

Duty to Co-operate Statement

Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations Publication (Pre-Submission)



WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS

DUTY TO COOPERATE STATEMENT (PART 2)

October 2015

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) places a legal duty on local planning authorities, county councils and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. Local planning authorities must demonstrate how they have complied with the duty at the independent examination of their Local Plan.
- 1.2 Most of the strategic issues that reach across local authority boundaries have been addressed in Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (LPP1). These included the District-wide needs for development including housing and employment. Nevertheless, Winchester City Council (WCC) has engaged with the County Council, public bodies, other statutory consultees and stakeholders in respect of Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2) to ensure that strategic and cross-boundary issues are adequately addressed and planned for.
- 1.3 This Statement provides a summary of the actions taken under the Duty to Cooperate since the publication of the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement and how they have influenced amendments to the LPP2. It therefore supplements the [September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement](#). It forms a further background document to the Local Plan in preparation for when it is submitted for Examination. Additional information on the consultation and front loading undertaken for LPP2 can be found in the [Consultation Statement Part 1 2014](#), and [Consultation Statement Part 2 2015](#) as part of the background documents for LPP2.

2 General Cooperation

- 2.1 As set out in the Consultation Statement (Part 2 2015), notification of the publication of the Consultation Draft Plan and supporting documents for comment from 24 October to 5 December 2014 was given through a Public Notice published in the Mid Hampshire Observer, by letter and email circulated to all persons and bodies on the Council's Local Plan Consultation Database including the statutory consultees, prescribed bodies and other interested parties, and via the Local Plan e-Newsletter.

3 Cooperation with neighbouring planning authorities

- 3.1 All neighbouring planning authorities were included in the general mailing on 23rd October 2014, informing them of the publication of the Consultation Draft of the LPP2 and supporting documents, and inviting them to meet City Council officers at the exhibitions.
- 3.2 Comments in response to the Draft Plan were received from the Eastleigh Borough Council, Havant Borough Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. Following consideration of all the representations received a number of liaison meetings were held with officers from neighbouring planning authorities, and with Hampshire County Council, to discuss the issues raised and the proposed amendments to the Draft Plan.
- 3.3 Meanwhile the regular meetings of Hampshire and Isle of Wight Planning Officers Group (HiPOG) Chief Planning Officers and its sub-group the Development Plans Group (DPG) continued. These meetings include officer representatives of all Hampshire and Isle of Wight Planning Authorities and Hampshire County Council. They take place approximately every other month. Strategic planning issues are covered at these meetings, as are the specifics of emerging Local Plans. The Planning Research and Liaison Group (PRLG) also meets regularly to discuss issues of relevance to Development Planning within Hampshire in respect of technical research and reporting; with Local Plan progress and evidence base development being standing items at this meeting. It has therefore been possible to engage with all planning authorities within Hampshire on the continuing development of the emerging Local Plan.
- 3.4 With the scale of housing provision and requirements for the settlements and major development areas within the District already being set through the LPP1, the opportunity to consider whether there is any unmet development need from beyond the District that may have to be accommodated has been addressed by the LPP1 adopted in March 2013. However this issue still comprises an important component of the Duty to Cooperate and there remains no indication from neighbouring authorities of any further requirement to help meet their development needs.
- 3.5 The regular meetings of Officer Groups in Hampshire outlined above have also ensured that neighbouring authorities are aware of progress on LPP2 and have had the opportunity to raise any strategic and cross-boundary issues that may have arisen since the adoption of the LPP1. It is also important to note that Winchester City Council has not needed to ask any neighbouring authorities help meet its objectively assessed needs and has not been asked to help any neighbouring authorities meet their needs.

- 3.6 Where particular issues that require cross-boundary co-operation have arisen, including the Major Development Areas and the Botley Bypass, these are set out under the headings below.

North Whiteley

- 3.7 Major development is planned north of Whiteley, within Winchester District; Policies SH1 and SH3 of LPP1 relate to this area. As the strategic allocation policy for North Whiteley is contained within LPP1 there are no specific implications that arise for LPP2.
- 3.8 The North Whiteley Forum, established as a WCC Committee as referred to in the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement, has not needed to meet since 3 July 2014. The Forum membership includes representatives of Winchester City Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Fareham Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, Botley Parish Council, Curdridge Parish Council and Whiteley Town Council.
- 3.9 However the preparation of more detailed plans for North Whiteley is ongoing and the City Council will continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities and stakeholders in relation to its development, including formal consultation on planning applications. The outline planning application for the North Whiteley development, submitted in March 2015, was approved by the City Council's Planning Committee on 12 October 2015 (subject to a Section 106 agreement).

West of Waterlooville

- 3.10 Major development is being undertaken to the west of Waterlooville in Hampshire, which is mainly within Winchester District, but also has some development within the adjoining Havant Borough. Policies SH1 and SH2 of LPP1 relate to this area: the development now has outline planning consent and several phases have detailed consent and are built out or under way. As the strategic allocation policy for West of Waterlooville is contained within LPP1 there are no specific implications that arise for LPP2.
- 3.11 The initial purpose of the West of Waterlooville Forum, which was referred to in the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement, has been served and its terms of reference are now revised to oversee the transition from new community to established community. Administered by WCC, the Forum membership also includes representatives of Havant Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, Denmead Parish Council and Southwick and Widley Parish Council. The Forum receives progress reports on aspects of the development and can make recommendations to the parent authorities of Havant and Winchester. Since the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate

Statement was prepared the Forum has met twice; on 6 July 2015 and 1 October 2015.

- 3.12 There is also a Joint West of Waterlooville Planning Committee formed by agreement of Havant Borough Council and Winchester City Council in Spring 2014 which discusses and determines planning applications within the development area, whether they occur within Winchester District or Havant Borough. Since the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement was prepared the Joint Committee has met three times; on 28 November 2014, 12 March 2015 and 15 October 2015.

Welborne

- 3.13 A new community is planned north of Fareham. This development was previously known as the North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) and is now named Welborne. The built development is within Fareham Borough, but is adjacent to the Winchester District boundary and includes significant areas of green infrastructure within Winchester District. Policies SH1 and SH4 of LPP1 relate to this area, with Policy SH4 containing specific reference to cooperation between the City Council and Fareham Borough Council and to the open areas of land within Winchester District. As the strategic policy relating to Welborne is contained within LPP1 there are no specific implications that arise for LPP2.
- 3.14 While the authorities have cooperated, a proposal in the draft Welborne Local Plan (Fareham Local Plan Part 3, prepared by Fareham Borough Council) to include the option of siting the secondary school adjacent to the Winchester District boundary with the school playing fields within Winchester District met with objections from the City Council. Following the Welborne Plan Examination hearings held during November 2014 the Inspector's findings in his report (12 May 2015) confirmed that locating the playing fields in the triangle of land adjoining Knowle village did not meet the requirements of Winchester District LPP1 policies SH4 and CP18 to keep this land open and undeveloped, for reasons including the shortfall of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) for which the Knowle Triangle has potential.
- 3.15 The Welborne Plan was modified accordingly and adopted by Fareham BC on 8 June 2015. Policy WEL30 includes the commitment that Fareham BC will continue to work with Winchester CC to determine appropriate uses and management of the natural greenspace within Winchester District. As such uses would be consistent with the countryside and settlement gap policies already in place in LPP1 there are no implications for LPP2. However, WCC continues to cooperate with Fareham BC and other stakeholders to deliver this element of the development.

- 3.16 There will also need to be engagement with the developers of the new community due to the scale of the proposal and its possible impact on the Winchester District, particularly in relation to traffic. The City Council encourages such liaison, which it considers will be essential in the lead up to the submission and determination of an outline planning application.
- 3.17 The Welborne Standing Conference, organised by Fareham BC, continues to meet as necessary to receive reports of progress on the Welborne development and discuss the development of the area, including such as how to achieve a high quality development. Membership of the Standing Conference includes WCC and organisations representing communities within Winchester District including Knowle Village Residents Association, Wickham Parish Council and the Wickham Society. Since the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement the City Council has been represented at all Standing Conference meetings, which have been held on 4 December 2014 and 11 June 2015, with a workshop on 26 February 2015.

Fareham Borough Council

- 3.18 The main cross boundary issues with Fareham Borough relate to North Whiteley and Welborne, as set out above.
- 3.19 Elsewhere the Little Park Farm employment allocation in the Winchester District is part of a larger site that remains available for employment uses (within classes B1, B2 and B8) and is mostly within Fareham Borough. As the entire site remains undeveloped, both authorities are taking allocations forward into their new site allocations Local Plans. The policy in the Winchester LPP2 (now renumbered SHUA4) includes a requirement that the site be developed in conjunction with the adjoining site in Fareham. This is important as the most appropriate means of access is within Fareham Borough. The Fareham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies was adopted on 8 June 2015; Policy DSP18 and development site brief E2 relate to Little Park Farm within Fareham Borough.
- 3.20 No comments were received from Fareham BC to the consultation on the Draft LPP2.

Havant Borough Council

- 3.21 The only comment from Havant Borough Council (HBC) on the Consultation Draft LPP2 relates to Waterlooville where the Havant Borough Site Allocations Plan allocates the existing Asda store and car park within the Waterlooville town centre for mixed uses (Policy WA2, site W109). HBC seeks reassurance that Winchester's Local Plan will allow for the corner of the car park that lies within Winchester District to be brought forward or allocates it for mixed use.

3.22 Winchester's LPP2 does not refer specifically to this very small area of land, which lies between Waterlooville town centre and land which the LPP1 allocates as the West of Waterlooville strategic development area. However as an existing commercial site within the built-up area of Havant there is no reason for Winchester to resist the Havant proposals, especially given the town centre policies in Winchester's Local Plan Parts 1 and 2 and the Duty to Cooperate, and it is not considered necessary to make a specific allocation.

Eastleigh Borough Council & Botley Bypass

3.23 The main cross boundary issue in relation to Eastleigh Borough relates to the Botley Bypass. Comments were received from Eastleigh BC on the consultation draft LPP2, objecting to the lack of any proposals or a policy in the draft Plan relating to the bypass.

3.24 The draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, submitted for examination during 2014, proposed a bypass for Botley in order to mitigate the effects of traffic in the village. Following a preliminary report from the Inspector that the plan was unsound as it did not provide sufficient housing, Eastleigh Borough Council resolved on 18 December 2014 to commence work on a new plan to 2036 in line with the emerging Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) revised South Hampshire Strategy.

3.25 A meeting took place with Eastleigh BC on 14 May 2015, to discuss each authority's local plans, including the current timelines, issues and work being undertaken including commissioned evidence studies to address those issues. Botley Bypass was also discussed along with progress on Eastleigh BC's Gypsy and Traveller DPD and the joint Employment Land Review (see Section 7). WCC officers agreed that, as the Botley Bypass had not been subject to a recommendation by the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Inspector, they would consider any updated evidence from the Highway Authority (HCC) or Eastleigh Borough Council on the need for and deliverability of the Bypass.

3.26 Meetings were subsequently held with Eastleigh and Hampshire CC officers on 19 June and on 27 August 2015 to discuss transport matters, including the level of detail needed in local plan policies, objections raised to the LPP2 on highway matters, evidence gaps and further studies. Discussion included the Botley Bypass. Although previously advised by Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority that a bypass could not be justified in transport terms or funded as a result of the North Whiteley development and traffic growth pressures, the position has since changed.

3.27 The latest advice from the Highway Authority is that, in order to meet the planned level of housing growth in the Eastleigh Borough, strategic transport infrastructure improvements will be necessary to help mitigate the impact of

traffic. These include the provision of Botley Bypass, although a full justification for the Bypass, together with a fully funded programme of delivery, has yet to be established. As a result a policy is included in the LPP2 Publication (Pre-Submission) Plan to safeguard the section of the potential route for the Botley Bypass within the Winchester District.

South Downs National Park Authority

- 3.28 The South Downs National Park (SDNP) covers approximately 40% of Winchester District. Although the LPP1 covered the SDNP part of the District, the authorities have agreed that LPP2 will not apply in any of the area of the SDNP that is within the Winchester District.
- 3.29 There has been considerable cross-boundary liaison, as described in the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement due to several of the settlements in Winchester District which have a specific housing requirement in LPP1 adjoining the SDNP.
- 3.30 Liaison has continued to ensure that there is no conflict between the planning strategies of the two authorities and comments were received from the SDNP Authority in response to the consultation on the Draft LPP2. The letter dated 22 December 2014 from the SDNPA states that, "The Authority agrees that Winchester City Council has engaged positively with the NPA in the formulation of the Local Plan Part 2." Specific comments on the LPP2 were welcoming and broadly in support with some suggestions for amendments to policies or supporting text which have been taken on board in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Plan.
- 3.31 The SDNP Authority (SDNPA) is producing its own Local Plan, covering both strategic and local matters within the boundary of the SDNP, which has reached the consultation draft stage. A 'Preferred Options' document was published for comment until 28 October 2015. Officers from WCC were invited and attended the SDNPA's Duty to Cooperate (DTC) event on 1 July 2015. This event, and the participation of WCC in the preparation of the SDNP Local Plan, is referred to in the SDNP DTC Interim Statement (Autumn 2015) which is published on the SDNPA's website.
- 3.32 A consultation response to the SDNP Local Plan Preferred Options has been submitted by WCC. This includes the comment that, while the National Park Local Plan may not be meeting the full 'objectively assessed need' for the Park as a whole, which may require the National Park Authority to ask some authorities to make additional provision to help address this, the situation in Winchester is that the housing provision proposed in the National Park Plan will be over and above Winchester District's assessed needs.

- 3.33 This is because the housing needs assessment undertaken for the LPP1 included the part of the National Park within the Winchester District. The resulting housing requirement is established in the LPP1 (12, 500 dwellings), the strategy of which directs development to the most sustainable locations. Given the presence of the National Park, the LPP1 specifically avoided any allocations within the Park and meets the whole housing requirement in locations in the non-National Park parts of the District. Further discussions with SDNP officers have confirmed that, in view of this approach, the allocations under Policy SD23 of the SDNP Local Plan should be regarded as over and above the WCC housing requirement identified through LPP1, which are already being planned for through LPP1 and LPP2.
- 3.34 A further liaison meeting between officers from WCC and the SDNPA was held on 7 October 2015 to discuss the latest positions, progress and relationship between the authorities' emerging Plans. In particular, the SDNP officers explained the background to the SDNP Local Plan policies and evidence base, which has helped in formulating WCC's representations.

Isle of Wight Council

- 3.35 In response to a letter received from the Isle of Wight Council (IWC) regarding the IWC's Housing Policy Review and the Duty to Cooperate a reply was sent stating that, Winchester City Council does not believe that there are any strategic Duty to Cooperate matters between the two authorities other than matters which are already being dealt with through the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH). These relate to housing needs, which are being jointly addressed through the PUSH Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategy Review, and the cumulative impact of development on the Solent SACs¹, which is being dealt with jointly through the emerging Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. (NB See Section 4 for further information re PUSH and Section 7 re Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy).

¹ Solent Maritime Special Areas of Conservation

4 Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)

- 4.1 Collaboration between the authorities involved in PUSH and the preparation of the South Hampshire Spatial Strategy has been recognised by Planning Inspectors² as a key element of fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate. For example, while the Inspector examining the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan did not find the plan sound and did not reach a formal final conclusion on the Duty To Cooperate he stated in his report³ that, “I consider that the Council met the Duty in relation to strategic housing and employment matters because of its involvement with PUSH and willingness to take forward the South Hampshire Strategy 2012.”
- 4.2 PUSH is a group of twelve authorities (the unitary authorities of Portsmouth and Southampton and Isle of Wight; Hampshire County Council and district authorities of Eastleigh, East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Test Valley, New Forest and Winchester) working together to support the sustainable economic growth of the sub region and to facilitate the strategic planning functions necessary to support that growth. PUSH has no statutory powers or functions but works collaboratively with the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership to deliver its distinct but complementary roles and objectives.
- 4.3 PUSH is governed by a formally constituted Joint Committee which meets bi-monthly and is supported by the work of three themed Delivery Panels. WCC is fully involved at both Member and Officer level with the Council Leader being on the Joint Committee and WCC’s Chief Executive is also Lead Officer of the Cultural Creative Industries and the Built Environment Delivery Panel. The other Delivery Panel themes are Planning & Infrastructure and Energy & the Green Economy. The Leaders and Chief Executives also have regular briefing and discussion meetings and workshops.
- 4.4 The preparation of the PUSH Spatial Strategy to 2036 is ongoing to a revised timetable which anticipates final approval by the Joint Committee in July 2016. The Strategy will replace and update the South Hampshire Strategy (2012) and extend the planning horizon from 2026 to 2036. It will take account of the

² [Havant Borough Local Plan \(Allocations\) Inspector’s Report July 2014](#) and [Fareham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies - Inspector’s Report 12 May 2015](#), [Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, Inspector’s Report September 2015](#)

³ [Report on the Examination into Eastleigh Borough Council’s Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029](#), Simon Emerson, Inspector, 11 February 2015

National Planning Policy Framework, the LEP's Solent Economic Plan, and the PUSH Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

- 4.5 WCC officers attend the monthly Chief Planning Officers and Planning Officers Group meetings and also provide other input to preparation of the Strategy and its supporting evidence base through one to one meetings and by correspondence with PUSH's consultants GL Hearn and Solent Transport. The PUSH SHMA that was published in January 2014 is currently being updated to take account of the 2012 household based projections. An economic study to consider employment land needs is also in progress. Other background information and strategies are also being updated including the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Transport Modelling of development options.
- 4.6 The Strategy and its updated evidence base will be key to enabling the Councils to update their Local Plans to 2036, consistent with national requirements for meeting objectively assessed needs. Reference to this is made in South Hampshire Urban Areas section of the LPP2 Publication Plan at paragraph 5.5 which states that provisions in the Winchester LPP1 and LPP2 more than meet the objectively assessed need identified in the 2014 PUSH SHMA for the Winchester part of the PUSH area. This means that any significant changes arising from the Spatial Strategy are expected only to apply beyond the LPP2 plan period, i.e. after 2031, but monitoring will enable the situation to be kept under review.
- 4.7 The preparation of the South Hampshire Spatial Strategy to 2036 requires the constituent authorities to consider how the overall needs of the sub-region can best be met and to reach some understanding and agreement regarding the distribution of development in the light of constraints and the practicalities of meeting the infrastructure requirements. Although the PUSH Spatial Strategy is not a formal part of the Development Plan in legal terms it none the less plays a major part in meeting the Duty to Cooperate.

5 Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships

Enterprise M3 LEP

- 5.1 The larger part of Winchester District that is not within the PUSH area is covered by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The Enterprise M3 LEP is a public/private partnership set up to support and sustain economic growth at a local level. It has a business-led Board of private, public and not-for profit sector members advised by a number of groups. There is also a Joint Leaders Board, the role of which is to strengthen local authority collaboration in support of the Enterprise M3 LEP and to enable collective discussion and local authority representation on priorities and issues affecting economic development and regeneration in the Enterprise M3 area.
- 5.2 Five Action Groups provide specialist advice and recommendations to the Board on particular projects under the following sectors: Land and Property, Transport, Rural Economy, Enterprise & Innovation and Global Competitiveness. The Action Groups have been evolving and have amended their Terms of Reference during the period November 2014 to February 2015. WCC's involvement at both Officer and Member level continues. The Enterprise M3 LEP was formally consulted but made no comments on the Consultation Draft LPP2.

Solent Enterprise LEP

- 5.3 The southern part of Winchester District that lies within the PUSH area is covered by the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The Solent LEP is led by the business community and supported by three university partners, the further education sector, three unitary authorities, eight district councils, one county council and the voluntary and community sector – all working together to secure a more prosperous and sustainable future for the Solent area. The LEP plays a central role in determining local economic priorities and undertaking activities to drive economic growth and the creation of local jobs but has agreed that land use planning in this area should continue to be undertaken by PUSH, with input on economic matters from the LEP.
- 5.4 The Solent LEP Board is supported by a range of Delivery Panels to drive forward specific areas of work including Employment & Skills, Land Property & Infrastructure, Inward Investment, Strategic Sectors and Innovation. Funding through the Solent Growth Deal is helping to provide the extension to Whiteley Way to join the existing community of Whiteley and the planned new development to the north of Whiteley to the existing highway network. WCC officers were involved in supporting and providing the justification for this bid. In addition to the direct investment through the Local Growth Deal, the Solent LEPs negotiations with Government have secured commitments for a range of

strategic transport schemes in and around the Solent area including improvements to the M3 between Winchester and Southampton and the M3 junction 9 with the A34 at Winchester.

- 5.5 The Solent LEP was formally consulted but made no comments on the Consultation Draft LPP2.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership (HloWLNP)

- 5.6 There are no updates to report regarding the activities of the HloWLNP since the September 2014 Duty To Cooperate Statement was prepared. The HloWLNP was formally consulted but made no comments on the Consultation Draft LPP2.

6 Infrastructure Delivery Agencies and Other Public Bodies

- 6.1 The Local Plan tests of soundness include consideration of whether plans are deliverable. The Duty to Cooperate seeks engagement with infrastructure delivery agencies to ensure deliverability. Engagement with statutory consultees and public bodies on issues such as transport, education provision, health and community service provision, water supply and disposal, and flood risk is also necessary to secure appropriate strategic planning. General consultation is also covered by the Consultation Statement Parts 1 (2014) and 2 (2015).
- 6.2 Infrastructure and service providers were consulted on the Consultation Draft LPP2 and responses were received from the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England, Southern Water and Thames Water. In addition to this, meetings and correspondence have taken place on specific issues, topics and/or parts of the District where necessary to expand on and update these responses in the light of amendments being made to the LPP2 policies and supporting text.
- 6.3 During the period of consideration of all the responses made to the Consultation Draft LPP2, the statutory agencies and utility companies were contacted again and invited to attend individual meetings to discuss their own comments as well as issues arising from other respondents of relevance to their topic of interest. As a result meetings took place with representatives of Natural England on 2 June 2015, Southern Water on 3 June 2015 and Historic England on 17 June 2015.
- 6.4 Their advice and suggested changes or additions to the wording of policies and supporting text has generally been taken on board in amending the LPP2 to arrive at the Publication version of the Plan. The specifics of these comments, the reasons for them and the alterations made to the Plan are set out in the appendices to the reports made to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September and 6 October 2015. These relate to site-specific issues and the wording of the site allocation policies as well as some development management policies.

Hampshire County Council

- 6.5 The various Officer and Member Groups that provide opportunities for WCC and HCC to meet and discuss issues of mutual interest are described in sections 3 and 4 above. No comments were received from Hampshire County Council to the consultation on the Draft LPP2, however liaison with specific County Council services has since continued to take place. In particular, meetings have been held and correspondence exchanged with officers from different services concerning aspects of infrastructure.

- 6.6 Meetings with Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority took place on 1 April, 19 June and 27 August 2015 to discuss general transport matters and studies, as well as the Botley Bypass. Transport officers assisted with the commissioning and review of draft reports on the Transport Studies undertaken by Systra consultancy on the B2177 B3354 & A334 Corridor and the New Alresford Land Allocations. Amendments have been made to policies and supporting text of the LPP2 in accordance with the findings of these studies, as set out in the appendices to the reports made to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September and 6 October 2015.
- 6.7 A meeting with Hampshire County Council as Education Authority took place on 5 May 2015. WCC officers explained the nature and status of the various site specific allocations and discussions took place concerning the capacity of the schools within the expanding settlements and their ability, or otherwise, to cater for the additional populations that would arise. The limitations imposed on potential requests for developer contributions by the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy were also discussed. This meeting led to further advice being provided by HCC's Children's Services on which schools would need further expansion as a result of development proposed in the Local Plan. Amendments to policies and supporting text of the LPP2 in accordance with this advice are set out in the appendices to the reports made to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 16 September and 6 October 2015.
- 6.8 Liaison has also taken place with HCC in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, in particular to follow up on concerns and comments received to the Consultation Draft LPP2 regarding the Wickham Drainage Infrastructure Policy WK1. The Wickham Flood Investigation Report (June 2015), which was commissioned by HCC in conjunction with WCC, Southern Water and the Environment Agency, resulted in changes being made to Policy WK1 and its supporting text.

Marine Management Organisation (MMO)

- 6.9 Although the MMO had no specific comments to make on the Consultation Draft of the LPP2 its response draws attention to the remit of the organisation. The MMO is preparing the South Inshore and Offshore Plan which runs from Folkestone to the River Dart and therefore includes a small part of Winchester district, i.e. The River Hamble which is tidal up as far as Botley and forms part of the boundary of Curdridge Parish.
- 6.10 The MMO will be working with all Local Authorities in the plan area and until such time as a marine plan is in place advises all local councils to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. As the marine planning authority for England

the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. The MMO's advice is noted in the LPP2 Feedback on Consultation Responses report made to the WCC Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 30 March 2015.

Highways Agency

- 6.11 The Highways Agency (HA) commented that it would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) as result of development. Also that the local plan must provide the planning policy to ensure that development cannot progress without appropriate infrastructure or demand management. However it is pleased to see that site allocations have taken into consideration all aspects of transport - cycling, walking and public transport into the site assessments and subsequent allocations. The HA requested early consultation on any emerging sites and stated that any sites which could have an impact on the SRN will require a full Transport Assessment.
- 6.12 The Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee at its meeting on 30 March 2015 noted the HA's comments and agreed that the policies requested already exist in Local Plan Part 1 (Policies CP10 and CP21) so there is no need for additional policies in Local Plan Part 2.

Other Public Bodies

- 6.13 Other public bodies that are subject to the duty to cooperate were also consulted on the LPP2 Consultation Draft but did not make any comments. These include the Civil Aviation Authority, the Homes and Communities Agency, the National Health Service England (Wessex), South East Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Office of Rail Regulation.

7 Projects

- 7.1 Work on various projects occurs regularly between WCC and other Hampshire local planning authorities as described in section 3 above. These projects contribute to the ongoing development and updating of the evidence base for the authority's plans and strategies and inform policies as appropriate.

Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership and Strategy

- 7.2 Work on the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project has moved on since the September 2014 Duty To Cooperate Statement was prepared and the LPP2 has been updated accordingly in the Implementation Chapter (paragraphs 7.12-7.14).
- 7.3 The joint working between the PUSH authorities, Chichester District Council, the New Forest and South Downs National Park Authorities, in conjunction with Natural England and other key wildlife/conservation bodies, has been transformed into the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) in December 2014. The role of the SRMP is to coordinate implementation of the mitigation measures necessary to address the impact of additional recreational pressure on the Solent Special Protection Areas arising from new housebuilding which would be funded by developer contributions.
- 7.4 The PUSH Joint Committee at its meeting on 2 December 2014 endorsed both the Terms of Reference for the SRMP and the Interim Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy prepared by the SRMP authorities and bodies.
- 7.5 Following advice from Natural England, WCC had already been seeking financial contributions from relevant developments (since August 2014) to support the Interim Mitigation Strategy. The requirement and areas affected is noted in paragraph 1.11 of the LPP2. Reference is also made in sections within the Plan where housing sites fall within the 5.6km zone, i.e. part of Bishop's Waltham (paragraph 4.2.14) and all of Waltham Chase (paragraph 4.7.11), Wickham (paragraph 4.8.20) and Whiteley (paragraph 5.16).
- 7.6 WCC continues to work with the other authorities and bodies on the development of a long-term comprehensive mitigation strategy and measures including the appointment of rangers, with liaison through attendance at SRMP meetings held on 15 February and 2 June 2015. The SRMP Inaugural Annual Report was presented to and endorsed by the PUSH Joint Committee at its meeting on 28 September 2015.

Gypsy and Traveller Needs and Site Assessments

- 7.7 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 are expected to require reconsideration of the level of need for traveller pitches. So that the LPP2 can progress to examination without further delay, it was agreed by the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 6 October 2015 that a separate development plan document (DPD) be prepared to cover this issue. Details and a timetable for preparing and adopting the DPD are included in the revised Local Development Scheme (October 2015).

- 7.8 Although it had been intended to include sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the LPP2, the only site identified in the Consultation Draft Plan is no longer available for such use. In the light of this, delays with the site assessment study, the changed definition and the updated government policy, the site allocation policy and a development management policy have been removed from the Publication (Pre-Submission) version of the LPP2.
- 7.9 However, WCC will continue to work jointly with East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority and other Hampshire authorities on this subject.

Employment Land Review

- 7.10 A joint Employment Land Review was commissioned by Eastleigh BC, with Southampton CC, Test Valley BC and Winchester CC, from consultants Lambert Smith Hampton during summer 2015. The purpose of the study is to determine the quality and suitability of existing employment sites within the study area⁴, in the context of current and future business requirements. This will involve appraising, from a commercial perspective, the existing/emerging local plan policy approach to a number of pre-selected employment sites, in the context of the study findings. These are not expected until the end of 2015.

⁴ The Western PUSH area, defined as the council areas of Southampton, Eastleigh and parts of Winchester and Test Valley districts.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 As set out in the September 2014 Duty to Cooperate Statement, the Consultation Statement Part 1 2014, and Consultation Statement Part 2 2015, a considerable amount of consultation and cooperation has been undertaken in preparing the LPP2. This has resulted in only limited areas of objection or concern from neighbouring authorities and statutory consultees, which are addressed by changes to the Draft Local Plan as necessary. No neighbouring authorities have asked the City Council to help them by accommodating objectively assessed needs which they are unable to meet themselves.