

**CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE****15 December 2009**Attendance:Committee Members:

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Beckett (P)

Pearson (P)

Coates (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Busher (P)

Jefferies (P)

Pines

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Evans

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Learney

---

**1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held 20 October 2009 be approved and adopted.

**2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Ms A Bartaby and Mr P Davies spoke regarding Report CAB1944(LDF) and their comments are summarised below.

**3. CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION (CHAPTERS 4 - 6)**

(Report [CAB1944\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item, due to his membership of Swanmore Parish Council, which had made representations on the Core Strategy. He also declared a personal (but

not prejudicial) interest as the Council's representative on the Council for the Protection of Rural England which had also made representations. However, he had no involvement in the formulation of either organisations representations and therefore remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beckett declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item, due to being a member of Compton and Shawford Parish Council. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the Council must comply with national and regional planning guidance in its Core Strategy, but did have discretion as to how this guidance was met locally. The Inspector had indicated that the Council had not included sufficient detail for each strategic allocation, particularly in relation to 'deliverability' and to make them more locally distinct and more technical work was proposed to address this.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the proposed Hedge End Strategic Development Area (SDA) was not currently included within the housing requirements for Winchester. However, depending on the results of the feasibility study currently being undertaken on this SDA, there was an assumption within the South East Plan that the SDA would be split between Eastleigh Borough Council and the City Council.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans spoke in support of the comments outlined in Appendix B of the Report regarding Woodcroft Farm. However, she expressed concern that comments outlined in Appendix C appeared to suggest that some of the green infrastructure required within the Fareham SDA could be situated within the Winchester District. She stated this was contrary to the Council decision of April 2009, which had removed references to green infrastructure being within this District from Policy SH5.

Councillor Beckett responded that the Fareham Borough Council were aware that the City Council was opposed to any of the SDA requirements being situated within its District. However, there was a possible exception regarding green infrastructure, but only if the Council was satisfied that such designation would not alter the character of the land and would in fact offer it greater protection in the long run than if it was designated as open countryside. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that further investigations into the type of green infrastructure which may achieve this, if any, were ongoing.

Two external representatives spoke regarding this item, and their comments are summarised below.

Ms A Bartaby (Terence O'Rourke consultants) spoke on behalf of the Church Commissioners, who owned Bushfield Camp. She advised that the Commissioners were working closely with Council officers to address issues that had arisen regarding Bushfield Camp, as a result of the consultation on the Core Strategy. With regard to the Vail Williams study concerning the

viability of the site, the Church Commissioners had appointed Drivers Jonas consultants to address issues raised. A Masterplan would be produced which would consider such matters as protecting the historic views, and meeting concerns raised about damage to the site's biodiversity. In addition, Gifford had been appointed to develop a green travel plan. She mentioned that there was significant potential for biomass and solar energy facilities on site. Ms Bartaby concluded by advising that the Church Commissions would also work closely with the City of Winchester Trust to attempt to address their concerns.

Mr P Davies (City of Winchester Trust) emphasised the results of the Vail Williams study which had raised serious concerns regarding the viability of plans for a knowledge park at Bushfield Camp. He also stated that the Inspector had raised concerns about the proposals and that, to his knowledge, the Trust had not yet been contacted by the Church Commissioners. Mr Davies advised that the Trust's concerns remained as stated in the Report and in particular believed that the landscape setting of Winchester in this area was so significant, it would not be possible for any development to take place without detrimental effect. In conclusion, the Trust believed that the knowledge park proposal should not be progressed any further and it was not a sustainable or viable option for Winchester.

In response, the Chairman thanked Ms Bartaby for her comments and welcomed the support of the Church Commissioners. Councillor Beckett agreed that the Vail Williams study raised concerns regarding the viability of a knowledge park, but disputed the premises the study had been based upon. In addition, the Inspector had outlined a number of issues requiring further investigation, which was accepted by the Council and it was intended that this additional work would be undertaken.

The Committee considered each of the Report's Appendices in detail and the Head of Strategic Planning responded to questions and comments thereon.

With regard to Appendix A, the Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the Core Strategy would allocate strategic sites, but it would be necessary for the Council to make smaller site allocations, in order to meet its housing requirements.

With regard to Appendix B, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that there had been objections received to the potential strategic allocations at Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp. Some of these had been from respondents promoting other smaller sites that they considered to be more suitable, particularly for housing development, and offer more flexibility. However, officers had concluded that it was more sustainable to concentrate on one or two larger strategic allocations.

With regard to Bushfield Camp, the Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that further work was required to address issues raised. The South of Winchester Park and Ride site had been agreed prior to the possibility of the

knowledge park being raised, and it was not intended that it would be used solely for parking for employees of the park.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that some representations had inadvertently been omitted from the original printed copy of Appendix C, but these had been included on the version on the Council's Website and hard copies circulated to Committee Members.

The Inspector had advised that the Core Strategy did not contain adequate detail regarding the Council's policy for the proposed Hedge End SDA. Further feasibility studies were currently being carried out with regards to this SDA, but if these confirmed it was required, the Council would have to show more detailed proposals as to how and where it would plan for it.

During discussion, the Committee raised major concerns regarding the traffic implications of the combined effects of the proposed MDAs and SDAs on an area already experiencing problems of capacity. These concerns related not only to the motorways, but also to rural roads. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Core Strategy would need to outline what the key transport infrastructure requirements of new developments would be and it would be for the Highway Agency to determine whether the impact of the developments on the strategic road network were acceptable. If the developer or public sector were not able to meet these requirements, it was possible that the proposed developments would be unsustainable. The Committee noted that Transport for South Hampshire was undertaking studies in this area, and Councillor Beckett had made representations through PUSH as to the urgency of this work.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses to comments received to Chapters 4-6 of the Core Strategy Preferred Option consultation be noted and the Recommended Approaches be agreed, to enable matters raised to be taken into account when preparing the next stage of the Core Strategy.
2. That the need to undertake the areas of further work identified in relation to the proposed strategic allocations be confirmed, as set out in the Council's Preferred Option, to enable the Core Strategy to proceed to its next stage.

4. **SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS**

(Report [CAB1945\(LDF\)](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure explained that the major change proposed in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was a presumption that parking would be provided for new residential developments (at a level set out in Table 2 of the SPD). This was welcomed by Committee Members.

The Chairman requested that Policy 2 and Paragraph 3.7 of the Standard be rephrased to remove the wording “anticipated level of car ownership” and instead refer to the level of parking which would be required by the Standard. This was agreed.

Whilst welcoming a degree of flexibility within the Standard, some Members expressed concern that it could offer too much flexibility to developers to not have to provide adequate parking for a new development. The Corporate Director (Operations) emphasised that the flexibility was intended for the Council not to have to insist on parking spaces being provided in all circumstances, as there was the possibility of exceptional cases where such provision would not be appropriate in design terms. In addition, developers were generally keen to include adequate parking as it increased the market value of new developments. However, he agreed to rephrase the Standard to emphasise that developers would be expected to adhere to its policies, unless the Council stipulated otherwise.

With regard to Policy 5, some Members commented that garage sizes varied and in some cases were not large enough to accommodate larger vehicle models. The Head of Access and Infrastructure acknowledged this comment and stated that the Standard enabled a flexible approach to be taken as to whether garages counted towards the overall parking requirement of a site or not.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the Residential Parking Standards be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Report, subject to amendments to reflect comments outlined above, and to correct any errors and update as necessary; such amendments to be agreed by the Head of Access and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 12.00pm

Chairman