

CHAPTER 2: STRATEGY

2.1. Strategic Context (paragraphs 2.3 - 2.9)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
2.6	261/5	Government Office for the South East
2.7	468/1	Cala Homes (South) Ltd

ISSUES

1. Does paragraph 2.6 refer to RPG9 in enough detail? (261/5)
2. Should paragraph 2.7 refer to the 'possibility' of a further Winchester City (North) MDA? (468/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 2.1.1 Although GOSE comment that para 2.6 fails to set out fully the wider regional context and vision together with the key development principles and core strategy set out in RPG9, the Council refers to advice in PPG12 which indicates that Local Plans should not repeat large sections of other documents in their plans. Furthermore, Plans should be clear, succinct and easily understood. Clearly there is a need for balance between the objector's and Council's views on this matter. I consider that, the Council's reference to the "urban centred policies being promoted through RPG9" sufficiently highlights the context and source for the strategy without being over-effusive and unnecessarily repetitive. Accordingly, if the Plan user requires more background on this, as the Council correctly point out RPG9 is a published document that can be readily consulted. Accordingly, I consider no modification is necessary in this regard.
- 2.1.2 Whilst the Council defends the use of the reference to the possibility of a MDA at Winchester City (North), I find the wording does not accurately reflect the Structure Plan terminology. Accordingly, I consider the wording of the fourth sentence of para 2.7 should state: *The Plan also requires identification of an additional reserve housing provision including a further Major Development Area at Winchester City (North),.....*

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1.3 That the Plan be modified by rewording the first part of the fourth sentence of paragraph 2.7 as follows: *The Plan also requires identification of an additional reserve housing provision including a further Major Development Area at Winchester City (North),.....*

2.2. The Local Plan Strategy (paragraphs 2.10 - 2.15)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
2.10	210/1	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
2.10	1434/5	Hampshire County Council
2.10	138/18	John Hayter
2.11	287/14	Holmes and Sons
2.15	206/2	Compass Roadside Ltd
2.15	1439/1	Shedfield Society

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD02.01	175/2	Save Barton Farm Group

ISSUES

1. Should the last sentence of the paragraph 2.10 be deleted or amended, as the description of the 'sequential approach' is not correct and any departure from Government and Structure Plan policies should be identified and justified on a case by case basis? (210/1, 138/18)
2. Should the Plan adopt a "phasing approach" to provide more flexibility without compromising the overall objective that the majority of early-release sites should be 'urban capacity' sites? (1434/5)
3. Should paragraph 2.11 have a new bullet point referring to the need to meet the Structure Plan's housing requirement as a 'key principle'? (287/14)
4. Should a greenbelt be designated to improve countryside protection? (1439/1)
5. Should para 2.15 be amended to recognise the need to provide suitable roadside facilities? (206/2)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 2.2.1 The Council altered the final sentence of para 2.10 (RD02.01) in the revised Deposit to address the objections to the First Deposit. However Save Barton Farm Group maintain the MDA at Winchester City North is not relevant to local circumstances. I consider the objections to the final sentence of para 2.10 derive from the Council's choice of wording which could be interpreted as departing from national and strategic guidelines by interpreting them to meet local circumstances. In practice all local planning authorities have to have regard to national guidance and strategic policies in preparing Local Plans which apply these in the local context and I regard the Council's approach as having followed this route. I thus conclude that a relatively minor re-wording of the final sentence would avoid the ambiguity that has crept in and would resolve the misinterpretation that has given rise to all the objections. I advance my own suggested re-wording in the recommendation below.
- 2.2.2 In the second issue, the Council indicated that there is no policy relating to the phasing of development, as this was not considered appropriate or relevant to the District. As much of the new housing is anticipated from sites that have extant permission, windfalls and sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study, the Council correctly state there is limited scope to apply such a policy covering these sources of development. Moreover, the large scale mixed developments at the MDAs will be individually phased of necessity to ensure that development proceeds in an orderly manner. I therefore conclude that no modification is necessary in this regard.
- 2.2.3 In issue three, I agree with the Council that it is neither appropriate nor necessary to identify the need to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement as a *key principle* in para 2.11 as compliance with the Structure Plan is obligatory and the County Council have issued a certificate of general conformity therewith. In any event that requirement is referred to generally in my rewording of the preceding para 2.10 and is already specifically mentioned in para 2.18.
- 2.2.4 The objector in issue four acknowledged that designation of Green Belts is undertaken at strategic level rather than in the preparation of a Local Plan and they have pursued the matter under Policy C3 – Local Gaps.
- 2.2.5 Finally, in issue five, I agree with the Council that the provision of roadside facilities is a detailed matter that would be out of place in the statement relating to the general overall aim of the Plan at para 2.15. Hence no modification is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.2.6 That the Plan be modified by rewording the final sentence of para 2.10 to read:
Therefore, the Local Plan applies Government guidance and Structure Plan policies, whilst also ensuring it is relevant to the District's circumstances and needs.

2.3. Objectives of the Strategy (paragraphs 2.16 - 2.28)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
2.16	353/2	Sparsholt College Hampshire
2.17	386/1	Bewley Homes
2.17	397/1	Taylor Woodrow (was Bryant Homes)
2.18	353/4	Sparsholt College Hampshire
2.18	353/3	Sparsholt College Hampshire
2.19	210/2	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
2.19	287/13	Holmes And Sons
2.20	210/3	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
2.20	386/2	Bewley Homes
2.20	468/2	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
2.20	1434/6	Hampshire County Council
2.20	287/12	Holmes and Sons
2.22	210/4	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
2.24	210/5	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
2.25	290/1	Thompson Bros (Esher) Ltd
2.26	210/6	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited

ISSUES

1. Should the proposal for a design-led approach be modified? (353/2, 386/1, 397/1)
2. Should the descriptions of the sequential approach be modified? (210/5, 287/13, 210/6, 353/3, 1434/6, 210/2, 353/4)
3. Whether the extent to which development requirements can be met from the existing defined urban areas are over-stated? (287/12, 210/3, 386/2, 468/2)
4. Should the Strategy take account of deficiencies in recreational land? (210/4)
5. Should Paragraph 2.25 be amended to read "development which is unsuitable in the context of the relevant policies", rather than referring to the term 'non-essential' development? (290/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 2.3.1 An objector broadly supports the design-led approach to development proposals, but considers other factors such as economics, fitness for purpose and utility may be more important, while two house builders consider that a policy such as EN1 of the adopted Plan identifying areas of special character is necessary for such an approach to be applied. The Council indicate they intend the design-led approach to be applicable to all forms of development throughout every part the District. In particular, they identify that the need to direct most development to the existing built-up areas and to accommodate higher densities makes this an increasingly important necessity, to ensure the attractiveness of the District is conserved and enhanced. I concur with this view and consider high quality design is an essential basic ingredient of any development proposal and especially so in a District where there is almost universal acceptance of its existing high quality environment.
- 2.3.2 In issues two and three, the objectors question the inclusion of the various references to *sequential approach* in the stated aim and in the text and also whether the development requirements of the Structure Plan can be accommodated in the existing defined built-up areas. Whilst the Council have followed the sequential approach to site selection advocated in PPG3 and refer to this in the text, I consider it is unnecessary to state that in the objective. However, as a significant component of the new development cannot be accommodated in the existing built-up areas, 2 MDAs are proposed as either a Baseline or Reserve urban extension on greenfield sites, in accordance with the Structure Plan. Whilst this is explained at various points in the accompanying text to this Chapter, it is not reflected in the second stated objective. I consider this omission should be rectified because the objective is misleading as it stands and I advance an alternative form of wording in my recommendation below.

- 2.3.3 My conclusion to remove the reference to sequential approach from the objective leads me to agree with the objector who considers it should be mentioned in the accompanying text at para 2.19. I therefore recommend accordingly. Detailed comments made by objectors regarding the appropriateness of various defined built-up area boundaries, the efficacy of the Urban Capacity Study and the quantum of development to be provided are covered in the Housing Chapter.
- 2.3.4 I consider the criticism by objectors of the phraseology in para 2.20 is sustained insofar as it over-emphasises the role of identified Urban Capacity sites being able to meet the Structure Plan's development requirements. In particular, I can see no purpose being served by relegating the substantial part that will be played by the MDAs in meeting this need to a statement in parenthesis. Also, in the Housing Chapter, I recommend the addition of a limited number of urban extension sites as Local Reserve housing provision to be used if the anticipated housing supply does not materialise for any reason. I therefore consider the brackets should be removed and the wording of the sentence be modified to take these factors into account and I thus recommend accordingly. In addition, in view of my recommendation regarding H3 development frontages, that reference in the second sentence of para 2.20 will need to be removed.
- 2.3.5 I now turn to issue four, where the objector considers there should be a strategy to address the serious deficiencies in recreational land, by permitting urban extensions to resolve this matter, particularly as they perceive that the concentration of further development in existing settlements could exacerbate the situation. The Council indicate that the Plan does indeed make allocations for recreational use and that policies require new developments to make provision for recreational land and facilities in accordance with their prescribed standards. They also indicate that para 2.22 mentions this point specifically, while the preceding bullet point objective refers to meeting leisure needs. I therefore consider the topic is adequately addressed.
- 2.3.6 Finally, the criticism of the use of "non-essential" development in the countryside stems from the objector's perception that as this terminology is used in connection with Green Belts, it could cause confusion. However, I agree with the Council that as there is no Green Belt within the District and as it is an expression frequently applied to countryside areas in general, there is unlikely to be any confusion as to its meaning and intent. Moreover, I consider the objector's suggested rewording: "*development which is unsuitable in the context of the relevant policies*" would neither provide succinctness nor clarity. I thus conclude no modification is appropriate or necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.3.7 That the Plan be modified by:
- a) rewording the second bullet point objective as follows:
To provide for the development requirements of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) primarily within existing defined built-up areas and by the allocation of two Major Development Areas (MDAs) as Baseline and Reserve urban extensions.
 - b) rewording para 2.19 as follows:
In line with Government advice and Structure Plan policies, development potential has been identified using a sequential approach directing it, where possible, to existing defined settlements and in addition to urban extensions on greenfield sites.
 - c) rewording the first sentence of para 2.20 as follows:
An Urban Capacity Study has been carried out which demonstrates that the Structure Plan Review's development requirements can be met by utilising a combination of sites within the existing defined built-up areas together with the two MDAs, without the need to allocate significant additional new sites. Nevertheless, a limited number of Local Reserve housing allocations have been made, with the intention that they may be implemented if the anticipated housing supply does not materialise for any reason.
 - d) removing the reference to H3 development frontages from the second sentence of para 2.20