns regarding preventing development until flooding issues had been addressed and to refer to a multi-agency strategy throughout
- Policy WK2 (Appendix G) amend to include requirements for sports provision and the requirement for a master plan.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses to the representations, as set out in the attached papers, together with the outcome of the further evidence studies, be noted and taken into account in considering the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management and Site Allocations.

2. That subject to changes detailed above, the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, as recommended in Appendices A to L of this report, be approved for submission to full Council.

3. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to update the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying documents prior to presentation to the Council and publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

4. That it be noted that at the next meeting of the Committee, it will be asked to consider the following recommendations to full Council:

"To Council:

5. That the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations be approved for Publication (Pre-submission) and subsequent Submission to the Secretary of State, together with supporting documents including the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

6. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to submit the Plan and accompanying documents to the Secretary of State following the publication period, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

7. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to make editorial amendments to the Local Plan and accompanying documents prior to submission to the Secretary of State, to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

8. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment /Leader, be authorised to make proposed changes to the Plan before, during and after the public examination process, in order to respond to matters raised through the consultation and examination process.

9. That approval be given to appoint a Programme Officer and undertake other work as necessary to prepare for and undertake the public examination (including agreeing to meet the Planning Inspectorate's fees), provided this is within the allocated Local Plan budget/Reserve."

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 11.55am and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.15pm.

CAB2721(LP) FOR DECISION WARD(S): ALL

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

6 October 2015

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Linda Jewell Tel: (01962) 848086 ljewell@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB2429(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Launch and Next Steps – Cabinet (LDF) Committee 17 December 2012

CAB2530(LDF) Local Plan Part 2 Update Report – Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 27 Nov 2013

CAB2615 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, publication and consultation - 22 September 2014

CAB2656(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, update following consultation - 9 February 2015

CAB2670(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses - 12 March 2015

CAB2676(LP) Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, feedback on consultation responses - 30 March 2015

CAB2711(LP) Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, approval of Plan for Publication - 16 September 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall strategic planning framework and development requirements are set out in Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (LPP1). The Local Plan Part 2 -Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) complements the LPP1 by allocating sites for development and providing detailed development management policies to replace the remaining policies saved from the Local Plan Review 2006. The LPP2 forms part of the 'Development Plan' for the District outside of the South Downs National Park. This report follows on from that presented to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September 2015. It should therefore be read in conjunction with that report which summarised the process followed in preparing the LPP2 and the outcome of further work and supporting evidence studies commissioned to assist consideration of the representations made on the Draft Plan. Following from the further evidence reports, liaison with a number of respondents, key agencies and Parish Councils, responses to the representations, and changes to the Plan where needed, are now set out for New Alresford, Winchester Town and the Development Management policies. Appendices M-O to this report summarise the representations and explain the reasons for the recommended changes to the Plan text, policies and maps as shown in the appendices.

The report (at recommendation 4 below) also sets out the recommendations to full Council that the Committee is asked to make at this meeting, at the end of its deliberations on various sections of the Plan. It should be noted that the debate on Chapters 1 and 2 Introduction & Background and Meeting Development, most of Chapter 4 Market Towns and Rural Area (parts for the settlements of Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham, the Smaller Villages and Rural Area of the Plan), Chapter 5 South Hampshire Urban Areas, Chapter 7 Implementation and Monitoring took place at the meeting on 16 September 2015 and will not be subject to further discussion on the 6 October (other than any outstanding matters that are referred to in this report).

This report also sets out the next steps needed to publicise the revised Plan before it is submitted for independent examination. The Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee is asked to agree the responses and to recommend to the Council that the Plan, as amended, be published for the statutory period for representations on its 'soundness', prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination.

Any changes to the text of the revised Plan, agreed by the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee, will be incorporated in an updated version of the Plan and circulated to all Members for the full Council meeting on 21 October 2015. All tracked changes in this draft final version will be removed for ease of reading.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 That the responses to the representations, as set out in the attached papers, together with the outcome of the further evidence studies, be noted and taken into account in considering the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations.
- 2 That subject to any changes made at the meeting, the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, as recommended in Appendices M to Q of this report, be approved for submission to full Council.
- 3 That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to update the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying

documents prior to presentation to the Council and publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

4 That the following be recommended to full Council:

"To Council:

5 That the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations be approved for Publication (Pre-Submission) and subsequent Submission to the Secretary of State, together with supporting documents including the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

6 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to submit the Plan and accompanying documents to the Secretary of State following the publication period, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

7 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, be authorised to make editorial amendments to the Local Plan and accompanying documents prior to submission to the Secretary of State, to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

8 That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment /Leader, be authorised to make proposed changes to the Plan before, during and after the public examination process, in order to respond to matters raised through the consultation and examination process.

9 That approval be given to appoint a Programme Officer and undertake other work as necessary to prepare for and undertake the public examination (including agreeing to meet the Planning Inspectorate's fees), provided this is within the allocated Local Plan budget/Reserve."

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

6 OCTOBER 2015

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

DETAIL

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report seeks approval for the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations, to be recommended to the Council for publication for representations on 'soundness' prior to submission for examination. This is a 'formal' stage of local plan preparation as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) complements the LPP1 by allocating sites for development and providing detailed development management policies to replace the remaining policies saved from the Local Plan Review 2006. The LPP2 forms part of the 'Development Plan' for the District outside of the South Downs National Park, but it should be noted that the saved policies from the Local Plan Review 2006 will remain in force for the National Park part of the District until the National Park Authority adopts its own local plan.
- 1.2 Following the period for consultation on the Draft LPP2, which took place from 24 October to 5 December 2014, this Committee received an update report and initial feedback on matters raised during the consultation at its meeting on 9 February 2015 (CAB2656(LP) refers). At its meeting on 12 March (CAB 2670(LP) refers), comments received in relation to Colden Common, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham and South Hampshire Urban Areas were considered and the meeting on 30 March (CAB2676(LP) refers) considered comments in relation to Winchester Town, Bishop's Waltham, New Alresford, Denmead, smaller villages and the rural area, development management policies, Chapters 1 & 2, general comments and those on the maps, appendices, sustainability appraisal, implementation and monitoring.
- 1.3 Many representations related to the site allocations; suggesting alternative sites for development and/or changes to settlement boundaries, or raising issues with the proposed allocations or policy wording. The Committee agreed that those comments would require further work to assess the matters raised in detail and to seek further advice as necessary, and for officers to report back to future meetings. This work is now completed and the results for Winchester, New Alresford and the Development Management Policies are set out in the reports attached as Appendices M-O to this paper (the meeting of this Committee on 16 September considered all other parts of the Local Plan, CAB2711(LP) refers).

- 1.4 Also attached within appendices M-O are the revised chapters of the Plan and Policies Map insets, indicating the changes that are recommended following further work. *NB Members may find it helpful to compare these with the Consultation Draft version of the Plan and are advised to bring their copy to the meeting.*
- 1.5 The Plan is supported by a considerable number of background reports and studies which have been updated and supplemented where further evidence is necessary to respond to the issues raised in the representations. Most of these were reported to the last meeting on 16 September (CAB2711(LP) refers). The housing supply data is updated to take account of the completions and permissions as at 31 March 2015 and the latest position regarding the deliverability of other available sites within the settlement boundaries. At the time of the meeting on 16 September the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was being finalised and it was indicated that there may be minor changes to the housing data tables within the settlement chapters of the Plan for the market towns and larger villages considered at the last meeting. In fact no changes need to be made to the housing supply tables in the appendices considered at the last meeting as a result of the updated SHLAA, which together with other the supporting documents is published on the Council's website.
- 1.6 The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (and Strategic Environmental Assessment), which has been updated to take account of amendments recommended to policies, and also a Habitats Regulations Assessment Scoping Report. These assessments are important requirements which Members should take into account in considering the revised Plan and can be viewed here: <u>http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/</u>
- 1.7 Following the formal publication period for representations the Plan, together with supporting documents, will be submitted for independent examination. Council will, therefore, also be recommended to give delegated authority for officers, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to submit the Plan for examination, to draft modifications to suggest minor changes if necessary in response to representations, and to respond to queries and draft modifications to assist the examination Inspector where necessary.
- 1.8 At the meeting of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September 2015 consideration was given to references in some site allocation policies of the need for a masterplan to indicate the disposition of land uses, where larger sites include mixed uses, are complex in nature or have mixed ownership. For consistency, proposed revised policy wording is attached at Appendix P. It is proposed that this will be incorporated within relevant site allocation polices (BW3, BW4, BW5, CC1, KW1, NA2, NA3, SW1, WC1, WK2, WK3), modified as necessary to reflect any specific requirements for the site concerned.

2 The Local Plan Process, Supporting Documents and Evidence Base

- 2.1 Previous reports in March 2015 (CAB2530(LDF) and CAB2615) refer to the extensive work that has been undertaken with local communities, particularly in identifying the sites to meet the development requirements of the larger villages and the involvement of the Town and Parish Councils, also the work on the Winchester Town area including the Town Forum and residents. The details of this, including the many and varied events that have been held to involve the local communities, are set out in the Consultation Statement (Parts 1 and 2) which is published on the Council's website: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-2/
- 2.2 The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (and Strategic Environmental Assessment), the purpose of which was reported to the last meeting. The SA update indicates that the changes proposed in the Appendices to this report do not significantly affect the findings of the previous SA on the draft Plan.
- 2.3 The Plan is also accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report. Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive an 'appropriate assessment' is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site, either individually or in combination with other projects. The Screening Report concludes that none of the policies/allocations in the Local Plan Part 2 are likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in combination, on the identified European sites; therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required. The HRA Scoping Report Update, as reported to the meeting on 16 September (Appendix L to CAB2711(LP) refers), considered the proposed changes, deletions and additions to the Plan and found that overall they do not significantly affect the findings of the previous HRA work. A further update for the new and amended policies for New Alresford, Winchester and Development Management also found that an Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 2.4 It should be noted that, as the LPP1 sets out the requirements in terms of the housing numbers that need to be met by the LPP2, it has not been necessary to undertake any further assessment of housing needs for the LPP2. The SHLAA considers the suitability of the sites that have been promoted for housing development to meet those needs, setting out those that are deliverable and developable (available and viable now or within the lifetime of the Plan). These were assessed in developing the draft Local Plan and the appendices to this report include updated evaluations of the sites proposed as allocations in the larger villages and others that have been put forward by their promoters ('omission' sites).
- 2.5 The Local Plan evidence base is already extensive and continues to be expanded and refined to provide updates and is supplemented by new reports to address matters raised through the representations. A full list of the key background documents and evidence studies was included within Appendix C of the draft Local Plan. A number of additional studies which have since been commissioned to support the recent revisions to the Plan were reported to the

meeting on 16 September (CAB2711(LP) refers). Mention is made here of the reports that serve as further evidence in support of the specific sections of the Plan that are to be considered on 6 October.

- 2.6 One of the 'tests of soundness' of the Local Plan is that it should be 'effective', including that the sites allocated for development are deliverable. In order to confirm the viability of the site allocations, 'light touch' viability studies have been undertaken. These have been produced for sites which have not been subject to planning applications or requests for pre-application advice where these proposals have been put forward they have helped to confirm the viability of the sites involved and interest in developing them. Some of the studies have been undertaken by external consultants and others by the Council's Estates Team. The outcome of these studies has been taken into account in considering policy revisions and summaries of the studies regarding The Dean and Sun Lane sites at New Alresford are appended to the report at Appendix N.
- 2.7 The LPP2 pages of the Council's website contain sections for each of the larger settlements with various studies, assessments and reports that were used to determine the requirements and proposed site allocations for each settlement. The Transport Assessment for New Alresford has been updated and the consultants SYSTRA were commissioned to undertake a study to assess the allocation and omission sites proposed for the Local Plan, to undertake a comparison with the alternative strategy proposed by the Alresford Professional Group, and to identify the relevant transport impacts of each. This includes traffic impact comparisons, i.e. forecast traffic increases on routes and junctions in and around the town and also takes account of transport sustainability in terms of distances to schools, local facilities and bus routes. The study also included an appraisal of the need for and feasibility of building a new junction with the A31 for the site at Sun Lane, concluding that viable options exist to accommodate a new access to the A31.
- 2.8 The Winnall Planning Framework was commissioned (in association with Hampshire County Council) from Parsons Brinkerhoff; two rounds of community engagement events, together with on-line opportunities to comment, were held during early 2015. While the Framework Plan remains in draft, with the final version expected to be published for consideration by the Cabinet. The consultation outcome and draft report has nonetheless informed the drafting of a new policy for Winnall in the Winchester Chapter. The report relating to Winchester (Appendix M) includes a Winnall Planning Framework Note that sets out the planning justification for the new policy proposed (WIN11).
- 2.9 The overall conclusion of the study "Specialist Housing for Older People in Winchester District", as reported to the last meeting on 16 September is that sufficient flexibility for developers to bring forward specialist housing for older people, including extra care schemes, already exists within LPP1 and LPP2. Indeed, greater flexibility for provision of all types of residential accommodation can best be maintained by keeping housing allocations non-specific with regard to residential use classes.

- 2.10 The study "Standards in New Homes in Winchester District", referred to at the last meeting, assesses the need to adopt the new national technical standards in relation to space and accessibility within new build homes. The study found evidence from the scale and growth of the older population to indicate a need for about 20% of the housing stock to be accessible and adaptable in the future and that the vast majority of homes on the market (new properties and existing stock) already meet the national minimum space standards, although there is a case for applying minimum standards to affordable housing and small flats. The study has informed the Development Management policies, so is addressed in Appendix O to this report.
- 2.11 The Open Space Strategy 2014 has been reviewed in the light of representations received, in particular in relation to Policy DM5 Protecting Open Areas, and changes are noted in the next section covering the changes proposed to the policy. As a result of finalising the Strategy some of the Policies Map Inset Maps for the settlements included with the appendices to the report of 16 September, which show the locations to which Policy DM5 applies, need updating and these are set out at Appendix Q Bishop's Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead, and Kings Worthy.
- 2.12 The study to identify sites for permanent pitches for Travellers within the Winchester District, to meet the requirements identified in the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013), is being undertaken jointly with the South Downs National Park Authority and East Hampshire District Council. The Study has not been completed in time for sites to be included in the LPP2, as these must also be subject to consultation and sustainability appraisal. In addition, the Government issued a revised 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' on 31 August 2015, including a change to the definition of gypsies and travellers for the purposes of planning policy. The implications of this change require further consideration, but it appears they will require reconsideration of the level of need for traveller pitches. So that the LPP2 can progress to examination without further delay it is recommended that a separate development plan document (DPD) be prepared to cover this issue. Details are included in the revised 'Local Development Scheme' which is reported as a separate item on this meeting's agenda.

3 <u>Content of LPP2, key matters raised and changes made to the Plan</u>

- 3.1 **Chapter 3 Winchester Town**. This Chapter sets out the proposed development strategy for Winchester, based on the Vision for Winchester and the spatial strategy in Local Plan Part 1. It needs to be read in conjunction with LPP1, which contains the spatial strategy for Winchester and the strategic allocations of Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp. It refers to, but does not repeat, the content of LPP1, so does not aim to be a comprehensive 'plan' for Winchester. Its policies deal mainly with adding detail to the policies for Winchester in LPP1, or setting out site-specific policies and allocations.
- 3.2 Comments were received on all of the policies and some changes are proposed, follows:

- Policies WIN1 and WIN2 on the vision for the town generally, and the town centre particularly, are proposed to be strengthened with regard to the references to economic prosperity, creativity and culture, promotion of the town centre, and heritage.
- Policy WIN3 on views and roofscape is proposed to be edited to be more comprehensive.
- Policy WIN4 Silver Hill is proposed to be amended so that it provides the necessary guidance to ensure the implementation of a high quality scheme.
- Policy WIN5 Station Approach Area is proposed to be amended to add cultural uses to the range of use classes specified, to include reference to a landscape framework, and to clarify all those issues that will need to be addressed through the preparation of development proposals covered by the policy
- Policy WIN6 Carfax an additional bullet point is proposed to be inserted on the need to retain key buildings and spaces, and to respect the scale of adjacent properties.
- Policy WIN7 Cattlemarket further references in the supporting text to the archaeological interest of the site are recommended, Policy WIN8 – Stanmore - changes are proposed to the policy and the supporting text to clarify the status of the Stanmore Planning Framework.
- Policy WIN9 Abbotts Barton changes to the policy and its supporting text are recommended to clarify the purpose and status of the Abbotts Barton Planning Framework and that the policy is renumbered WIN10).
- Policy WIN10 Houses in Multiple Occupation no changes but it is recommended that the policy and text follows after the Stanmore policy and is renumbered WIN9.
- Policy WIN11 Winnall following community engagement and the preparation of a draft planning framework for Winnall a new policy with supporting text is recommended.
- 3.3 Representations were also received on the scale and location of housing at Winchester, including some omission sites being promoted by developers and landowners. The updated table setting out the various components of housing supply to meet the outstanding requirements taking account of provision within the LPP1 confirms that no further site allocations outside of the settlement boundary are needed. This is explained, together with the issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section for Winchester in **Appendix M**.
- 3.4 **Chapter 4 Market Towns and Rural Area.** This Chapter deals primarily with the site allocations at the market towns and larger villages to meet the housing targets set in LPP1 (Policy MTRA2). Each of the 8 larger rural settlements has a separate section in the LPP2. All were considered at the meeting on 16 September ((CAB2711(LP) and Appendices B-I refer) except for New Alresford which is for consideration on 6 October. Some formatting changes have also been made to Chapter 4, with the explanatory text being moved to precede the relevant policy for consistency, and the background details of the evolution of policies removed as this is explained in the Plan's supporting documents.

- 3.3 **New Alresford** – The assessment of the capacity for housing within Alresford's settlement boundary and ben updated and wo housing sites are proposed (400 dwellings total) as site allocations. One is on the edge of the centre at The Dean (about 75 dwellings) through the relocation/redevelopment of an employment area for mixed uses, and the other is a large site at Sun Lane comprising housing (about 325 dwellings), open space and employment allocations to the east of the settlement. A policy is also included to safeguard the existing town centre car parks from development, as these sites are leased and there is concern about their loss given their importance to Alresford's commercial centre. The large 'Sun Lane' site has proved very controversial throughout the Plan preparation period with a competing 'alternative plan' for a range of smaller sites being proposed through representations by the Alresford Professional Group. Following consideration of this and other representations. and in the light of the outcome of further studies on viability, transport and access, the proposed Local Plan allocations are still considered to be the best way to provide for development needs, as the most suitable, viable and deliverable option.
- 3.4 Recommended changes include the following:
 - Policy NA1 on car park provision is proposed to be amended to allow for development essential to the operation of Alresford Station or Perins and to specify the range of spaces (50-100) to be provided in association with the redevelopment at The Dean or other suitable locations.
 - Policy NA2 The Dean housing allocation is proposed to be amended to include a requirement for a masterplan and be more flexible and less prescriptive with regard to the need for the inclusion of employment uses, following consultation with existing businesses and advice regarding viability. Requirements are also proposed in relation to contamination and drainage.
 - Policy NA3 Sun Lane This policy allocating a substantial area for public open space and other green infrastructure alongside housing and employment uses is largely unchanged from that in the draft Plan, other than revising the requirements for a masterplan, adding a requirement to provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network and reference to the Groundwater Protection Zone..
- 3.5 The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section for New Alresford are set out in full at **Appendix N.**
- 3.6 **Chapter 6 Development Management**. This Chapter contains various policies which it is recommended should provide the future basis for determining planning applications. It is important to note that these are not the only policies that may apply as the LPP1 also contains various development management policies (hence the highlighted box which stresses the need to take account of all relevant policies). The policies are grouped by the 3 Community Strategy themes, in the same way as LPP1, as follows:
- 3.7 **Active Communities** various key policies are already contained in LPP1 (e.g. the proportion of affordable housing required, open space standards,

criteria for travellers' sites, etc), but there is also a need to cover other development management issues or to provide more detailed guidance on some matters covered in LPP1. For example, policy DM2 covers dwelling sizes in more detail than policy CP2 in LPP1. Policy DM4 sets a target for pitches for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople; although work by consultants to assess potential sites remains on-going therefore site allocations will need to be determined through a separate development plan document. Policies DM5 and DM6 carry forward the protection of important open spaces and provide more detail of requirements for open space provision on development sites.

- 3.8 **Prosperous Economy** LPP1 contains three policies under this heading, on employment development, loss of employment sites and transport. There is a need to cover some matters in more detail in order to replace current 'saved' policies, so the draft LPP2 therefore contains a number of policies under the prosperous economy heading. Town centre policies DM7-DM9 largely replace policies of the 2006 Local Plan, having regard to current Government advice and the updated Retail Study. Various types of development related to the rural economy are covered in policies DM10-DM13, including replacement dwellings, agricultural workers' housing, equestrian development, and leisure/recreation development. These largely replace policies in the 2006 Local Plan, while combining some matters to reduce the number of policies and cover some issues in more detail where necessary.
- 3.9 **High Quality Environment** the LPP1 policies on this theme cover broad aspects of the environment, such as renewable energy, biodiversity and flooding. There is also a need for more detailed development management policies to provide guidance and requirements regarding matters such as design, landscape and heritage. Design and access issues are dealt with by policies DM14-DM18, covering masterplans for large landholdings, local distinctiveness, site design criteria, development principles, and access/parking. Environmental protection policies DM19-DM22 cover pollution, noise, contaminated land and utilities carrying forward similar policies from the 2006 Local Plan Review. Policies DM23-DM24 cover landscape and trees and Policies DM25-DM34 relate to various heritage aspects and replace the series of historic environment policies in the 2006 Local Plan. Policy DM31 provides the basis for the development of a 'local list' of heritage assets.
- 3.10 The most significant changes recommended from the Draft Plan relate to the Active Communities policies. These and some other more minor changes are summarised as follows:
 - Policy DM2 Dwelling Sizes amendments are proposed to the policy and supporting text resulting from new national technical standards, including internal space, accessibility and adaptability, and the requirement to justify the adoption of such standards. The study "Standards in New Homes in Winchester District" provides some evidence to apply minimum space standards and to adopt the nationally described space standards for affordable dwellings.
 - Policy DM4 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is proposed to be deleted as the proposed allocation at Ashbrook Stables, Colden

Common is no longer available and the overall need for pitches will have to be re-assessed following changes to the definition of travellers. The explanatory text refers to the proposed new DPD on gypsies and travellers.

- Policy DM5 Protecting Open Areas Changes to the explanatory text are proposed to clarify the reason for the protection of some open spaces within settlement boundaries, even though they may not be publicly accessible (because they make a substantial contribution to the character, visual amenity and appearance of the locality) in accordance with the assessment in the updated Open Space Strategy. The updated Strategy also indicates that Protected Open Areas need only apply to sites within the settlement boundaries, as these are the most valuable but vulnerable sites (because of the presumption in favour of development within defined settlement boundaries). As countryside policies will protect important open space, sports and recreation sites where they lie outside the settlement boundary and in the countryside, consequential changes are proposed to remove DM5 notation from such sites on the Policies Map.
- Policy DM7 Town, District and Local Centres Changes to the explanatory text and policy are proposed to clarify the definition of town centre uses.
- Policy DM16 Site Design Criteria The text accompanying the policy is amended to refer to the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted by the Cabinet on 18 March 2015 (CAB2669 refers).
- Policy DM17 Site Development Principles Proposed addition to policy seeking high speed broadband connection to new residential and business properties.
- Policy DM18 Access and Parking Proposed changes to refer to "relevant standards" and cycle parking.
- Policy DM28 Demolition in Conservation Areas Additional criterion proposed to ensure that redevelopment would enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area.
- Policy DM29 Heritage Assets Changes to the explanatory text and policy are proposed to strengthen the policy with regard to the loss of heritage assets.
- Policy DM31 Proposed changes to remove the criteria for local listing from the policy as these are set out in the Appendix to the Plan.
- 3.11 The issues raised by the representations, the responses to them and the revised section for Development Management are set out in **Appendix O**.
- 3.12 **Maps.** The Plan must be accompanied by a 'Policies Map' which shows on an Ordnance Survey map base where the policies apply. The Policies Map consists of an overall District map with inset maps at a larger scale for those settlements with settlement boundaries. At this stage it is also helpful to indicate how the adoption of the LPP2 will make changes (deletions and additions) to the existing Policies Map and these are illustrated by the inset maps attached to each of the settlement reports (Appendices M and N below). In finalising the Open Space Strategy some corrections have been identified relating to areas subject to policy DM5 for the Inset Maps already considered

by this Committee on 16th September (for Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy). It is recommended that the revised Inset Maps at Appendix Q be approved to replace those agreed at the last meeting.

- 4 <u>Next Steps</u>
- 4.1 The Development Plan Regulations require that before submitting a Plan to the Secretary of State the local planning authority (LPA) must make a copy of the Plan and other supporting documents available for inspection and invite representations for a period of not less than 6 weeks. Subject to the agreement of the Council at a special meeting on 21 October, this period will commence as soon as practicable following the printing of final versions of documents and issuing of public notices and be concluded prior to the Christmas and New Year holidays. It is anticipated that the period for representations will run from Friday 6 November to Monday 21 December 2015.
- 4.2 The earlier stages of plan preparation included a considerable amount of public consultation on the proposals of the Plan and the wording of the policies. Representations made at the forthcoming stage must relate to whether they consider the Plan is legally compliant, sound and complies with the Duty to Cooperate. This is explained in guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate that will be made available along with the representation forms. Therefore the priority is to publicise the opportunity to make formal representations and there is no need for exhibitions or public meetings at this stage.
- 4.3 Legal compliance refers to matters of process and includes: whether the preparation of the Plan has followed the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme and the requirements of the Regulations; whether public consultation has generally accorded with the strategy for involving the community as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement and whether the policies of the plan reflect the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal; also that the Plan has had regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- 4.4 "Soundness" means that the Plan is:
 - Positively prepared based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 - Justified the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 - Effective deliverable and based on effective joint working on crossboundary strategic priorities;
 - Consistent with national policy delivers sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.5 The publication of the Plan will therefore be accompanied by a raft of documents that demonstrate this compliance and that the Plan is considered by the Council to be sound. Following the close of the period for representations

the Council must submit the Local Plan and supporting documents for examination, together with the representations received and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations.

- 4.6 As the Plan that is published for representations should be the one that the Council would expect to adopt, i.e. it should be the Council's final version of the Plan, there is no requirement to comment on the representations received and further changes to the Plan should not be necessary. However the statutory provisions allow for modifications to be made under certain circumstances provided they are subject to appropriate consultation and sustainability appraisal. These may be needed before the Plan is submitted for examination but are more likely to emerge during the course of the examination through discussion and debate at the hearings. Delegated authority is sought to enable officers to respond to these matters, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, as necessary. Formal approval would be sought for any significant modifications if the timescale of the examination allows for this.
- 4.7 Once the Plan is submitted for examination the Inspector will begin the examination by looking at legal compliance, and by reference to the representations will decide what matters he/she considers would merit discussion at hearing sessions. The Inspector will set the agenda for the hearings and who may be invited to participate in the round table debate led by the Inspector. Everyone who has made representations, including those who are not invited to participate at the hearing sessions (anyone can attend to hear the debates) are able to make written representations. This report therefore also seeks delegated authority for officers to submit the Plan for examination and to prepare for the examination, including any written statements, and to suggest changes to assist the Inspector.
- 4.8 The examination concludes when the Inspector submits their report to the Council. The time taken for this will depend on a number of factors including the need for any further evidence, the need for modifications and consultation on these and the need for a Pre-Hearing Meeting. A Pre-Hearing Meeting may be held to explain the procedures associated with the examination, but may not be needed if written explanatory notes of the process are considered sufficient.
- 4.9 Throughout the examination the arrangements for the hearings and all liaison with the Inspector is undertaken by a Programme Officer appointed by the Council but independent from the Council's officers. Authority is therefore sought for the appointment of the Programme Officer to carry out these tasks.
- 4.10 The Local Development Scheme refers to the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 being programmed for publication in June 2015, which was the original intention. Due to the need for further work, including the commissioning of additional evidence reports in order to fully consider and respond to the representations, that timetable has not been met. Although changes to the plan preparation timetable have been published on the Council's web site and in the Local Plan e-Newsletter, the Local Development Scheme must be revised to also include the timetable for a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations

development plan document (DPD). Following consideration of the implications of the revised 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', a separate report on the revised Local Development Scheme is included on the agenda for this meeting.

- 4.11 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies, and their degree of consistency with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Planning Practice Guidance that accompanies the NPPF states that refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination. However it indicates that there are circumstances where it might be justified, i.e. where the granting of planning permission may undermine the plan-making process by pre-determining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to the emerging local plan. Thus as the emerging Plan indicates the direction of travel and is more up to date with regard to consistency with the NPPF, especially where policies have little or no objection raised to them, the Plan can be regarded as a material consideration in decision making.
- 4.12 It is not possible to give a definitive guide as to how much weight the emerging Plan will have in comparison to saved policies or other guidance, so each case will need to be considered on its merits. Planning and legal officers will advise Planning Committee as appropriate, having regard to the stage of the process reached, the level of objection to particular policies, and other material considerations.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. <u>COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO)</u>

5.1 The Local Plan is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Community Strategy and implementing several aspects of Portfolio Plans. That the Plan has had regard to the Community Strategy is a requirement for legal compliance.

6. **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The key resources for undertaking work on LPP2 have been approved as part of the budget process, consisting primarily of an annual sum of £36,700 and an earmarked reserve which stood at £172,759 at 1 April 2015. This budget and earmarked reserve are used for ongoing consultancy requirements and ensuring resources are available to deal with major expenditure at key stages, e.g. examination which is estimated at up to £155,000 to include the Planning Inspectorate's fees and the appointment of the Programme Officer. This funding is expected to be adequate for the foreseeable future, subject to progress with LPP2, any changes in government requirements and the need to review plans.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 7.1 The steps undertaken in preparing the Plan have all been done with consideration for minimising the risks that the Plan may not pass examination or could be delayed in its adoption. This is to ensure that the development plan is up to date, that a five year supply of housing sites can be demonstrated and not put the Council at risk of development being determined through the appeal process. The Local Development Scheme sets out a more detailed risk assessment of the Local Plan Part 2.
- 7.2 The Government recently announced its intention to require that local plans are put in place quickly, so it is important that progress is maintained on adopting LPP2. The revised timetable for the LPP2, which envisages adoption of the Plan by November 2016, should avoid the risk of government intervention. While the threat by the government to arrange for a plan to be written where no local plan has been produced by 2017 is unclear, Winchester City Council has already adopted the LPP1 since the National Planning Policy Framework came into force. The LPP1 was considered by the Inspector at the Local Plan Examination to be compliant with the NPPF.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 8.1 None.
- 9. <u>APPENDICES</u>

Due to their size, the appendices have been attached for Cabinet and invited Councillors only, together with the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillors for the Wards covering the settlements listed in Appendices M and N have also been supplied with the Report and relevant appendix.

A complete copy is available in the Members' Library and can be viewed online: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/meetings/details/1489

- Appendix M Winchester
- Appendix N New Alresford
- Appendix O Development Management Policies
- Appendix P Proposed Revised Policy Wording for Site Allocations Where a Masterplan is Needed
- Appendix Q Policy Map Insets for Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy (illustrating revised DM5 notations)

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

6 October 2015

Attendance:

Committee Members:

Councillors:

Read (Chairman) (P)

Godfrey (P) Weston (P)

Pearson (P)

Other invited Councillors:

J Berry (P) Evans (P) Hutchison (P)* Ruffell (P) Tait (P)

*Councillor Hutchison in attendance for afternoon session only

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Simon Cook, Power, Rutter and Weir

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Achwal, Dibden and Thompson

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2015 be approved and adopted.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of the following items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

He also mentioned a possible disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Winchester College, if any Winchester College matters were to arise during the Committee's deliberations. However, no such matters arose during the Committee.

The Corporate Director advised that he was a resident of New Alresford but, as the proposals did not impact on him or his family personally, he did not have any interest to declare.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a trustee of WinACC. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Phil Gagg (WinACC) expressed concern that the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) would not be found sound or sustainable by the Inspector. He believed each of the 13 development areas would have major negative traffic effects and that the Council had ignored the recommendations of the MVA traffic reports. He also considered that the Council should introduce much stronger policies to tackle sustainable transport issues and Policy CP10 would not achieve this.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the sustainability appraisal was an iterative process and policies would continue to be refined to take account of its recommendations. With regard to transport, the development strategy was tested as part of the LPP1 process and found to be sound and LPP2 would put more detail on the strategy. The most sustainable locations had been allocated and where any issues were highlighted, a policy requirement had been created to address this.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Rutter stated that at the previous meeting, the Head of Strategic Planning had said that no community would have an exception site imposed upon it. However, this had occurred in Kings Worthy with the approval of the "Top Field" planning application at Planning Committee on 17 September 2015.

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that he had explained at the previous Local Plan Committee meeting that an exception site would not generally be imposed, but could be in certain circumstances, as had occurred recently in Kings Worthy.

Various questions and statements were also made on specific agenda items and are summarised under the relevant items below.

4. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2015**

(Report CAB2722(LP) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the key changes proposed were outlined in Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4 of the Report. One of these was the requirement for a separate Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), with subsequent cost implications involved in preparation. A minor correction to Paragraph 3.3 of the Local Development

Scheme (LDS) set out in Appendix 1 to the Report was noted to change the year 2011 to 2012.

The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the table on Page 3 of the LDS was not meant as a hierarchical depiction of different policy documents. There was no longer any requirement to list all Village Design Statements (VDSs) but they were referenced and a full list is available on the Council's website.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Gypsy and Traveller DPD would be a separate document, sitting alongside the LPP2. It was acknowledged that the requirement to show a five year supply of gypsy and traveller sites could leave the Council vulnerable to speculative development before the DPD was produced. However, sites would still be subject to LPP1 Policy CP5 and be required to meet the requirements of a planning application which would offer some protection.

In response to guestions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that LPP1 contained a policy requiring 40% affordable housing provision on all sites where this was viable, but there was no set numerical target for the number of affordable housing units required in the District. The Annual Monitoring Report would examine whether the policy requirement was being achieved.

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

RESOLVED:

That the revised Winchester District Local Development Scheme 2015, as set out in Appendix 1 to the Report, be approved and brought into immediate effect.

5. WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 (LPP2): DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS - APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

(Report CAB2721(LP) refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting about 15 members of the public. some of whom addressed the Committee on the appendices, as set out within the report. A summary of their comments are outlined under the relevant appendices below.

The Head of Strategic Planning introduced the Report and explained that this was the second of two meetings examining the responses to the LPP2 consultation (the first was held on 16 September 2015 and considered Report CAB2711(LP)). The purpose of the meetings was to recommend final changes to the Plan for approval at Council on 21 October 2015. If approved, it was aimed that the LPP2 be published on 6 November for a consultation period until 21 December 2015. The consultation would be on the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan and any comments received would be passed to the Local Plan Inspector for consideration, as part of the examination process.

There had been extensive consultation on the Draft LPP2 and the detail of this was set out in a separate consultation statement.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that Appendix P to the Report contained proposed revised policy wording for site allocations where a masterplan was required, as had been requested at the previous Committee meeting. This change had been incorporated within the proposals for New Alresford (Appendix N of the Report) but would need to be added to the policies listed in Appendix P.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that Appendix Q to the Report contained revised policy map insets for Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy which illustrated revised Policy DM5 notations. These revised maps replaced those previously issued with CAB2711(LP) and the DM5 revisions had been included within the maps for Winchester and New Alresford in CAB2721(LP).

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the proposed amendments to Policy WK1 requested at the previous meeting had been circulated to relevant Councillors for their comments and revised wording would be reported to Council on 21 October 2015 for approval.

The Committee then discussed each Appendix/settlement area, as contained in Appendices M to O of the Report (with Appendix N being considered first).

Appendix N – New Alresford

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that local community views on the proposals for New Alresford had been split between those supporting the strategy set out in LPP2 and an alternative proposal put forward by the Alresford Professional Group (APG). Careful consideration, further studies and investigations have been carried out on the alternatives and it has been concluded that the LPP2 proposal was the most suitable in planning terms and the most deliverable. These included an assessment that allocating the Dean Lane site for mainly employment use would not be viable and transport studies that determined provision of a new junction from the A31 was feasible.

The Chairman highlighted that a number of emails from local residents had been received by Committee Members and would be taken into consideration.

During public participation, six members of the public/local groups spoke and their comments are summarised below.

Jan Field (Chair of Alresford Society) spoke in support of the LPP2 proposals and the opportunities created for additional housing and new infrastructure, such as the new A31 junction. She believed these were in the best interest of the town overall and were deliverable, whereas the APG proposals did not include a credible evidence base and were not deliverable. She considered that the Strategic Planning Team had listened to the differing arguments and comprehensively built a strong evidence base in favour of the LPP2 proposals which now deserved support. Mark Luken (Luken Beck – Planning Consultant to Sun Lane landowners) also supported the proposals in the Appendix and believed it contained a very detailed and comprehensive report. Specifically he highlighted the following:

- Both options accepted that the Sun Lane site was a preferred location for future housing;
- Independent evidence was that the proposed site in NA3 was sound;
- Other alternatives failed to pass essential planning tests and were not sound.

Peter Pooley spoke as a resident of Alresford for 20 years and a former officer of the Alresford Society. He supported previous comments and highlighted the necessity to avoid future uncertainty and move forward with the proposals as contained in the Appendix.

Jonathan Cranfield (a Nursery Road resident) also spoke in support of the proposals in the Appendix and believed that there was a "silent majority" of residents who concurred with these views, despite a vocal opposition. In particular, he welcomed the proposals for increased open space land.

Brian Tippett spoke as a resident of Alresford for about 50 years and expressed concern that Appendix N was not an objective assessment. He did not believe the proposed new A31 junction would solve access problems to Sun Lane, particularly into the town centre. He highlighted the particular access difficulties to the north of Sun Lane.

Elizabeth Chard also spoke as an Alresford resident in support of the proposals in Appendix N as being deliverable and offering new housing, open space and access onto the A31. She also believed there could be provision for additional parking in The Dean.

At the invitation of the Chairman, local Ward Councillors Power and Simon Cook addressed the Committee and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Power supported all the proposals set out in the Appendix N, with the exception of the lack of a specific proposal for additional offices at The Dean. She believed there was a need for this and highlighted that the current unoccupied retail space in the town centre was in need of improvement. She also believed that there were discrepancies between the population figures used and the actual population growth in Alresford and surrounding villages.

Councillor Simon Cook stated that he preferred the alternative plan promoted by APG but believed that it had been produced too late to be accepted in time. He was not convinced that the proposed highways and access arrangements within the Appendix would work in practice and that the alternative sites could become subject to speculative development interest. However, in conclusion, he did not oppose the proposals because of the need for future certainty and to move forward.

The Head of Strategic Planning responded to the various questions and comments made, as summarised below:

- The Council had not predetermined the Sun Lane site but had carefully examined all the various comments and objections and he was convinced, on balance, that it offered the best solution;
- A transport report had been commissioned which had determined that the proposed new A31 junction was feasible;
- He accepted that access to the town centre from the Sun Lane site was not ideal, but this applied equally to the alternative proposals;
- Assessments had determined that introducing even a small amount of new employment use to The Dean had a significant negative impact on viability.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that Policy NA3 detailed the phasing of works expected regarding Sun Lane. The first stage would be provision of a new access from the A31 and once this was in place, the business area could be made available and only then could residential use be provided. Consideration was also being given to making Sun Lane no-entry above Nursey Road, but this level of detail would be determined through the planning application process. In response to questions regarding the detail of the new access to the A31, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Local Plan required the access to be suitable in transport terms and further detail would also be a matter for the planning application stage.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised the viability report contained on Page 81 of the Appendix, which indicated a very significant uplift in the current value of the Sun Lane land, after making allowance for the costs of the new junction, affordable housing, open space, etc, which should ensure its deliverability.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that there was potential and scope for office development within New Alresford. He also confirmed that the Perins School playing fields were proposed to remain outside of the development boundary. The alternative of the New Farm Road site put forward by APG was not considered to be as good in terms of the planning criteria as it was further from the town centre and local amenities, including primary schools and there were site access difficulties.

With regard to NA1, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Policy aimed to retain the existing two central car parks and provide additional parking, either at The Dean or another suitable location.

Appendix O – Development Management Policies

During public participation, Eleanor Bell spoke regarding the Open Space Strategy on Page 7 of the Appendix and in particular the statement that Sports England did not consider the Strategy to be a robust piece of work. She queried how the Council's open space and sports requirements would be met and whether the Council's policies were sufficiently robust.

In response, the Head of Strategic Planning noted that there might have been a degree of confusion between the Open Space Strategy and the Open Space Study undertaken in 2008. The Open Space Strategy had been considered by the Inspector as part of LPP1 and found to be sound. It was also highlighted that the revised maps set out in Appendix Q to the Report illustrated revised DM5 notations. It was proposed that DM5 should not apply outside settlement boundaries.

The Committee considered each of the proposed Policies DM1 to DM34 and the Head of Strategic Planning responded to detailed questions thereon. As a result of these discussions, a number of changes to Policies were proposed as outlined below.

Some concern was expressed about the effectiveness of Policy DM2 and DM3 in restricting development sizes as the size could often be increased after a property had been built. Concern was also expressed about the sometimes inadequate size of bedrooms in new builds and whether Policy DM2 adequately addressed this. The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that permitted development rights were extensive and this limited the Council's control after a property was built. However, one aim of Policy DM2 was to prevent the construction of new 2/3 bedroomed houses which were so large as to not meet the Council's housing mix requirements in LPP1 policy CP2. With regard to room size, the recommended policy DM2 stipulated that the Government's national space standards must be applied in full for all new affordable housing. In relation to market housing, only the minimum standards would be required as it was considered it was generally a commercial decision for the developer/purchaser to decide if the room size was adequate.

One Member suggested that LPP2 should include reference to the existing LPP1 policy and the intention to produce a separate Gypsy and Travellers DPD. It was noted that the intention to produce the DPD was mentioned, but it was agreed to add reference to policy CP5 of LPP1.

One Member expressed regret that Denmead had been classified as a local centre and that it did not have primary shopping frontage. The Head of Strategic Planning explained that this designation had taken place as part of LPP1.

One Member requested that Policy DM7 be amended to include the requirement for "active shopfronts". It was noted that Policy DM33 related more specifically to Shopfronts. Following discussion, it was agreed that reference to active frontages should be included, either here, or in DM33.

With regard to DM11, one Member suggested that minimising flooding and surface water run off be included. However, the Head of Strategic Planning explained these matters were dealt with by other specific policies and the aim was to avoid duplication where possible. Concern was expressed that the Policy DM11 should be strengthened to deal with the situation where existing accommodation on a farm unit is disposed of, and subsequently an application for a new dwelling is received. It was agreed that additional text be included within the explanatory text to take account of any existing accommodation which may have been sold in the recent past. With regard to DM12, some Members expressed concern about whether the Policy was robust enough to prevent inappropriate development in connection with equestrian use. The impact of lighting in the countryside and associated hardstanding for horse boxes etc was highlighted, along with inappropriate developments and the need for adequate screening and boundary treatments. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that Policy DM23 was intended to cover the protection of the rural character of an area, including against noise and light pollution. It was agreed that Policy DM12 be strengthened/cross referenced in relation to the requirement for development to need a countryside location and for adequate landscaping schemes. References to horse boxes were to be added to the explanatory text.

One Member queried whether the wording of Paragraph 6.4.2 should be amended to reflect the most current situation with regard to the building regulations required by Government. This was agreed.

One Member suggested that the wording of DM16 be amended to reflect the need for design consideration of bin storage areas in new development. It was noted that the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document included reference to this matter. It was agreed that the wording of DM16 be reconsidered.

With regard to DM17, it was requested that it be amended to include that new development should not impact in terms of surface water run-off. The Head of Strategic Planning agreed to amend DM17 (iii) accordingly.

A change was agreed to DM20 to insert the word "noise" before "pollution" in the first sentence.

It was agreed that the reference to Policy CP20 in paragraph 6.4.68 should be amended to refer to LPP1.

In relation to Policy DM25, it was agreed that the wording of the explanatory text be amended to reflect the Committee's wish that the public be kept informed regarding archaeological digs/finds etc, should there be a demand for this.

The issue of active frontages was again discussed in relation to Policy DM33. It was agreed that this should be added to the policy, and a reference to the High Quality Places DPD be added to the supporting text. With regard to Policy DM34, it was considered that signs should have regard to the character of the local area. It was agreed that this should be added to the Policy. One Member was concerned that, whilst not wishing to restrict individuality, the Policy should seek to limit the amount of goods for sale and other associated "clutter" outside of shops. The Head of Strategic Planning agreed to consider revised wording to address the issue of clutter/obstruction.

Appendix M – Winchester

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the Report concluded there was no requirement to identify any new greenfield allocations outside the

Winchester boundary. The updated housing capacity work indicated a current supply of about 4,800 which was significantly above the 4,000 required. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Council considered it had a five year supply of housing land and would continue to argue this strongly in any future appeals by developers against refusal of planning applications outside agreed settlement boundaries.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) had published its Preferred Options Local Plan on 2 September 2015 for a six week consultation period. The proposed comments from the Council were currently being prepared with a view to bringing a Report for Members' agreement to Cabinet on 21 October 2015. (Note: subsequent to the meeting it was agreed that this would be dealt with by the Portfolio Holder Decision Notice process.)

During public participation, contributions were received from two members of the public/local groups as summarised below.

Eleanor Bell (on behalf of WinACC) expressed concerns that the proposed Policies were not sufficient to address the traffic, congestion and pollution difficulties currently experienced within Winchester. WinACC would want to see parking spaces in the centre decreased as more Park and Ride spaces became available. Mitigation measures must be introduced for each of the five development areas addressing routes into and out of the city. WinACC would propose a new Policy WIN12 which would replace and retain Policy W6 of the 2006 District Local Plan.

Patrick Davies (City of Winchester Trust) outlined a number of areas where the Council did not appear to have responded in full to its concerns:

- Reference to special character and setting it was not clear what was meant by these terms;
- The suggestion of a green belt to the North West and South of Winchester had not been addressed (the SDNP was to the east);
- Whether there was adequate infrastructure capacity in terms of gas, water and sewerage to address proposed levels of growth;
- Concern that additional secondary school education would be required.
- The effect of "local listing".

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Weir addressed the Committee as Chair of the Winchester Town Forum, which had considered the Appendix at a meeting the previous evening. She highlighted the following points raised by the Forum:

- Concerns about the Council's ability to deliver its aspirations regarding the numbers of affordable housing and a request to strengthen policies to challenge developers' claims as to unviability;
- Concerns about levels of traffic and congestion and barriers to introducing a shift towards walking and cycling; consideration of the use of "shared space" in the town centre;
- How the landscape and heritage of Winchester would be safeguarded;
- A requirement to engage honestly with local groups regarding the constraints on the amount of open space and recreation land available;

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services reported that further to the discussions at the Winchester Town Forum on 5 October 2015, a further amendment had been discussed with the Head of Strategic Planning, as set out below:

Page 76, Paragraph 3.6.6 – alteration to new wording proposed (additions in italics):

"The approved walking and cycling strategies, *when implemented*, will facilitate these forms of movement around Winchester, in accordance with the aims of the Access Plan, and projects are monitored on a regular basis, with reports presented to Winchester Town Forum. *Streets and roads within all new developments should be consistent with the principles of these strategies while also creating and enhancing links to the existing network of pedestrian and cycle routes.*"

The Committee agreed to this proposed change.

In response to comments made above, the Committee noted that the matter of the sustainability appraisal had been considered earlier in the meeting. The Head of Strategic Planning highlighted that there were a number of additional strategies such as the Walking Strategy and Cycling Strategy aimed at reducing carbon emissions. The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) advised that he believed there were strong policies and strategies in place regarding transport and parking. In addition, there were opportunities to deliver improvements such as through the new Park and Ride bus contract. He acknowledged that some actions from the Air Quality Action Plan were outstanding but Government and County Council assistance was required to address this.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that none of the statutory agencies consulted had raised concerns requiring any changes to policies regarding adequate infrastructure (in relation to gas, water and sewerage). There had been regular liaison with the County Council in relation to education provision and they did not believe there to be a need to increase secondary provision.

The Head of Strategic Planning stated that it was not considered to be appropriate to seek to define character and setting too closely as it was generally a matter for assessment on a case by case basis. The introduction of a green belt had been debated at the LPP1 examination hearing and the Inspector had concluded it was not necessary. As it would require assessment of future development over the next 20-50 years, it was a strategic matter and not something that could be included within LPP2.

The Committee considered each of the Policies in relation to Winchester in detail and the Corporate Director and Head of Strategic Planning responded to questions thereon.

With regard to Policy WIN3 (iv), it was agreed to insert the word "energy" between "micro" and "generation".

In relation to Policy WIN5, one Member expressed concern that the references to improving the public realm and pedestrian and cycling access into the city centre were not strong enough. It was suggested that the wording be expanded to include "streets" and public realm and also include reference to a link to relate access to the city centre. It was agreed that the Head of Strategic Planning make amendments to WIN5 (iii) to strengthen it to refer to links to the surrounding area rather than just within the site.

In addition, it was requested that reference to distinctive buildings that contributed to the character of the area be included, in addition to trees. However, it was noted that reference to specific buildings was included in Policy WIN6 and this was agreed to be sufficient.

In response to questions on WIN5, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that consideration of the potential for accommodation for the elderly was specifically included as a need was identified through the assessment of older persons' housing. However, whether or not various parts of the area were suitable would be a matter for further consideration.

The Corporate Director explained the Policy WIN9 did not prevent the provision of new Houses in Multiple Occupation, but brought it within the remit of planning applications to determine the impact in the local area. He advised that the University were actively examining possibilities for future possible additional purpose-built student accommodation within the city.

The Committee noted that during the meeting, a number of changes to the Appendices M and O had been requested as detailed above and summarised below:

Appendix M

- Amendment to add wording to Paragraph 3.6.6;
- Change to WIN5(iii) to refer to links to the surrounding area;
- Correction to WIN3 to micro-energy.

Appendix O

Amendments to the following Policies/Paragraphs as detailed above:

- · Paragraphs referring to travellers;
- DM11, explanatory text;
- DM12, explanatory text;
- Paragraph 6.4.2;
- DM16 (iii);
- DM17 (iii);
- DM20;
- Paragraph 6.4.68;
- Paragraph 6.4.77;
- DM33/DM16 and DM33 explanatory text;
- DM34.

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

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

1. THAT THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS BE APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION (PRE-SUBMISSION) AND SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TOGETHER WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND THE HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

2. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO SUBMIT THE PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION PERIOD, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

3. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TO CORRECT ERRORS AND FORMAT TEXT WITHOUT ALTERING THE MEANING OF THE PLAN.

4. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT /LEADER, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLAN BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION PROCESS, IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO MATTERS RAISED THROUGH THE CONSULTATION AND EXAMINATION PROCESS.

5. THAT APPROVAL BE GIVEN TO APPOINT A PROGRAMME OFFICER AND UNDERTAKE OTHER WORK AS NECESSARY TO PREPARE FOR AND UNDERTAKE THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION (INCLUDING AGREEING TO MEET THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE'S FEES), PROVIDED THIS IS WITHIN THE ALLOCATED LOCAL PLAN BUDGET/RESERVE.

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses to the representations, as set out in the attached papers, together with the outcome of the further evidence

studies, be noted and taken into account in considering the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management and Site Allocations.

2. That subject to changes detailed above, the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, as recommended in Appendices M to Q of this report, be approved for submission to full Council.

3. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to update the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying documents prior to presentation to the Council and publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.00pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.10pm.

Chairman