

12.2. West of Waterlooville - (paragraphs 12.28 - 12.38, NC.2)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT & REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

See Appendix 1 to this Chapter

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.2.1 This section of the Plan attracted a large number of objections at Deposit stage. These ranged widely from challenging the principles to questioning very detailed components and have the most part now largely been overtaken by events as the Revised Deposit deleted the majority of the text and the alternative development options. This action garnered the support of GOSE, Environment Agency, East Hampshire District Council and Hampshire County Council. Although there were a few objections to the Revised Deposit many of these have been addressed through the evolution of the MDA Masterplan, which has proceeded alongside the Local Plan Inquiry process and was subject to a parallel public consultation exercise that informed its preparation in addition to the objections made to the Deposit Local Plan. Indeed, the Masterplan layout was formally endorsed by the West of Waterlooville Forum on 15 April 2004, (Plan M/25 Rev P) and I was advised at the close of Inquiry that planning applications were due to be submitted imminently based thereon. Thus, where objectors have unresolved issues regarding details of the MDA, I am satisfied they will be afforded yet another opportunity of airing them in the normal development control process. Other unresolved objections are covered below or elsewhere in my Report or relate to a level of detail that would be inappropriate for a Local Plan.

12.2.2 Therefore, I regard the three paragraphs that remain in the Revised Deposit as generally providing an appropriate introductory text, while the policy (NC.2) extensively sets out the criteria to be met. However, in order to provide improved clarity, particularly in the light of Havant BC's objection, I consider it should be explicitly stated that the number of dwellings should be expressed as: *at least 2000* rather than *up to 2000* to comply with the Structure Plan and indicating that the figure relates to the combined area in both Districts, notwithstanding that it was assigned solely to Winchester in Table A of the Structure Plan for administrative convenience and because Havant at that time envisaged very little being within their District.

12.2.3 If it is expressed in these terms, I consider it unnecessary to place a definitive figure for the amount that should be in Winchester District. However, if the precise figure that will be provided in Havant is finally resolved following modification procedures and adoption of the Havant Borough Local Plan by the time this Plan is published, it will enable a figure for Winchester to be inserted. It is conceivable that there will be planning permissions and legal agreements in place for the MDA when the Modified Plan is published, and I thus anticipate the text will be capable of being suitably updated and the policy simplified to reflect the status of the Masterplan and planning applications for the Baseline MDA at that time. I accept the Council's FPC12.03 proposing modifications to Inset Map 41a to take account of the approved Masterplan layout (Plan M/25 Rev P) would provide appropriate updating of the Plan.

12.2.4 The Council advanced a Pre-Inquiry Change PIC12.01 to add further cross-referencing to other Plan policies in criterion (ix), but as I have indicated elsewhere in my Report, extensive cross referencing to other policies within the main body of a discrete policy should be avoided and I therefore do not support it. However, I do accept the Further Proposed Change FPC12.A, which the Council advanced in respect of policy criterion (v) replacing *Purbrook Heath Road* with *the A3*, in the interest of clarity and accuracy as the former is regarded as unsuitable to accommodate the traffic flows envisaged from the MDA. The additional Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(i) proposes the replacement of *main ridgeline* with *highest point*, and a similar modification to para 12.76 is proposed by FPC12B(i), both of which I also find acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.2.5 That the Plan be modified:

- a) by updating the Inset Map in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.03 to reflect the approved MDA Masterplan (Plan M/25 Rev P).
- b) by amending the policy and introductory text to reflect the status of the Masterplan and any planning applications relating to the MDA at the time of publication and indicating that the requirement is to provide a total of at least 2000 dwellings within the Baseline allocations in the combined MDA area that straddles the boundary with the neighbouring Havant Borough Council.
- c) by simplifying the development criteria listed and omitting cross-reference to other policies.
- d) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.A in respect of policy criterion (v) replacing *Purbrook Heath Road* with *the A3*.
- e) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(i) in respect of policy criterion (viii) replacing *main ridgeline* with *highest point*.
- f) in accordance with Further Proposed Change FPC12.B(i) in respect of para 12.76 replacing *main ridgeline* with *highest point*.

12.3. Masterplan (paragraphs 12.39 - 12.41)

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1215	236/5	George Wimpey Strategic Land

ISSUE

Should the Local Plan specify that the Masterplan Framework represents the preferred option of the Council for the implementation of the MDA? (236/5/REVDEP)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.3.1 As indicated above, the MDA Masterplan has been formally agreed for the Baseline component of the MDA by the constituent authorities and this paragraph can be suitably updated and subsumed within the introductory text, while para 12.41 appears redundant and could be satisfactorily deleted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.3.2 That the Plan be modified by:

- a) updating paragraph 12.39 and subsuming it within the introductory text;
- b) deleting paragraph 12.41.

12.4. Development Principles (paragraphs 12.42 - 12.45)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.43	378/4	Salway

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1220	236/6	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1223	362/2	P Hill

ISSUES

1. Will the southern access road improve traffic flow through Purbrook at the expense of the existing quality of life (noise, pollution) in the countryside to the west Purbrook and/or lead to 'rat running' along Purbrook Heath Road? (378/4, 362/2REVDEP)
2. Whether the new paragraph RD12.20 and the issue of 'phasing' is sufficiently clear? (236/6/REVDEP)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.4.1 The first issue concerns transport matters and particularly the fear that additional traffic will use unsuitable rural roads to the west of the MDA. I am aware that this is an issue that is foremost in the minds of the highway planners and was advised that the detailed layout and junction designs will be scrutinised to ensure the major traffic flows will be directed to routes most capable of accommodating them, together with promoting measures where appropriate and necessary to discourage any significant additional traffic from using the rural lanes to the west.

12.4.2 With regard to the second issue, the Council advanced PIC12.02 which deletes *up to* relating to the Baseline figure and inserts a reference to the Reserve housing provision to accommodate up to 1000 dwellings. Whilst this would bring the wording into line with that used in the Structure Plan it does not remove the objector's concern relating to ambiguous reference to phasing in para RD12.20. The Council concede that the approved Masterplan brief suggests the MDA will not be phased, but rather be subject to a continuous development commencing in several locations simultaneously. They further indicated that the mention of a phased release of land was intended to reflect the universally recognised need for a comprehensive development programme to ensure that implementation of all the ancillary infrastructure proceeds in a coherent manner and that not all of the land may be required if higher densities are implemented. However, I consider the matter has become confused by the added reference to the Reserve provision. I advance a suggested rewording of RD12.20 to address the confusion and phasing issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.4.3 That the Plan be modified: by rewording RD12.20 as follows:

Inset Map 41 identifies areas for residential, mixed use, employment, community facilities and other uses and infrastructure to accommodate the Baseline provision of at least 2000 dwellings. It is envisaged that development of the MDA will commence in several locations simultaneously and it will be necessary to secure a comprehensive development programme to ensure the implementation of all the ancillary infrastructure proceeds in a coherent manner. The Inset Map also indicates the maximum extent of the Reserve site for up to 1000 dwellings, which may be reduced in size if higher densities than currently envisaged are achieved in the Baseline allocation.

12.5. The "Area of Search" (paragraphs 12.46 - 12.48)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/	Rep	NAME
-----------	-----	------

Paragraph	Number	
12.46	219/4	Bryant Homes Ltd
12.47	1091/2	E Goodman

ISSUES

1. Should the MDA identify land for housing beyond the plan period and make provision for the necessary infrastructure? (219/4)
2. Should the local authority plan for the development of the reserve allocation at Waterlooville? (1091/2)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.5.1 These two objections were addressed by alterations that were incorporated in the Revised Deposit Plan deleting reference to *area of search* and substituting *reserve area* in its place. This land is a strategic reserve that has been identified to cater for any decision by the strategic planning authorities in Hampshire that further land releases beyond the identified Baseline requirement are needed. Although some objectors expressed concerns about the likely availability of this land, due to its dependence upon progress on the Baseline allocation, it accords with the Structure Plan's identification of this locality for that purpose and I found no suitable available alternative substitute.

RECOMMENDATION

12.5.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

12.6. An Integrated and Balanced Community (paragraph 12.49)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.49	1091/3	E Goodman

ISSUE

Can Waterlooville support major development of the scale envisaged? 1091/3

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.6.1 The Waterlooville MDA proposal is being planned as a comprehensive development with additional community facilities, employment and town centre enhancement in conjunction with the neighbouring Havant Borough Council and in accordance with the strategic requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan. I am satisfied the Masterplanning exercise has taken account of all conceivable infrastructure requirements that are needed to support the scale of housing development proposed.

RECOMMENDATION

12.6.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

12.7. Housing (paragraphs 12.50 - 12.52)

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1228	1437/3	East Hampshire District Council

RD1228	236/8	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1229	236/9	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1229	2285/3	Executors of E.S Edwards (Deceased)

ISSUES

1. Should the layout of the residential areas apply the principle of home zones?
1437/3REVDEP
2. Are the proportions proposed for the housing mix and affordable housing justified? (2285/3REVDEP, 236/8REVDEP, 236/9REVDEP)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.7.1 In the first issue, whilst the Council concede that the principles of home zones may be appropriate for inclusion in the detailed design of parts of the MDA, they regard the specification of street layouts as too detailed a matter for inclusion in the Local Plan. My interpretation of the objection is that it raises questions over whether developers' contributions will adequately ensure the necessary improvements to infrastructure are implemented beyond the MDA. However, I am satisfied that where these can be directly attributable to the MDA development, they would be capable of being covered appropriately through use of Planning Obligations.

12.7.2 With regard to the proportions of smaller dwellings and affordable homes deemed appropriate to be provided, these topics are aired in greater detail in the Housing Chapter. Whilst the objector regards the 50% provision of smaller (1 & 2 bed) units as unduly prescriptive, I consider that it is not unreasonable having regard to household size, the assessment of demand and the shortfall in the existing provision. However, with regard to affordable housing, the Council have relented on their former stance of requiring a 50% provision within the MDA and have advanced Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(ii) deleting reference thereto and providing elaboration of which other authorities the area is intended to serve. I share objectors' concerns that such a high proportion could have had adverse impacts upon housing delivery and in Chapter 6 I have thus recommended a figure of up to 40% affordable housing in the MDA, which should now be incorporated in the modified text here.

RECOMMENDATION

12.7.3 That the Plan be modified generally in accordance with FPC12.A(ii), but with the second sentence altered and combined with the third sentence to read: *This Plan seeks up to 40% affordable housing in the MDA within Winchester District (see Policy H5) which is intended to meet a wider sub-regional need, and will contribute to*

12.8. Employment (paragraphs 12.53 - 12.57)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.56	261/74	Government Office for the South East

ISSUE

How does provision of training meet the Circular 1/97 guidance on Planning Obligations?

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.8.1 GOSE questioned whether the reference in para 12.56 to requiring developer contributions towards the provision of training schemes for local people complied with advice in Circular 1/97. The Council consider that provision of new jobs within the MDA is an important sustainability issue. They maintain that where "Local Labour in Construction" schemes are in place to assist in the training and retraining of the local economically active population, that it is entirely proper to seek contributions to

support and extend such schemes. They cite research undertaken on behalf of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation as supporting their view that such agreements would be directly related to the development site and have a planning purpose.

12.8.2 Whilst I can appreciate that such schemes would improve the local skills base, the wording states: *Developers will be expected to contribute to the provision of training schemes for local people, which will assist with development and business take-up.* To my mind, this confuses the construction process and the end user and also fails to recognise that many companies provide on-site or in-house training. In those circumstances, the wording appears unduly prescriptive and/or confusing. I note the text continues by referring to possible scope for Single Regeneration Budget funding, this adds another dimension and uncertainty. To my mind, the text of para 12.56 should either be deleted or clarified and expressed in a manner that complies with Circular 1/97, which requires contributions to be necessary, relevant and reasonable.

RECOMMENDATION

12.8.3 That the Plan be modified either by deleting para 12.56 or expressing the sentiments it contains in a clarified manner that also complies with Circular 1/97 requirements.

12.9. Resource Centre (New Subheading; paragraphs RD12.31 – 12.32)

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1231	1433/7	Hampshire County Council
RD1232	2018/1	A Beeston
RD1232	1079/2	A Norris
RD1232	156/1	Alan Cooper
RD1232	600/1	Alastair Pratt
RD1232	167/1	C Crascall
RD1232	2101/1	C Tarrant
RD1232	755/1	D L Morgan
RD1232	2262/2	D W Lock
RD1232	2090/2	Donald Wright
RD1232	1437/5	East Hampshire District Council
RD1232	2081/2	F Harrison
RD1232	82/2	Gwen Blackett
RD1232	2104/1	H V Dodson
RD1232	1433/8	Hampshire County Council
RD1232	2255/1	I Udal
RD1232	2082/2	J Harrison
RD1232	2274/3	J R G Cobbett
RD1232	168/1	John Crascall
RD1232	685/1	John Harvey
RD1232	731/1	Julie Morgan
RD1232	599/1	Katherine Bedford
RD1232	1077/2	M Norris
RD1232	2296/1	M Synnett
RD1232	2296/2	M Synnett
RD1232	2102/1	N J Tarrant
RD1232	2324/1	P J Sleeman
RD1232	157/2	Pam Cooper
RD1232	2091/1	Patricia Wright
RD1232	2306/1	Pete Sanders
RD1232	2103/1	R P Dodson
RD1232	572/1	Rebecca Havill
RD1232	117/1	Robin McIntosh
RD1232	2094/1	Rosemary Platt

RD1232	684/1	Susan Harvey
RD1232	83/2	William Blackett

OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PI1203	156/1	Alan Cooper
PI1203	755/1	D L Morgan
PI1203	2104/1	H V Dodson
PI1203	731/1	Julie Morgan
PI1203	2335/1	Linda Bowden
PI1203	10/1	M. Beauvoisin
PI1203	157/1	Pam Cooper
PI1203	117/1	Robin McIntosh
PI1203	732/1	S C Griffiths
PI1203	2336/1	Sally Beard
PI1203	116/1	Sheila McIntosh
PI1203	82/1	G Blackett
PI1203	83/1	W Blackett

ISSUES

- Should the resource centre be renamed to "Resource Recovery Park" and should the main detail be included within the Minerals and Waste Development Framework prepared by Hampshire County Council? (1433/7REVDEP)
- Has the need for and location of the resource centre been justified and have the traffic implications been fully considered? (156/1REVDEP 167/1REVDEP 82/2REVDEP 168/1REVDEP 157/2REVDEP 117/1REVDEP 83/2REVDEP 684/1REVDEP 685/1REVDEP 731/1REVDEP 755/1REVDEP 1077/2REVDEP 1079/2REVDEP 1433/8REVDEP 2081/2REVDEP 2082/2REVDEP 2090/2REVDEP 2091/1REVDEP 2094/1REVDEP 2101/1REVDEP 2102/1REVDEP 2103/1REVDEP 2104/1REVDEP 2262/2REVDEP 572/1REVDEP 599/1REVDEP 600/1REVDEP 2255/1REVDEP 2296/1REVDEP 2296/2REVDEP 2306/1REVDEP 2324/1REVDEP 2018/1REVDEP 1437/5REVDEP 2274/3REVDEP)
- Should the plan make specific reference to Purbrook, Widley and Waterlooville rather than "nearby settlements and residential areas" when referring to the need to minimise traffic impact? (156/1PIC, 82/1PIC, 83/1PIC, 755/1PIC, 2104/1PIC, 731/1PIC, 2335/1PIC, 10/1PIC, 157/1PIC, 117/1PIC, 732/1PIC, 2336/1PIC, 116/1PIC)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 12.9.1 The objection by Hampshire County Council in the first issue seeks to alter the name of this facility. Although the Council are ambivalent about the change of nomenclature, as this section of text has been included at the specific request of the objector and it is they who would be implementing the proposal, I consider it would be appropriate to describe it in the manner they suggest.
- 12.9.2 Issue two concerns the general paucity of information about what this site will comprise in detail. I am advised that the decision on the facilities to be provided and its precise location within the employment allocation has not been finally determined and will in part be influenced by the outcome of the County Council's consultation on their Material Resources Strategy. This in turn will be ultimately incorporated in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework. However, the County Council have indicated that a biomass plant is not proposed there and they seek the exclusion of any reference thereto. The Council advanced Further Proposed Change FPC12.A(iii) which deletes the sentence that mentions it, thereby addressing the County Council's concern and also those of the objectors who raised fears about such a plant in this location.
- 12.9.3 The Council also advanced PIC 12.03 to address objectors' concerns regarding possible traffic impacts on nearby settlements, which I endorse. Although some objectors raised concerns about traffic generation and possible harmful effects from potential on-site processes upon occupiers of neighbouring dwellings/ employment

buildings, the majority accept there is a need for such facilities. I am satisfied that the proposal merely identifies and safeguards the site at this juncture, in accordance with SEERA advice. Detailed proposals would necessarily evolve following in-depth studies to ensure they meet environmental, technical and operational objectives and any planning application would need to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment and conditions or legal agreements applied to impose appropriate controls.

12.9.4 In issue three, the objectors sought to expand the text of PIC12.03 to include reference to additional settlements within neighbouring Havant that could be affected by traffic generated. However, the Council indicate that as the jurisdiction of this Plan does not extend beyond the Winchester District boundary it would be inappropriate for the Plan to make proposals in respect of them. Nevertheless, I am conscious that the planning applications in respect of the MDA straddle the boundary of the two Districts and both Councils will have an involvement in determining them. In these circumstances, I can see no harm in adding the three additional settlements to the list already included in the text, particularly as routeing restrictions in Winchester District could have implications on those parts of neighbouring Havant Borough.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.9.5 That the Plan be modified:

- a) by renaming the section *Resource Recovery Park*;
- b) in accordance with FPC12.A(iii);
- c) in accordance with PIC12.03;
- d) by adding *Purbrook, Widley and Waterlooville* to the list of settlements in the final sentence of para RD12.32.

12.10. Transport (paragraphs 12.58 - 12.61)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.58	1387/16	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1236	1437/6	East Hampshire District Council
RD1236	289/2	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
RD1236	362/3	P Hill
RD1236	2311/2	The Rowans
RD1237	1079/3	A Norris
RD1237	156/2	Alan Cooper
RD1237	2085/1	B Scarth
RD1237	167/1	C Crascall
RD1237	2101/2	C Tarrant
RD1237	755/2	D L Morgan
RD1237	2262/3	D W Lock
RD1237	2090/3	Donald Wright
RD1237	1437/7	East Hampshire District Council
RD1237	2081/3	F Harrison
RD1237	236/10	George Wimpey Strategic Land
RD1237	82/3	Gwen Blackett
RD1237	2104/2	H V Dodson
RD1237	2082/3	J Harrison
RD1237	2120/1	J Thrush

RD1237	685/2	John Harvey
RD1237	731/2	Julie Morgan
RD1237	289/3	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
RD1237	1077/3	M Norris
RD1237	2084/1	Mary Winifred Scarth
RD1237	2102/2	N J Tarrant
RD1237	362/4	P Hill
RD1237	2091/2	Patricia Wright
RD1237	2103/2	R P Dodson
RD1237	2094/2	Rosemary Platt
RD1237	116/1	Sheila McIntosh
RD1237	684/2	Susan Harvey
RD1238	1437/9	East Hampshire District Council
RD1238	1437/10	East Hampshire District Council
RD1238	2117/6	Havant Borough Council
RD1239	2324/2	P J Sleeman
RD1239	2306/2	Pete Sanders
RD1239	572/2	Rebecca Havill

OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PIC1204	214/3	Grainger Trust Plc
PIC1205	236/4	George Wimpey Strategic Land
PIC1205	214/4	Grainger Trust Plc

ISSUES

1. Does the Plan adequately provide for enhanced public transport provision? (1387/16)
2. Has the need for and location of the resource centre been justified and have the traffic implications been fully considered? (572/2REVDEP 2324/2REVDEP)
3. Will the Southern Access Road lead to an increase in traffic along Purbrook Heath Road to the detriment of access to the Rowans Hospice and increase congestion in Purbrook to the detriment of the success of the A3 Bus Route? (362/3REVDEP 362/4REVDEP 2311/2REVDEP 82/3REVDEP 116/1REVDEP 151/1REVDEP 156/2REVDEP 167/1REVDEP 684/2REVDEP 685/2REVDEP 731/2REVDEP 755/2REVDEP 1077/3REVDEP 1079/3REVDEP 2081/3REVDEP 2082/3REVDEP 2084/1REVDEP 2085/1REVDEP 2090/3REVDEP 2091/2REVDEP 2094/2REVDEP 2101/2REVDEP 2102/2REVDEP 2103/2REVDEP 2104/2REVDEP 2120/1REVDEP 2262/3REVDEP)
4. Is the Plan sufficiently clear about the timing for the provision of the Southern Access Road and its junction configuration? (236/10REVDEP 289/2REVDEP 289/3REVDEP)
5. How will traffic heading north from the MDA gain access to the A3(M) and will the proposals lead to increased traffic through Horndean? (1437/7REVDEP)
6. Should the Plan refer to the need for developer contributions towards the extension of the South Hampshire light rail transit route to Waterlooville? (1437/6REVDEP)
7. Is sufficient provision made to facilitate walking and cycling to local secondary schools from the MDA and will sufficient improvements be made to secondary schools in the Waterlooville area? (1437/9REVDEP, 1437/10REVDEP)
8. Does the Plan provide for adequate integration between the MDA and Waterlooville Town Centre? (2117/6REVDEP)
9. Would the road links to the Brambles Business Park lead to unacceptable increase in traffic flows and potential harm to existing businesses? (2306/2REVDEP)
10. Whether PICs12.04 and 12.05 are necessary and reasonable (214/3 & 4PIC, 236/4PIC)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.10.1 The text objected to in the first issue was deleted in the Revised Deposit and I am content that the matter of accessibility to public transport service in the MDA has been a priority in the evolution of the Masterplan.

12.10.2 The matters raised in the second issue have been addressed above in section 12.9.

12.10.3 Issue three concerns the Southern Access Road (SAR), which is intended to provide a southerly route into the MDA from the A3 and to ease congestion in Purbrook village centre. Purbrook Heath Road will have a connection into it as a local access road serving the recreation ground, hospice etc and the countryside beyond. Hence, it is not planned to route the main traffic flows to and from the MDA along Purbrook Heath Road. Indeed, the Council indicate that if necessary, traffic management measures could be installed to reduce the potential of its use by non essential traffic. It is also not planned to provide any direct link between the MDA and Newlands Lane in the countryside to the west due to its inadequate width and visibility.

12.10.4 In the fourth issue, the Council indicated that the Southern Access Road Study concluded that the road should be provided before 1400 dwellings are completed at the very latest, on traffic generation grounds. It is also apparent that it is required to provide a new bus priority link as part of an integrated transport system for the MDA to enable residents to benefit from it at the earliest opportunity. Moreover, it is likely

to be used as the route for drainage infrastructure and potentially for construction traffic. Thus, the Council state that it is expected to be provided at an early stage for these reasons, rather than immediately before it becomes necessary purely on traffic generation grounds. I also assume that the indicative figure of 1400 dwellings would be lower if there is significant early implementation of employment development in the MDA.

- 12.10.5 I am content that highlighting the requirement to be implemented at an early stage in the development will enable the precise details of its timing to be negotiated at the planning application stage, together with the other infrastructure requirements and made the subject of legal agreement accompanying any planning permissions. Thus, whilst it is evident that some development can proceed in advance of its completion, it does form part of the essential comprehensive infrastructure for the MDA, which will comprise an entirely new community. I am sure the developers would also wish to see this made available at the earliest practical opportunity, not only for the convenience of the purchasers of their dwellings, but because the early provision of infrastructure and ancillary facilities also assists in construction programming, marketing and community building.
- 12.10.6 On the matter of the detailed design of the junction of the SAR with the A3, as this detail is still evolving, the Council advanced FPC12.B to delete “at or” so that it refers to the junction being in the vicinity of Ladybridge roundabout. As the final location and design have not yet been determined, and may be dependent upon land acquisition, I am content that this provides sufficient indication as to where it will be generally located and also accords with the terminology used in the Havant Borough Local Plan. Although there was criticism of the latest design of a proposed junction to the south of Ladybridge roundabout prepared by the Council’s consultants and the Council acknowledged it is better to use existing junctions where possible, they pointed out that they wished to retain all options open for the planning application that was expected to be submitted shortly after the close of the Inquiry, as there are several solutions possible. Accordingly, I do not consider it appropriate to be prescriptive about the precise location of the proposed junction of the SAR with the A3, which in any event lies outside the District boundary.
- 12.10.7 Turning to the fifth issue, the approved Masterplan provides for two northern accesses, one onto the Asda roundabout, which provides access to good connections with the A3(M) and the other to Hambledon Road. The Council indicate these will provide satisfactory access to the north and east and avoid traffic heading towards Horndean.
- 12.10.8 Issue six concerns developer contributions towards provision of a light rail transit route, but this scheme was not supported by the Department for Transport. The A3 Bus Priority corridor remains as the relevant link to the South Hampshire Rapid Transit System for the foreseeable future, while contributions will be required to provide links to the A3 bus priority route. I am satisfied the Plan suitably addresses this.
- 12.10.9 In the seventh issue, the need to provide satisfactory walking and safe cycling routes within the MDA and improvements to secondary schools in Waterlooville are already highlighted in para 12.65, which I am satisfied can be implemented by direct provision or through developer contributions.
- 12.10.10 Issue eight arises from Havant BC’s concerns that close integration between the MDA and Waterlooville town centre could be impeded by the barrier that Maurepas Way (South) represents and they wish to ensure good access links are provided. Havant suggest that Maurepas Way could be closed and the traffic diverted along the MDA spine road, whereby physical pedestrian linkage between the MDA and the centre could be achieved at ground level. However, as Winchester DC indicated, the spine road would then act as a divide between the western and eastern parts of the MDA and ultimately carry almost double the traffic flows that Maurepas Way now has.

Whilst I accept Havant's suggestions that segregated crossings could be made of the MDA spine road, the same is true for Maurepas Way.

- 12.10.11 The objection stems from the evolution of Havant BC's Draft Waterlooville Town Centre UDF, which includes a proposal to relocate the Asda store. Havant's suggestion of closing Maurepas Way and diverting traffic through the MDA originates from results of a public exhibition where respondents favoured that course, while the second most favoured option was to span over the road with a building. The MDA developers' preferred solution to integration, which proposes narrowing Maurepas Way and installation of a toucan crossing, was second least favourite option only to a footbridge link. However, it became apparent that Havant's stance on road closure is based on the views of just 80 respondents who attended the public exhibition.
- 12.10.12 Hence, whilst it is clear to me that closure of Maurepas Way indisputably would provide unhindered physical integration between the town centre and the MDA, it is not the only means to achieve apposite linkage. Moreover, it is important to retain a consistent approach to integrated transport and consider all forms of accessibility to the centre including by public transport and by car where either walking or cycling is unlikely to be the preferred option due to distance or bulkiness of purchases. Whilst I am satisfied that some solutions for ensuring integration of the MDA with the town centre are more attractive than others, several suitable options exist that do not necessitate closure of Maurepas Way and in any event the road lies largely outside Winchester District. Therefore I do not regard it as either necessary or appropriate to specify road closure provisions within the neighbouring District as a prerequisite to achieve integration. Although Havant suggested as an alternative, that reference could be made in Policy NC2 to implementing traffic calming measures on Maurepas Way (South) to facilitate integration of the centre with the MDA, I do not regard that as appropriate either in view of the alternative possible solutions, which could include grade separated crossings of the road. I also consider that as the areas involved lie outside the MDA, the issue would be more appropriately addressed in Havant's emerging Waterlooville Town Centre UDF or as part of the consideration of any major planning application that may be submitted before the former is adopted.
- 12.10.13 The objector in issue nine is concerned about the potentially harmful impacts that increased traffic could cause for existing commercial enterprises at Brambles Business Park by the two proposed road connections (RD12.39). However, the Council indicate that the 30ha employment site within the MDA was sited adjacent to the existing Brambles Business Park as they regarded it to be the most logical position where it could be associated with established commercial premises and conveniently positioned to gain most direct access to the principal traffic routes. The links through to Brambles Park from the MDA are intended to provide permeability between the two. Whilst the objector fears that the new accesses would negate existing voluntary traffic management measures to ameliorate previous problems experienced at Brambles Park, the Council indicated that they would encourage its extension to the new employment area, including an extension of the bus service. Moreover, a Transportation Assessment would be required with any planning application and any measures to control traffic impacts that are deemed necessary could be imposed through conditions and legal agreements.
- 12.10.14 The Council indicated that the links are depicted to demonstrate an intention that the two areas should be integrated rather than established as separate entities. While the objector supported the establishment of vehicular links and they did not object to the Elettra Avenue option, they were concerned about the Waterberry Drive access due to the need to acquire third party land and the potentially harmful impact upon nearby sensitive business operations. The Council stated that they would be prepared to be flexible about the precise position, particularly as they preferred to see the links achieved through negotiation rather than by compulsory acquisition. I am satisfied that its depiction by an arrow provides adequate flexibility. However, I remain concerned that the wording of para RD12.39 could be interpreted as implying that access to the MDA spine road from the employment areas would be resisted,

which I was advised is not the intention. Accordingly, this should be addressed by a revision of the wording, possibly by reference to *access links*.

12.10.15 The Council advanced PIC12.04 to specifically address the matter of construction traffic and PIC12.05 indicating the requirement for a Transport Assessment to support any planning application together with encouragement of non-car transport modes, which were welcomed by the objector and suitably address those particular concerns. I consider the latter would also inform any appropriate routeing measures for HGVs that would be required. They also indicated that any application for the Resource Centre would be required to be supported by an Environmental Statement so that various likely impacts can be assessed.

12.10.16 Finally, whilst Grainger Trust objected to the mention of Purbrook Heath Road in PIC12.04, I consider it should remain, as it is agreed as being unsuitable for MDA traffic. Moreover, despite the objections to PIC12.05 by Grainger and Wimpey, I am satisfied that only works directly attributable to the MDA development will be capable of being required under a Planning Obligation, in accordance with Circular 1/97.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.10.17 That the Plan be modified:

- a) in accordance with FPC12.B
- b) by revising the wording of RD12.39 to indicate that access links are proposed between the proposed employment area and Brambles Business Park while also providing transport connections to the remainder of the MDA and that Transportation Appraisals would inform decisions regarding appropriate measures required for lorry routeing.
- c) in accordance with PICs12.04 & 12.05

12.11. Cemetery (paragraph 12.69)

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1242	2201/1	A Barrett
RD1242	2134/1	A Chambers
RD1242	2177/1	A Cole
RD1242	2204/1	A Fullard
RD1242	2168/1	A H Hall
RD1242	2152/1	A Harris
RD1242	2212/1	A J Bolton
RD1242	2171/1	A J Hampshire
RD1242	2175/1	A James
RD1242	2258/1	A L Crook
RD1242	1079/4	A Norris
RD1242	646/1	A W Fuller
RD1242	2236/1	Adam Rennel
RD1242	141/1	Alan Cobb
RD1242	156/3	Alan Cooper
RD1242	2254/1	Alfred Huntley
RD1242	2202/1	Andrew Fullard
RD1242	2223/1	Andy Thorpe
RD1242	2267/1	Ann Ozouf
RD1242	2166/1	Anthony Cocker
RD1242	2184/1	Anthony DeFano
RD1242	2145/1	B Coupland
RD1242	2256/1	B Hall
RD1242	2233/1	B Van Steen
RD1242	2230/1	B Whale
RD1242	2198/1	Barry Ford
RD1242	2214/1	Barry Manns
RD1242	2128/1	Brian Kidd
RD1242	2157/1	C A Benford
RD1242	167/1	C Crascall
RD1242	2170/1	C D Herbert
RD1242	2203/1	C Fullard
RD1242	2169/1	C Hall

RD1242	2144/1	C J Coupland
RD1242	2164/1	C Read
RD1242	2101/3	C Tarrant
RD1242	147/1	C. J. Wearn
RD1242	2234/1	Carla McIntyre
RD1242	2219/1	Carol Hobbs
RD1242	659/1	Charles Pool
RD1242	726/1	D Barber
RD1242	2122/1	D Campell-Lendrum
RD1242	2187/1	D Clark
RD1242	755/3	D L Morgan
RD1242	2126/1	D M Bolton
RD1242	2240/1	D Murphy
RD1242	2151/1	D P Barnes
RD1242	2260/1	D Streton
RD1242	2262/4	D W Lock
RD1242	152/1	David Jones
RD1242	2228/1	David W Hughes
RD1242	2191/1	Deanne Hart
RD1242	2190/1	Deborah Hart
RD1242	151/1	Debra Jones
RD1242	661/1	Dereck Riddell
RD1242	2229/1	Dianne Hughes
RD1242	2137/1	DPD Weston
RD1242	2130/1	E Langford
RD1242	2139/1	E P Gilson
RD1242	125/1	E Priddy
RD1242	1437/11	East Hampshire District Council
RD1242	2131/1	Ebm Heyburn
RD1242	2259/1	Elaine Toghill
RD1242	2162/1	Eve Woodley
RD1242	2081/4	F Harrison
RD1242	688/1	Fay Harvey
RD1242	2154/1	Felicia Miceli Hyde
RD1242	2117/7	Forward Planning
RD1242	2242/1	G Doggett
RD1242	2112/1	G M Wearne
RD1242	2180/1	G Mitchell
RD1242	2148/1	G S Barnes
RD1242	82/4	Gwen Blackett
RD1242	678/1	Gwen Hunt
RD1242	2210/1	H Bolton
RD1242	2104/3	H V Dodson
RD1242	2019/1	Hannah Muir
RD1242	2133/1	Harold Chambers
RD1242	2113/1	Helen Wearn
RD1242	2153/1	Hellen Harris
RD1242	2235/1	Ian Johnson
RD1242	2244/1	J A Watt
RD1242	145/1	J Allen
RD1242	2211/1	J Bolton
RD1242	2226/1	J Chivers
RD1242	2082/4	J Harrison
RD1242	2181/1	J M Mitchell
RD1242	2243/1	J Powell
RD1242	24/1	J. A. Cleife
RD1242	2172/1	James Fraser
RD1242	2192/1	James Hart
RD1242	164/1	Jo Watts
RD1242	168/1	John Crascall
RD1242	685/3	John Harvey
RD1242	731/3	Julie Morgan
RD1242	1063/1	K A Jennings
RD1242	2209/1	K Bolton
RD1242	2186/1	K Clark
RD1242	2199/1	K Ford
RD1242	2163/1	K Read
RD1242	2183/1	Karen Purkiss
RD1242	2205/1	Kate Townsend
RD1242	2161/1	Katy Woodley
RD1242	2167/1	Kristina Anne Cocker
RD1242	2195/1	L Cobb
RD1242	2176/1	L Cole
RD1242	2196/1	L J Brown
RD1242	2125/1	Lionel Bolton

RD1242	2239/1	Lundford
RD1242	2149/1	M A Barnes
RD1242	663/1	M A Riddell
RD1242	2185/1	M DeFano
RD1242	2141/1	M Garner
RD1242	2138/1	M Gilson
RD1242	2098/1	M H Hawkes
RD1242	669/1	M Harvey
RD1242	2096/1	M Hobbs
RD1242	2179/1	M Jay
RD1242	2225/1	M K Hodge
RD1242	2124/1	M Lewis
RD1242	1077/4	M Norris
RD1242	2206/1	M Townsend
RD1242	2216/1	M Watt
RD1242	143/1	M. J. Neil
RD1242	2136/1	Martin
RD1242	2135/1	Martin
RD1242	2213/1	Mavis Manns
RD1242	2173/1	Michelle Fraser
RD1242	2194/1	Moira Steward
RD1242	2221/1	Ms Wiseman
RD1242	2092/1	N Harvey
RD1242	2102/3	N J Tarrant
RD1242	735/1	N Lincoln
RD1242	2193/1	Nicola Steward
RD1242	2200/1	P Barrett
RD1242	2227/1	P Chivers
RD1242	2188/1	P Conner
RD1242	2174/1	P D James
RD1242	2156/1	P E Benford
RD1242	2143/1	P Hardy
RD1242	2237/1	P J Brumhill
RD1242	2241/1	P Lundford
RD1242	2158/1	P Moth
RD1242	2231/1	P Q Dervis
RD1242	144/1	P. T Neil
RD1242	157/4	Pam Cooper
RD1242	2129/1	Pamela M Kidd
RD1242	2091/3	Patricia Wright
RD1242	2197/1	R Brown
RD1242	2189/1	R Conner
RD1242	2140/1	R Garner
RD1242	2142/1	R Hardy
RD1242	2103/3	R P Dodson
RD1242	2257/1	R T Crook
RD1242	2253/1	Rita Huntley
RD1242	160/1	Robert Osachuk
RD1242	2208/1	Robert Townsend
RD1242	2094/3	Rosemary Platt
RD1242	2127/1	S A Barber
RD1242	2238/1	S E Gridley
RD1242	676/1	S F Hunt
RD1242	2159/1	S Moth
RD1242	2160/1	S Moth
RD1242	139/1	S. N. Allen
RD1242	2220/1	Sean Aicken
RD1242	2178/1	Simon Jay
RD1242	2121/1	L Steggles
RD1242	2155/1	Stephen Hyde
RD1242	165/1	Steven P. Watts
RD1242	684/3	Susan Harvey
RD1242	660/1	Sylvia Pool
RD1242	2224/1	T Bartram
RD1242	2146/1	T G McInally
RD1242	2123/1	T Lewis
RD1242	2215/1	T Smith
RD1242	2222/1	Teresa Irish
RD1242	2311/4	The Rowans
RD1242	2182/1	Tim Purkiss
RD1242	2217/1	Tomlin
RD1242	2218/1	V Davey
RD1242	2150/1	V P Barnes
RD1242	25/1	V. W. Cleife
RD1242	2097/1	Valerie Hawkes

RD1242	2147/1	W M McNally
RD1242	148/1	Wearn
RD1242	2232/1	Y Munro
RD1242	158/1	Yvonne Osachuk

ISSUE

Will the proposed location for the cemetery have a detrimental impact on Rowans Hospice and/or meet the requirements of Havant Borough Council?

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.11.1 There was considerable interest from respondents regarding the precise location of the proposed cemetery, with many considering it was insensitive to locate it adjacent to Rowan's Hospice in the Revised Deposit Plan. However the MDA Masterplan layout, approved by Winchester and Havant Councils in April 2004, now shows it positioned adjacent to London Road, north of Milk Lane. The area to the north of the hospice is shown as an area for "habitat creation and to meet informal recreational needs". The Council introduced FPCs12.01 & 12.03 to reflect the Councils' recent decision which addresses the objections by amending the text and Inset Map 41a.

RECOMMENDATION

12.11.2 That the Plan be modified in accordance with FPC12.01 and FPC12.03.

12.12. Integration with Waterlooville Town Centre (paragraph 12.70)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.070	261/75	Government Office for the South East

ISSUE

Should the Plan set out guidance on integration with Waterlooville Town Centre which is within Havant District? 261/75

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.12.1 GOSE indicate that Plans should not specify land use provisions in respect of areas outside its administrative boundaries. Whilst that is strictly true, it would be parochial in the extreme to ignore the fact that the MDA is planned as an urban expansion of Waterlooville with the majority proposed on land within Winchester District, although the existing settlement is predominantly within Havant. Moreover, the town centre is intended to be the main focus of higher order facilities for the planned new community as part of a comprehensive development. Hence, it is entirely appropriate to make reference to this in the Plan and the importance of securing integrated transport links thereto. Moreover, the section objected to is explanatory text rather than policy and to my mind serves to highlight the important nexus between the two.

12.12.2 Havant BC's concerns about providing the most effective means of integration is addressed in 12.10 above.

RECOMMENDATION

12.12.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

12.13. Recreation and Open Space (paragraphs 12.71 - 12.72)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
12.71	261/76	Government Office for the South East

OBJECTION TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1244	1437/12	East Hampshire District Council

ISSUES

1. Should the plan extend its land use preferences outside its administrative boundary?
261/76
2. Should a local gap be maintained between Waterlooville and Purbrook?
1437/12REVDEP

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.13.1 GOSE's objection in issue one refers to the mention of neighbouring Havant's Open Space Standards, which they regard as inappropriate. I am mindful that the MDA needs to be planned comprehensively and to that end the Masterplan has had regard to existing provision within Havant. However, as matters have moved on and the Masterplan Framework has been jointly agreed, the Council advanced FPC12.02 to delete the text added at Revised Deposit Stage. Nevertheless, I consider the entire text of paragraph 12.71 is redundant, as the size and distribution of the recreational open space provision has been established in the approved Masterplan. Hence, I consider the entire paragraph can safely be deleted.

12.13.2 The Revised Deposit addition of a reference to an urban park was interpreted by the objector in issue two as intended to provide a Local Gap between Purbrook and Waterlooville, which they regarded as insufficient to serve that function. However, it is not only apparent that the urban park was not designated as a Local Gap in the Winchester Local Plan, but that feature has not been carried through to the agreed Masterplan and my recommendation to delete the paragraph overcomes that point. That said, I am satisfied that whilst it is insufficient to warrant designation as a Local Gap a degree of separation is nevertheless maintained by designation of a 6.59ha cemetery and 5.5ha sports field, and in any event there is continuous development on the eastern side of London Road.

RECOMMENDATION

12.13.3 That the Plan be modified by deletion of paragraph 12.71.

12.14. Local Gap (paragraph 12.80)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
C3/ 12.80	236/1	Wimpey Strategic Land

ISSUE

Whether the Local Gap between Waterlooville and Denmead is appropriately defined.

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

12.14.1 Although the principle of the Waterlooville/ Denmead Local Gap was accepted by the objector as a laudable planning measure, they challenged its precise extent, maintaining that it included more land than is necessary to achieve its purpose and that it failed to follow field boundaries. They seek the removal of land south of Closewood Road from the designated Local Gap.

12.14.2 Whilst some landscape evidence was advanced by the objector to illustrate that there is little intervisibility between the two settlements due to the local topography, and mature hedgerows the Council maintain that this is not the sole determinant and the designation is as much to do with providing physical separation as with any visual assessment of the landscape. They do not assert that the land has any great landscape value but consider its value lies in the role it has of providing physical separation as one travels between the settlements. They refer to sporadic development that lies within the Gap that serves to weaken the experience of leaving one and entering the other and hence also of their separate identities. To reduce the width of the Gap by a quarter, in line with the objector's suggestion, would provide a further weakening of its role and threaten its effectiveness.

12.14.3 Whilst I would frequently agree with the objector that field boundaries represent clear and defensible boundaries upon which to base land use designations, in this instance, the edge of the West of Waterlooville urban extension is delimited by the high voltage overhead power lines. Whilst these do not form a continuous feature at ground level, the pylons are clearly widely visible in the landscape and the wayleave below them is an inhibitor to built development. The Council does not wish to see development extend westwards beyond the route of the power line and to designate the eastern boundary of the Gap some distance to the west of the overhead lines would in reality place such intervening land under threat of development pressure. I therefore agree with the approach that the Council has adopted of defining the Gap extending up to the designated settlement limits and I am conscious that this Gap has already been relegated from Strategic Gap in the adopted Plan to Local Gap in this Review to cater for the MDA proposals.

12.14.4 I regard the Local Gap here as being essential to prevent the coalescence of the expanding Waterlooville with nearby Denmead and I am aware of the considerable development pressures hereabouts. I find the Council's approach of using the edges of the defined settlement boundaries as the limits of the Local Gap is entirely logical and particularly where it coincides with a defensible feature in landscape and land use terms, such as the overhead power lines in this instance.

RECOMMENDATION

12.14.5 That no modification be made to the Plan.