

# CHAPTER 3: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

## 3.1. General Comments

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
CHPT3	212/2	Bishops Waltham Society
CHPT3	138/19	John Hayter
CHPT3	1216/1	Peter S Middleton

### ISSUES

1. Are the Plan's design principles made sufficiently clear, with regard to the overall aim of achieving sustainable urban-centred development, without causing social or environmental problems and, in terms of implementing a 'design-led' approach for all new development, is it necessary to distinguish between large and small-scale developments? (212/2, 138/19)
2. Does the Plan take sufficient account of the localised parking impacts, or more widespread traffic generation implications, resulting from the levels of new development likely to occur within the District's built-up areas? (212/2, 1216/1)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1.1 With regard to the first issue, it is apparent that there is considerable agreement between the objectors and the Council particularly regarding the aim to maximise development within the existing built-up areas in the interests of sustainability, whilst ensuring that their amenity and character are protected and enhanced. I consider this is adequately stated in para 3.3. On the matter of distinguishing between large and small-scale schemes, the objector believes the requirements for small developments should be simplified, but the Council considers the design-led approach is a fundamental principle applicable to all development irrespective of size.
- 3.1.2 Having heard the debate, I consider there is much common ground on this point also and I sympathise with the Council in their assertion that it would be more confusing to introduce different yardsticks for differing scales of development. Furthermore, in practice, the volume of information needed to evaluate a proposed development will vary not only due to its scale, but also in respect of the sensitivity of the locality in which it is situated. This is elaborated in paragraphs 3.11-3.15. Whilst the objector considers that proposals could be rejected due to a lack of information being submitted, I consider that is unlikely where the application is being undertaken by a diligent professional designer. Moreover, inadequate proposals submitted by untrained applicants/agents are unlikely to be of the quality that the Council are seeking to secure.
- 3.1.3 With regard to issue two, the principle of seeking reduced car parking requirements combined with contributions towards improvements that will encourage the use of non-car modes of transport conforms with national policies aimed at reducing reliance upon the car. Moreover, the underlying approach of directing development towards the existing built-up areas should serve to reduce the need to travel by car and is a fundamental element of the sustainable principles upon which the Plan has been based.

### RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 3.2. Development Aims (paragraphs 3.3 - 3.4)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.4	210/7	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited
3.4	287/11	Holmes and Sons

### ISSUES

1. Whether the Plan's strategy will cause harm to non-renewable resources. (210/7)
2. Whether the Aims have been expressed sufficiently comprehensively. (287/11)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.2.1 The first issue questions the Plan's underlying development aim in principle, suggesting it will lead to a loss of significant features such as open areas and over-burden public transport, roads and other facilities. However, the philosophy of guiding development to existing built-up areas is based on national and strategic policy and is intended to ensure it is sustainable, involving the re-use of brownfield sites and unused/under-used land, whilst at the same time utilising and augmenting existing infrastructure. I regard such an approach as entirely appropriate compared with the alternative of ignoring that potential and directing the major part of the development onto greenfield sites in the countryside. Moreover, there are safeguards within other policies in the Plan to ensure amenity is protected and infrastructure is suitably improved.
- 3.2.2 In the second issue, the objector considers this section should mention the need to meet the District's strategic housing target. Although the Council correctly indicate this is already referred to elsewhere in the Plan and hence there is no need to repeat it here, I consider the reference solely to the development within the existing built up areas does not cover the strategy sufficiently comprehensively. Accordingly, I consider a further sentence should be added to para 3.3 which states: The Plan also seeks to ensure that the District's strategic housing and employment requirements can be accommodated in urban extensions at MDAs West of Waterlooville and Winchester City (North) in order to comply with the Structure Plan.

### RECOMMENDATION

- 3.2.3 That the Plan be modified by adding a further sentence to para 3.3 which states:  
*The Plan also seeks to ensure that the District's strategic housing and employment requirements can be accommodated in urban extensions at MDAs West of Waterlooville and Winchester City (North) in order to comply with the Structure Plan.*

## 3.3. Design and Development Principles for all New Development; Design-led approach (paragraphs 3.5 – 3.10)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.5	386/3	Bewley Homes
3.5	261/6	Government Office for the South East
3.9	210/8	Berkeley Strategic Land Limited

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD03.01	2312/1	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD03.02	2312/2	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD03.03	2288/1	J Hyland
RD03.03	175/3	Save Barton Farm Group
RD03.04	2312/3	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD0304	175/4	Save Barton Farm Group

## ISSUES

1. Should the text be amended to further clarify the 'design-led' policy approach adopted by the Plan, in regard to new development? (261/6)
2. Would the inclusion of a locationally specific 'protective' proposal, along the lines of Proposal EN.1 in the adopted Local Plan, more closely accord with the intentions of PPG.3? (386/3)
3. Is it necessary, or appropriate, for the Review Plan's design and development principles to elaborate on how the Plan's housing strategy will address any adverse public response to the intensification of development within the built-up areas? (210/8)
4. In terms of its 'design-led' approach to new development, is the Plan sufficiently flexible to respond positively to more imaginative design proposals? (2312/1REVDEP, 2312/2REVDEP)
5. In seeking higher-density density development and redevelopment within the District's built-up areas, does the Plan pay sufficient attention to the comparative size of any adjoining residential plot(s), situated beyond the site boundaries of proposed new developments? (2288/1REVDEP, 175/3REVDEP)
6. Does the Plan provide sufficient encouragement, and the necessary means, for local communities and individuals to participate in the design process? (2312/3REVDEP, 175/4REVDEP)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.3.1 In the first issue, the Council introduced alterations to the text (RD03.01 & RD03.02) which, to my mind, adequately clarify the Council's intention regarding the design led approach and which accord with the Government's advice in PPG3.
- 3.3.2 With regard to issue two, the objector has raised a concern that is mentioned by other objectors elsewhere regarding the omission of any policy comparable to EN1 in the adopted Local Plan. This identified special policy areas with the intention of limiting the amount and type of development within them. However, the Council recognise that this does not conform to current Government advice and they now propose to have a design-led approach, aimed at ensuring every development proposal, whatever its scale and location, responds positively and sympathetically to its particular site and surroundings, whilst reinforcing the local distinctiveness and character. Areas requiring special attention due to their architectural or historic interest are identified separately as designated Conservation Areas and there are statutory requirements concerning development within them. I consider the arbitrary introduction of additional special areas lying outside these is inappropriate and unnecessary if an even-handed design-led approach is taken towards the remaining areas of the District.
- 3.3.3 A developer expresses some concern in issue three about the stance the Council will adopt towards public opposition towards higher densities. However, the Council indicate the underlying principles of the Plan are aimed at enhancing the economic and social well being of the District, whilst bringing functional and environmental benefits to all sections of the community. They consider these aspects are likely to be appreciated and accepted by the majority of those who live and work in the District. Moreover, I note that the alteration to the text (RD03.03) specifically indicates that development should utilise the potential for higher densities. I am content that the Council will have regard to valid objections to development proposals and distinguish between these and those that are NIMBY-based opposition to development *per se*.
- 3.3.4 In issue four, the Council indicate that whilst they intend to ensure every proposal will respond positively to its site and surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness, that does not imply a particular design style or vernacular will be imposed. Indeed, the revised wording of para 3.6 refers to the importance of good quality layouts and imaginative designs that do not compromise the

quality of the environment. I am content that with this indication and the requirement to submit supporting and explanatory information with applications, there is sufficient encouragement for imaginative designs and scope for the selected solution to be elucidated.

3.3.5 Turning to issue five, the appearance of new higher density developments within or as an extension to existing built-up areas will frequently differ from that which it adjoins. Development inevitably by its very nature involves a change from what currently pertains, but it is not essential for new development to mimic or be a clone of its surroundings to make it acceptable.

3.3.6 Finally, the contribution that local communities can make towards the development process has been recognised by the introduction of an alteration to the text (RD03.04), where the Council indicate they will specifically encourage and support local communities in the preparation of design statements and neighbourhood plans as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The altered wording clearly states that such SPG will be subject to public consultation and I am content that is a necessary prerequisite for such a document to carry any significant weight. Nevertheless, whilst one of the objectors states that they have received no support or encouragement from the Council in preparing or presenting any guidance documents relating to Barton Farm, the Council indicate that they are unaware of any such approach from them concerning the production of a development brief for Winchester City (North) MDA. Nevertheless, I am content that the Inquiry afforded ample opportunity for representations concerning that proposal to be aired.

### RECOMMENDATION

3.3.7 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 3.4. Planning Applications: Supporting and Explanatory Information (paragraphs 3.11 - 3.17, Proposals DP.1 & DP2)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.1	886/1	A. J Archard
DP.1	373/2	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
DP.1	138/20	John Hayter
DP.1	879/1	Littleton and Harestock Parish Council
DP.1	1439/5	Shedfield Society
DP.1	330/1	Wildlife Trusts
DP.1	324/2	Town Planning Consultancy Ltd
DP.2	224/2	Church Commissioners
DP.2	877/1	Kier Land
DP.2	353/7	Sparsholt College Hampshire
DP.2	367/1	Terry
DP.2	306/1	Ministry of Defence

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0306	2108/1	BT Plc
RD0306	2263/1	J A Porter
RD0306	2312/4	Kingfisher Housing Association

### ISSUES

1. Where adopted Village Design Statements exist, should the Review Plan give these a formal status as Supplementary Planning Guidance for the community? (879/1)

2. Should a 'design statement' be required in the case of every application for planning permission and does the Plan lack clarity or adequately explain the reduced need for such information, in instances where a proposed development would have little, if any, external impact? (138/20, 324/2, 373/2, 1439/5)
3. Should the size of an application site be a primary determinant of the need for an accompanying design statement? (261/8, 2108/1REVDEP, 2312/4REVDEP, 2263/1REVDEP)
4. Should nature conservation interests be given more prominence in Proposal DP.1? (330/1, 886/1)
5. Should the Plan require all major landowners to produce long-term Master Plans for their landholdings in Proposal DP.2? (224/2, 306/1, 353/7, 367/1, 877/1)

## **INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 3.4.1 The first issue been addressed by the Council in the Revised Deposit Plan by the alteration to para 3.10 (RD03.04) to take account of the status that will be attributed to village design statements. I consider this suitably qualifies the Plan, providing additional clarity whilst also overcoming the objection.
- 3.4.2 In issue two, the Council points out that para 3.11 identifies the reduced requirement for straight-forward or small-scale proposals, which includes a short design statement in addition to the usual details required with a planning application. Paragraph 3.12 *et seq* sets out the requirements for more complex or large scale development proposals. The Council introduced a size qualification of 0.5ha (RD03.06) in addition to proposals in sensitive locations or those which would have a significant impact on a locality as the triggers that would require a more detailed explanation of the design principles. Although an objector considered it was necessary to set out more prescriptive guidance in the Plan to avoid the possibility of an application being rejected for having inadequate accompanying information, I am satisfied that in practice, professional designers will be very aware of what they are required to produce and frequently already do so. Nevertheless, it was accepted by the Council at the Inquiry that the paragraph at the end of the policy would be better positioned towards the beginning, immediately following the first sentence (subsequently advanced as FPC03.A). I agree that this is a more logical ordering of the policy and would assist in improving the clarity of the Plan.
- 3.4.3 Issue three derives from the insertion of the size threshold. Whilst some objectors consider this to be arbitrary and unnecessarily onerous, it was introduced in the Revised Deposit Plan at the insistence of GOSE in the interest of certainty. Whilst I accept that it is a figure that has not been justified and could thus be viewed as being arbitrary, I agree with the Council that it is a fair threshold for determining what constitutes a large proposal and provides the degree of certainty that was sought. Although some smaller developments could warrant a more detailed justification and assessment, I consider these are adequately covered by the introduction of the reference to *sensitive sites* and *proposals which will have a significant impact on the local area*. Accordingly, despite an objector finding its punctuation required amendment for clarity, I am satisfied that the policy is not unduly onerous and is sufficiently clear and precise, particularly with the re-ordering of its wording that has been agreed and recommended above and when it is read with the accompanying explanatory text.
- 3.4.4 In the fourth issue, the objectors consider insufficient emphasis has been given in the criteria to wildlife and habitat conservation considerations. However, the Council indicate that criterion (i) of Proposal DP.1 refers to *natural features and designations*, which is intended to encompass all nature conservation interests and they consider the singling out of nature conservation as a factor for special mention would confer an undue prominence upon the topic. I am concerned that the term *natural features* may be too imprecise as to be open to various interpretations. In particular, being linked with townscape and landscape, it could be viewed as pertaining to visual natural features such as trees, hedgerows, rivers etc, which whilst also being of nature conservation value are not specifically cited as such. I regard areas which have, or are designated for their nature conservation interest/ importance to be at least as weighty as the elements of historic importance that are included separately in criterion (v) and sufficiently worthy therefore to warrant an individual mention in a further criterion. I recommend accordingly.
- 3.4.5 Finally, issue five relates to Proposal DP.2, with objectors generally commenting that the requirement for owners/ users of large land holdings to produce Masterplans for their estates when submitting development proposals is unduly onerous and disproportionate. The Council qualified

the requirement in the Revised Deposit by the inclusion of a reference to significant development and contiguous land (RD03.07). I consider the revised wording provides added clarity of the intent and regard it as an appropriate measure for the Council to gauge the wider potential implications or cumulative benefits of proposals, notwithstanding that most such areas are within the countryside. I thus conclude no further modifications are necessary.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

3.4.6 That the Plan be modified by:

a) rewording Proposal DP.1 as follows:

*The Local Planning Authority will only permit development where planning applications are supported by a design statement. Plans, sketches and other explanatory information should be included, as appropriate to the site and the scale of development, to set the proposal in its full context, indicating where important existing features are to be retained and enhanced where appropriate, justifying the removal of any such features and explaining how the site and its context have influenced the design of the proposal. Particularly in the case of more sensitive sites, those exceeding 0.5 hectare in size, or development proposals which will have a significant impact on the local area, design statements should include a full site analysis identifying, as appropriate, the following:*

(i) etc.

b) addition of a further criterion to Proposal DP1 that refers to areas known and/or designated for their nature conservation importance/interest.

## 3.5. General Design Criteria (paragraphs 3.18 - 3.22, Proposal DP.3)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.19	468/4	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.3	386/4	Bewley Homes
DP.3	227/2	Bewley HomesPlc and R C H Morgan-Giles
DP.3	211/1	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
DP.3	212/3	Bishops Waltham Society
DP.3	1381/1	C Beaven
DP.3	1164/4	C Robert Bradshaw
DP.3	468/3	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.3	224/3	Church Commissioners
DP.3	206/6	Compass Roadside Ltd
DP.3	261/9 & 10	Government Office for the South East
DP.3	214/2	Grainger Trust Plc
DP.3	354/7	Hallam Land Management
DP.3	1434/9	Hampshire County Council
DP.3	345/2 & 3	Hugh Watson
DP.3	346/2	Iain Fleming
DP.3	1376/1 & 6	J. G Hurcom
DP.3	1392/1	J. P. A. Ouvry
DP.3	1168/3	Jean Bradshaw
DP.3	138/21	John Hayter
DP.3	881/1	John Stanning
DP.3	350/2	Martin Meadows
DP.3	1380/1	Michael Adams
DP.3	1385/1	Neil M. M. Buchanan
DP.3	1245/1 & 2	P. H. Radcliffe
DP.3	1249/2	P.A Warner
DP.3	880/1, 2 & 3	Pat Goodall
DP.3	1149/1	Patrick Geraets
DP.3	302/8	R. L. Stubbs and Clients
DP.3	313/5 & 7	St Giles Residents' Association

DP.3	343/4 &5	Stephenson
DP.3	397/2	Taylor Woodrow (was Bryant Homes)
DP.3	324/3	Town Planning Consultancy Ltd
DP.3	1251/1 & 7	W. G. Pollock
DP.3	333/3	Winchester Landscape Alliance
DP.3	334/1	WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc
DP.3	1428/2	Wonston Parish Council

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0308	386/1	Bewley Homes
RD0308	212/16	Bishops Waltham Society
RD0308	468/10	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD0308	2245/1	Compton and Shawford Parish Council
RD0308	2278/1	Compton Down Society
RD0308	2165/1	David Walker
RD0308	261/1 & 2	Government Office for the South East
RD0308	374/1	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
RD0308	2263/2	J A Porter
RD0308	1089/1	J. A Morse
RD0308	138/19	John Hayter
RD0308	2312/5, 6, 7 & 8	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD0308	446/1	Linden Holdings Plc
RD0308	2290/1	Linden Homes
RD0308	2298/1	Long
RD0308	1370/1	Maurice Keith Charrett
RD0308	175/5	Save Barton Farm Group
RD0308	2291/1	Sharon Brentnall
RD0308	397/1	Taylor Woodrow (was Bryant Homes)
RD0308	2311/6, 7 & 8	The Rowans
RD0308	328/2	Twyford Parish Council

## OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PIC0301	212/1 & 2	Bishops Waltham Society
PIC0302	220/1	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
PIC0302	475/5	Clients of Southern Planning Practice
PIC0302	1146/1	Colten Developments Ltd
PIC0302	234/1	Gleeson Homes
PIC0302	1434/1	Hampshire County Council
PIC0302	2207/1	South Coast Fencing (manufacturing) Ltd
PIC0302	2338/1	Wilson House Developments Ltd
PIC0303	212/3	Bishops Waltham Society
PIC0303	220/2	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
PIC0303	1146/2	Colten Developments Ltd
PIC0303	234/2	Gleeson Homes
PIC0303	1434/2	Hampshire County Council
PIC0303	1433/1 & 2	Hampshire County Council
PIC0303	2207/2	South Coast Fencing (manufacturing) Ltd
PIC0303	2338/2	Wilson House Developments Ltd

## ISSUES

1. Are the requirements and criteria in Proposal DP.3 too complex, and unnecessarily wide-ranging and/or could they be improved by a number of changes? (138/21, 206/6, 211/1, 212/3, 224/3)
2. Should the Plan contain a 'protective' policy for areas of special character, to carry forward the spirit and purpose of Proposal EN.1 in the adopted Plan and require planning briefs to be prepared for whole areas affected by the development where large-scale schemes are proposed, to explore development potential of other land? (1370/4, 354/7, 276/3, 1381/1, 1385/1, 880/2, 881/1, 350/1, 1380/1, 1149/1, 1168/3, 1392/1, 212/1PIC, 220/1PIC, 220/2PIC, 234/1PIC, 234/2PIC, 475/5PIC, 1146/1PIC, 1146/2PIC, 2338/1PIC, 2338/2PIC, 2207/1PIC, 2207/2PIC, 1434/1PIC, 1434/2PIC, 212/2PIC, 21/3PIC, 1433/1PIC, 1433/2PIC)

3. Do the Revised Deposit alterations to DP.3 make the policy more difficult to interpret and to apply? (138/19REVDEP, 261/1REVDEP, 2263/2REVDEP)
4. If its retention is considered appropriate, should criterion (i) of Proposal DP. 3 be re-worded to provide for a more flexible application of housing density requirements, which can take account of, and be influenced by, qualitative considerations such as location within a Conservation Area or other townscape, or settlement, character area? (302/8, 261/9, 214/2, 227/2, 386/4, 397/2, 1251/1, 345/2, 343/7, 313/7, 346/2, 1245/1, 1376/6, 880/1, 1428/2, 1249/2, 1164/4, 386/1REVDEP, 397/1REVDEP, 446/1REVDEP, 2291/1REVDEP, 1370/1REVDEP, 2245/1REVDEP, 2298/1REVDEP, 2165/1REVDEP, 2278/1REVDEP, 1089/1REVDEP, 2288/1REVDEP, 175/3 & 5REVDEP, 328/2REVDEP, 2312/5REVDEP, 261/1REVDEP)
5. Should Proposal DP.3 (ii) give greater encouragement to a more 'innovative' or creative approach, in the design of new developments? (214/2, 261/10)
6. Are the off-street parking standards, referred to in Proposal DP.3 (iii) and supporting paragraph 3.19, unreasonably restrictive and do they conform to those standards set by Government advice and Hampshire County Council? (334/1, 468/3, 468/4, 1251/7, 345/3, 343/5, 313/5, 1245/2, 1376/1, 880/3, 2312/6REVDEP)
7. Do the provisions of Proposal DP.3 (vi) prejudice commercial 'ransom' opportunities, or the arrangement of access and parking layouts within a principal development site? (1434/9, 324/3)
8. Should the word "unacceptable" be removed from Proposal DP.3 (vii)? (333/3)
9. In terms of giving expression to the Plan's 'design and development principles', are the DP.3 criteria (viii), (ix) and (x), necessary and appropriate and are they expressed in terms which would usefully guide and inform development proposals? (468/10REVDEP, 2312/8REVDEP, 2312/7REVDEP, 212/16REVDEP, 261/2REVDEP)

## **INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 3.5.1 In response to numerous objections at the First Deposit stage seeking detailed variations to this policy and its accompanying text, the Council duly incorporated various alterations in the Revised Deposit, but these have themselves attracted objections. This led to the Council's Pre-Inquiry Changes PIC03.01, PIC03.02 and PIC03.03, which in turn have attracted counter objections. Whilst it is apparent that there is general acceptance of the principles espoused, I regard the objections and the Council's response mainly as an exercise of floundering in detail, which is exemplified in the first issue and an inevitable consequence of introducing all-encompassing design criteria that are aimed at every conceivable type of development in any possible location throughout the District. The Council consider the policy and text are consistent with Government policy and not over-complicated, but in my experience, it is preferable to keep such policies as concise as possible, and to leave the more effusive specific requirements to detailed design statements and development briefs. My consideration of the objections follows that philosophy.
- 3.5.2 In the second issue, considerable concern has been expressed regarding the failure to include any policy in this Plan that is the same as or comparable to Proposal EN1 of the adopted Local Plan. It is evident that EN1 was formulated largely to apply to areas of low density housing where there is often a well developed tree cover. However, the Council assessed this policy as being untenable, particularly in the light of the Government's policy towards increasing development densities as outlined in PPG3 and they have thus adopted a design-led approach towards new development which provides for making more efficient use of land within existing built-up areas. Nevertheless, the Plan still provides for retention of trees, and well designed development, while areas recognised for their special character or appearance are designated as Conservation Areas, where there is a statutory requirement to ensure that is preserved or enhanced. Proposal DP3 is not intended to be unduly restrictive or heavily reliant on replicating what exists but rather requiring development to respond creatively to the character and appearance of the locality.
- 3.5.3 Whilst some of the objections are based on the fear that the present appearance of EN1 areas will be altered, to some extent at least that is the consequence of most development in whatever location. Whilst a substantial part of the public comment and hence the Council's responses related to residential development, it should be borne in mind that this is a general policy applicable to all forms of built development. I generally support the Council's stance of taking account of local character and encouraging a comprehensive approach towards inserting new development in established areas rather than an acceptance of haphazard pepper-potting, which sometimes has the unsatisfactory unplanned incongruous appearance that has been alluded to by some objectors. Nevertheless, whilst I thus accept PIC03.01, I regard PIC03.02 as being too vague a policy criterion



to be workable. The Council already have in place or will produce Masterplans or Development Briefs in respect of the MDAs and large sites. They acknowledge their proposed requirement to produce comprehensive schemes does not indicate a minimum site size threshold, the potential for blight and the fact that they cannot refuse permission for an otherwise acceptable proposal. I therefore consider the criterion is unclear and unworkable and thus reject PIC03.02 and the supporting text in PIC03.03.

- 3.5.4 The proposition advanced by objectors in issue three, is that the Revised Deposit alterations to Proposal DP.3 have made the policy more difficult to interpret and to apply. Meanwhile GOSE suggest that some of the lengthy policy wording would be more appropriately incorporated as text in the Plan. I share both those sentiments and address some of these in more detail below.
- 3.5.5 Issue four concerns criterion (i) which has been expanded considerably, introducing details of residential density and also attempts to indicate considerations that will be taken into account when assessing density calculations. I regard these as being more appropriate for location in the Housing Chapter and consider it would suffice to merely state: *makes efficient and effective use of land or buildings*. The cross-reference to another criterion is necessary only because the policy is unclear whether all the criteria should be met or just some of them. I conclude this could be overcome by the addition of *all* to para 3.18 between *against* and *the*; and *where relevant* to the end of the sentence. This conclusion to simplify the criterion also addresses the many detailed comments that have arisen, which frequently seek to duplicate other provisions that are covered elsewhere in the Plan.
- 3.5.6 The matters raised in issue five relating to criterion (ii) express concerns that derivative or repetitive designs might be sought, the omission of any reference to height and with GOSE suggesting there could usefully be a robust reference to “responsible innovation”. I am satisfied that the additional sentence proposed for insertion by PIC03.01, suitably indicates the need to take account of the wider geographical setting and the additional scope that Supplementary Planning Guidance can provide. Nevertheless, PPG12 is quite clear on the need to differentiate between Plan policies and SPG and I consider it would therefore be more appropriate that PIC03.01 is incorporated into the accompanying text rather than in the policy. With regard to the comment about height, I agree with the Council that the use of the word *scale* already encompasses that together with matters such as mass and footprint. The Council regard the GOSE comment as having already been addressed by the mention of creative design in para 3.19. I agree. Nevertheless, I consider the criterion could be usefully terminated at the word *environment* and the elaboration consigned to the text.
- 3.5.7 Turning to issue six, which relates to criterion (iii), whilst some objectors are concerned about use of the word *minimum* the Council state it is qualified by para 3.19 which indicates that parking should conform to the County Highway Authority standards and these in turn are accepted as being compliant with PPG13 advice. The expansion of the criterion at Revised Deposit stage acceptably widens the ambit to take account of parking in the locality. Whilst this additional wording led to an objection, on grounds that it does not encompass the full range of matters that can influence parking provision, these are covered in greater detail in the Transport Chapter. Nevertheless, I consider the criterion could be usefully terminated at the word *minimum* and the elaboration consigned to the text.
- 3.5.8 In line with other suggestions to abbreviate the criteria, I consider criterion (iv) could be terminated at the word *permeability*, with the elaboration consigned to the text.
- 3.5.9 To correct an inaccurate reference to Proposal T3 following criterion (v) the Council advanced a Further Proposed Change (FPC03.B) to refer instead to T13, which I accept on grounds of accuracy. However, I also consider that criterion (v) could be terminated at the word *transport*, with the elaboration consigned to the text.
- 3.5.10 Issue seven relates to criterion (vi) and particularly concerns perceived prejudice to commercial ‘ransom’ opportunities, or the arrangement of access and parking layouts within a principal development site. However, the Council indicated that whilst the former is not a planning matter, such ransom strips can threaten site assembly and the criterion is more concerned with ensuring layouts take proper account of neighbouring land. I accept that response and I also do not agree that it would necessarily prejudice a layout within the principal development site as the Council

indicate they would not apply it in an inflexible manner. Moreover, if there were a degree of financial prejudice involved in providing access to a further piece of land, I am content that could be allowed for in any normal commercial negotiations, or where necessary, compulsory acquisition. However, again in the interest of brevity, I consider the criterion could be terminated at *sites*, with the elaboration consigned to the text.

- 3.5.11 In issue eight, concerning the requested deletion of *unacceptable* from criterion (vii), I agree with the Council that removal of that word would make it an unreasonable test that would be unduly onerous and fail to conform with the yardstick of assessing whether “demonstrable harm” arises.
- 3.5.12 Finally, in issue nine, the objections arise from the revisions made at the Revised Deposit stage. It is apparent that (viii) and (ix) have been inserted particularly in relation to the provision of residential recreation and amenity space. Moreover, the requirement in (viii) to provide such in accordance with Proposal RT.3 seems to me as an unnecessary repetition of a policy requirement that appears elsewhere in the Plan. As policies should be self contained and not contain cross-reference to other policies, I consider the criterion may safely be deleted. On the other hand criterion (ix) is worded again to apply solely to housing, whereby the Council appear to have lost sight in its drafting of the fact that this is a general policy aimed at all forms of development. They have also used expressions that lack precision and clarity. I therefore propose an alternative form of wording that reflects the requirement for provision of amenity and recreational space. I regard the matter of overlooking as falling within the purview of criterion (vii). I am content with the repositioning of the former Proposal DP.7 as a criterion (x) relating to refuse and recyclables.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.5.13 That the Plan be modified by:
- a) adding *all* to para 3.18 between *against* and *the*; and *where relevant* to the end of the sentence.
  - b) rewording criterion (i) to state: *makes efficient and effective use of land or buildings*.
  - c) terminating criterion (ii) at the word *environment* and consigning the elaboration to the text.
  - d) incorporating PIC03.01 into the accompanying text rather than in the policy criterion.
  - e) terminating criterion (iii) at the word *minimum* and consigning the elaboration to the text.
  - f) terminating criterion (iv) at the word *permeability* and consigning the elaboration to the text.
  - g) terminating criterion (v) at the word *transport* and consigning the elaboration to the text.
  - h) in accordance with FPC03.B
  - i) terminating criterion (vi) at the word *sites*, and consigning the elaboration to the text.
  - j) deletion of criterion (viii)
  - k) re-wording criterion (ix) as follows: *includes within the development sufficient amenity and recreational space appropriate to its size, design and function*.

## 3.6. Access for People with Limited Mobility (Paragraphs 3.23 - 3.24, Proposal DP.4)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.4	468/5	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.4	287/10	Holmes and Sons
DP.4	138/22	John Hayter
DP.4	882/1	Keith Story

### ISSUE

Whether the policy is appropriate and should the terminology used be more fully defined?

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.6.1 As to the concern about the terminology used, the Council introduced the definition of *Mobility Housing* in the Glossary of the Revised Deposit, which addresses the objection in part. Whilst I understand the objectors' concern about the imprecision of some of the other terms used, I agree with the Council that *adequate access* and *appropriate facilities* do not require further elaboration as to do so would involve inappropriate reference to measures covered by other legislation than Planning. Further qualification sought regarding the precise types of development to which this would apply would also stray into territory covered under other enactments and overlooks the fact that the policy is intended for general application.
- 3.6.2 Some objectors question the necessity and appropriateness of the policy, having regard to the other legislation that covers this topic. However, the Council point out that the relevant regulations and provisions in other enactments are mentioned in para 3.24 and indicate the inclusion of the policy is not intended to duplicate these, but rather to emphasise a legitimate planning interest in these issues. I am content that the policy and text sufficiently highlight the topic without being unduly prescriptive or duplicative. However, I too question the efficacy of the policy and consider nothing would be lost if it were to be converted to informative text.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 3.6.3 That the Plan be modified by incorporating Proposal DP.4 as text.

## 3.7. Landscape and the Built Environment (paragraphs 3.25 - 3.27, Proposal DP.5)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.25	1387/15	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group
3.27	1387/12	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group
DP.5	1371/1	A Ames
DP.5	386/5	Bewley Homes
DP.5	468/6	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.5	224/4	Church Commissioners
DP.5	1387/14	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group
DP.5	214/1	Grainger Trust Plc
DP.5	882/2	Keith Story
DP.5	877/2	Kier Land
DP.5	397/3	Taylor Woodrow (was Bryant Homes)
DP.5	333/4	Winchester Landscape Alliance

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0309	386/2	Bewley Homes
RD0309	468/3	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD0309	214/1	Grainger Trust Plc
RD0309	2107/1	Grainger Trust PLC
RD0309	374/2	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
RD0309	2312/9	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD0309	175/6	Save Barton Farm Group
RD0309	2291/2	Sharon Brentnall
RD0309	2311/9	The Rowans

### OBJECTIONS TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGES

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

Paragraph	Number	
PIC0304	212/4	Bishops Waltham Society
PIC0305	212/5	Bishops Waltham Society

## ISSUES

1. Does paragraph 3.25 place equal emphasis on the treatment of the built environment and landscape and should this paragraph make reference to progress on the Countryside Agency's proposals for the creation of a South Downs National Park? (1387/14, 1387/15)
2. With regard to any major proposal, should the reference to 'full environmental assessment', in paragraph 3.27, be changed to become a mandatory requirement? (1387/12)
3. With particular regard to features 'of interest', are the purposes of proposal DP.5 sufficiently well defined? (214/1, 224/4, 386/5, 397/3, 1371/1, 882/2, 468/6, 877/2, 333/4, 3742REVDEP, 386/2REVDEP, 2312/9REVDEP, 468/3REVDEP, 175/6REVDEP)
4. Should the Landscape Character Assessment, or Appendix 2 to the Plan, be changed in order to include specific reference to the provisions of Proposal DP.5? (212/4PIC)
5. Does paragraph 3.26, in the supporting text to Proposal DP.5 provide a sufficiently clear explanation as to the methods by which 'important features' can be identified? (212/5PIC)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.7.1 Although the CPRE consider the text should be altered as indicated in issue one, I agree with the Council that para 3.25 does not provide a disproportionate distinction between importance the built environment and the rural landscape. Moreover, reference to the National Park status for the AONB is contained in the Countryside Chapter. Hence, I consider no modifications are necessary.
- 3.7.2 In issue two, the CPRE seek full environmental assessments for major developments as a requirement. Although the Council indicate that such assessments are likely to be necessary for all major developments, they use the words *may be required* to allow them to decide on a case by case basis. In any event as the requirement to provide an EA is set out in statutory regulations, I agree with the Council that it would be inappropriate to specify them as a requirement.
- 3.7.3 In issue three, the Council incorporated some alterations at the Revised Deposit stage (RD03.09) to address some of the detailed concerns regarding clarity and inserting a criterion relating to ecological importance. However, objectors question whether the criteria in Proposal DP5 are too subjective, all encompassing and open to interpretation. The Council disagree and do not regard it as being too generalised in its approach and maintain that the reference to *important* features is deliberately intended to avoid being over-prescriptive and would be assessed when dealing with individual development proposals. However, I consider the criticisms stem from the general nature of the policy, in which, by definition, a degree of subjectivity is almost inevitable. Furthermore, I acknowledge that varying degrees of importance may be attributed to different features by various individuals or bodies as would the assessment of the harm that would arise. The topic is one upon which almost everyone has views and opinions and it will be open to developers, the Council and third parties to obtain informed judgements and arrive at their conclusions accordingly. I fail to see how the policy can be made more definitive having regard to these factors.
- 3.7.4 The objections to the Revised Deposit again questioned the policy's clarity. In particular, it is unclear in criterion (i) who would be responsible for site analysis studies or whose recognition of importance would prevail. The Council point out that under the design-led approach they will be expecting all applications for development to be accompanied by supporting information. The Council proposed a Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC03.05) to para 3.26 referring to the potential sources. I consider this suitably addresses the objection and provides the added clarity sought. While another objector considered the loss of some of the features mentioned should be balanced against development needs and the formation of new features, I regard that as an inherent concomitant of the planning process.
- 3.7.5 Criticism is also made of the lack of elaboration of key characteristics as altered in Appendix 2 by the Revised Deposit Plan. This is addressed by the Council's proposal to add the mention of landscapes and built form strategies in a Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC03.04) to DP.5(v). I regard that as suitably amplifying the criterion.
- 3.7.6 Issues four and five arise from the two PICs and a perception that this policy, Appendix 2 and Policy CE.6 are not mutually consistent, mainly because the Landscape Character Areas referred

to in Appendix 2 and Diagram 2 relate to the countryside and wash over the smaller settlements but omit the built-up area of Winchester. However, as the Council indicated, Winchester is covered by the townscape assessment: "Winchester City and its Setting", which I consider could usefully be added to the end of PIC03.05 to address the objection.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7.7 That the Plan be modified in accordance with PIC03.04 and PIC03.05, with the addition of: *such as "Winchester City and its Setting"* added to the end of the latter.

## 3.8. Trees and Development (paragraphs 3.28 - 3.32)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.28	1379/1	Richard Bayley
3.31 & 32	1387/7 & 13	CPRE Mid Hampshire District Group

### ISSUES

1. Does the wording of Plan paragraph 3.28 indicate appropriate regard to the availability of space, in connection with the planting and subsequent maturing of trees on high-density sites? (1379/1)
2. Is the wording of paragraphs 3.31 and 3.32 sufficiently clear and robust, with regard to the protection of trees and hedgerows and the circumstances in which supplementary tree planting will be required? (1387/7, 1387/13)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.8.1 In the first issue, the objector is concerned that insufficient attention may be paid to the impact that growing trees can have on buildings in terms of root damage and shading etc. when pressing for development at increased densities. However, the Council indicated that such concerns are covered in para 3.29, where these factors are mentioned in precise terms in connection with both existing and new tree planting to ensure adequate space is allowed for them to mature.
- 3.8.2 CPRE are extremely keen to ensure trees and hedgerows are afforded sufficient protection and propose some minor additional wording which they regard as assisting that aim. I do not agree that replacing *high priority* with *the highest priority* in para 3.31 is appropriate as there may well be other factors which will on occasions merit highest priority. Moreover, the Council indicates that the replacement of *is likely to* with *will* in para 3.32 would not allow for circumstances where supplementary tree planting is neither appropriate or desirable. I agree and therefore see no need to modify the Plan in the manner sought.

### RECOMMENDATION

3.8.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## 3.9. Design of Amenity Open Space (paragraphs 3.33 - 3.35, Proposals DP.6 & DP.7)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.6	214/3	Grainger Trust Plc
DP.6	415/1	St Michaels Development Co. Ltd
DP.7	484/2	A Carruthers

DP.7	386/6	Bewley Homes
DP.7	261/13	Government Office for the South East
DP.7	138/23	John Hayter
DP.7	302/5	R. L. Stubbs and Clients

## ISSUES

1. Should Proposal DP.6 be more specific? (415/1, 484/2)
2. Should the reference to 'hard' landscaping be deleted? (214/3)
3. Should DP.7 be altered or deleted? (386/6, 261/13, 138/23, 302/5)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.9.1 The objectors in issue one consider the types of development to which this policy applies should be specified and that in para 3.35 a minimum garden size for housing should be prescribed. However, as the Council indicates, the policy is intended to apply to all forms of development as each can benefit from amenity open space being provided either as a setting for the building or for use by occupants and visitors. I agree. The objector who seeks the specification of a minimum garden size acknowledges that the 12m length they suggest may not always be required. As the Council state, there is no point whatsoever in advancing such a rigid standard unless it is intended to be rigorously applied and I accept their view that the interpretation of what is adequate will vary according to differing circumstances and that the underlying premise of PPG3 is to seek to depart from past conventions that led to stereotypical forms of development. Accordingly, I consider no modification is necessary or appropriate.
- 3.9.2 In issue two, the objector considers reference to hard landscaping should be deleted as it may not be appropriate in all landscaping schemes and provision of parking for local amenity space could encourage car usage. However, criterion (iii) refers to *appropriate hard landscaping and planting* and clearly does not specify hard landscaping must always be provided. With regard to the concern about car parking, criterion (iv) refers specifically to providing parking areas sensitively and not to the provision of parking for amenity areas. I therefore consider the criteria recognise that hard landscaping may not be universally appropriate and that parking should be provided in a sensitive manner. The Plan accordingly requires no modification in this regard.
- 3.9.3 In issue three, Proposal DP.7 was deleted and incorporated as a criterion in Proposal DP.3 (see above) in the Revised Deposit Plan, which I consider to suitably address the objectors' concerns.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 3.9.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

# 3.10. Efficient Use of Resources (paragraphs 3.36 - 3.40, Proposals DP.8 & DP.9)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.8	227/3	Bewley HomesPlc and R C H Morgan-Giles
DP.8	468/7	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.8	214/4	Grainger Trust Plc
DP.8	877/3	Kier Land
DP.8	289/1	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
DP.8	397/4	Taylor Woodrow (was Bryant Homes)
DP.9	468/8	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
DP.9	175/8	Save Barton Farm Group

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD03.12	468/11	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
RD03.12	175/7	Save Barton Farm Group

### ISSUES

1. Is DP.8 too restrictive? (289/1, 397/4, 214/4, 468/7, 468/11REVDEP)
2. Are some elements of criteria (ii-viii) building control matters which should be moved to supporting text as statements of best practice or require further clarification? (877/3, 214/4, 468/7, 214/4)
3. Should the references to soil be amended? (468/7, 175/7REVDEP)
4. Is DP.9 unnecessary, inadequate or inaccurate? (468/8, 175/8, 253/4)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.10.1 Both Government planning advice and Regional Guidance reinforce the need for sustainable development and part of the means for achieving that aim is to ensure there is a prudent use of energy and natural resources. In particular RPG9 indicates that local authorities should use their development control and building regulation processes to seek to influence the design of new development to incorporate use of appropriate renewable energy systems. Whilst interior features of buildings such as heating, ventilation and insulation are covered by other regulations than Planning, many external factors relating to sustainable design and layout, such as those cited in Proposal DP.8, do fall within the purview of Planning and are thus appropriate to highlight within the Plan. Whilst objectors consider it should be phrased more in the way of encouraging rather than prescribing the various measures cited, the Council regard it as appropriate that this is a mandatory rather than an advisory policy. It is frequently stated that the building industry is conservative and slow to adopt innovative measures. Hence, I agree it is important that the increasingly urgent need to consider sustainability in building design and layout is reinforced in a policy such as this. I appraise the detailed objections to the various components of the policy below.
- 3.10.2 In issue two, whilst the Council accept that some of the criteria do relate to matters which are also covered by other legislative regimes, they consider them all to be relevant to the construction stage or subsequent use and each is promoted in national planning guidance. I generally agree that despite the perceived potential for duplication, there are discrete planning considerations involved here in issues connected with the development process and the use of land and buildings. The Council nevertheless acknowledge there are limited planning powers available in relation to some of the criteria listed in this policy and they also state that it would not be applied rigidly to prevent an otherwise acceptable development from taking place. In these circumstances, and given the rather nebulous nature of some of the criteria, I consider it would be preferable to state the policy in simple terms and list in the text only those criteria in respect of which there is planning jurisdiction.
- 3.10.3 In issue three, it is apparent that the inclusion of reference to soil structure has been inserted in the context of drainage and its potential to support plant life. I consider both these aspects are suitably covered elsewhere in the Plan in terms of flood risk and conservation of agricultural / environmental land resources. I therefore see no reason for its inclusion here, notwithstanding that RPG9 indicates that soil has received little attention in the past despite its important role in the production of food, as an ecosystem and as a filter protecting food and water chains from pollutants. However, in common with the other criteria I recommend for listing as examples in the text, the Council could specify that they will seek to avoid the quality of land being destroyed by compaction and ensure topsoil is protected in situ or stored for re-use within the site or elsewhere during building operations through the use of appropriate conditions.
- 3.10.4 Finally, the Environment Agency express concern about the failure in para 3.37 to make specific reference to the types of receptor that would be used to reduce the flushing of pollutants into river systems. I am content there is sufficient indication of the need for attention to this matter in the bullet points under this paragraph and I therefore see no need for any modification in this regard.
- 3.10.5 Although one objector incorrectly raised flooding issues in connection with Proposal DP.9, another indicated that it was inappropriate and unnecessary to include a policy in the Plan relating to measures that would be taken under other enactments. Quite clearly the policy inappropriately refers to other Plan policies and to the Environment Agency's "Ground Water Protection Policy",

which should be consigned to the text. In connection with an objection to Proposal DP.13, which deals with surface and groundwater pollution, I accept there is an unnecessary duplication with this policy and I therefore conclude it can be deleted. I consider the matter of safeguarding the sources of water supply could appropriately be added as a further example to the list in the amended text accompanying Proposal DP.8.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

3.10.6 That the Plan be modified by:

- a) rewording the Proposal DP.8 as follows:  
In order to promote sustainable forms of development, permission will not be granted to proposals where their design and layout would demonstrably involve the wasteful use of energy and/or natural resources.
- b) Incorporating suitably amended accompanying text to DP.8 listing examples selected from the current criteria in Proposal DP.8 in respect of which there is planning jurisdiction.
- c) adding a further example stating: *safeguarding the sources of water supply* and including reference to the Environment Agency's "Ground Water Protection Policy".
- d) deleting Proposal DP.9

## 3.11. Aerodrome Safety (New Subheading, Text and Proposal)

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0318	261/3	Government Office for the South East

### ISSUE

Whether there should be a reference to Airport Safeguarding measures.

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

3.11.1 GOSE's concern in this regard was addressed by the inclusion of a new policy and accompanying text in the Revised Deposit Plan RD03.13 – RD03.18). However, in response to the further information from GOSE that the references required updating to refer to the National Air Traffic Services Ltd (NATS) safeguarding maps, the Council advanced three Pre Inquiry Changes to the text, Proposal and Proposals Map (PICs 03.06, 03.07 and 03.08). I accept all three in the interests of accuracy and completeness. The Council also advanced a Further Proposed Change FPC03.E, in respect of RD03.17 making mention that the safeguarded areas are shown. (See also 1.1.8 above.

### RECOMMENDATION

3.11.2 That the Plan be modified in accordance with Pre Inquiry Changes 03.06, 03.07 and 03.08 and FPC03.E.

## 3.12. Flood Risk (paragraphs 3.41 - 3.46, Proposals DP.10 & DP.11)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.10	386/7	Bewley Homes
DP.10	468/9	Cala Homes (South) Ltd



DP.10	261/18	Government Office for the South East
DP.10	889/1	J.D.M White
DP.10	879/2	Littleton and Harestock Parish Council
DP.11	1357/1	A McKenzie
DP.11	386/8	Bewley Homes
DP.11	497/2	Bruce Horn
DP.11	305/1	BT Plc
DP.11	883/1	C. A. Payne
DP.11	1208/1	D. A Coates
DP.11	884/1	E. J Wells
DP.11	1434/10	Hampshire County Council
DP.11	1356/1	I. F Grant
DP.11	1215/1	J. C Richardson
DP.11	1354/1	Katherine S. Golding
DP.11	1352/1	L. A. B. Wessely
DP.11	1358/1	M R W Evans
DP.11	452/1	NHS Estates South East
DP.11	1355/1	P Wild
DP.11	1351/1	R M Rainsbury
DP.11	472/1	William Wheatley (Wickham) Ltd

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0319	386/3	Bewley Homes
RD0319	212/5	Bishops Waltham Society
RD0319	374/3	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
RD0319	2312/10	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD0319	2291/3	Sharon Brentnall
RD0319	2311/10	The Rowans
RD0320	1434/1	Hampshire County Council
RD0320	2095/1	NHS Estates South East
RD0323	2312/11	Kingfisher Housing Association
RD0323	175/8 & 9	Save Barton Farm Group
RD0323	2311/11	The Rowans

## ISSUES

1. Do the floodplain areas shown on the inset maps need changing? (879/2, 497/2, 883/1, 1208/1, 1215/1, 1351/1, 1352/1, 1353/1, 1354/1, 1355/1, 1356/1, 1357/1, 879/2, 1358/1)
2. Does the general wording of DP.10 need to be altered to add clarity and to conform with PPG25? (251/9, 386/7, 468/9, 889/1, 2312/10/REVDEP, 212/5/REVDEP)
3. Does the general wording of DP.11 need to be altered to add clarity and to conform with PPG25? (386/8, 305/1, 472/1, 2095/1, 452/1, 251/10)
4. Does the section on flood risk fully apply the principles of the sequential test? (261/18)
5. Should paragraph 3.45 be amended regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and to indicate it is the responsibility of statutory undertakers to provide flood defence or alleviation works? (311/4, 2312/11)
6. Should a distance that development can be located away from dry valleys be specified? (386/3 REVDEP, 374/3/REVDEP)
7. Does RD03.19 conflict with the proposed development at Barton Farm? (175/8 & 9/REVDEP)
8. Is DP.11 unnecessarily restrictive for some sites? (884/1, 434/10, 1434/1/REVDEP)
9. Is there a conflict between DP.10 and DP.11? (212/5 REVDEP)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.12.1 Despite various criticisms that the detailed extent of the flood plains depicted on the Proposals Map are inaccurate in places, the Council state that these were produced from the Environment Agency's indicative flood plain maps, which represent the best current information available on the extent of flood risk. Whilst some areas not so depicted may have been the subject of flooding, this could have been a result of blocked drainage or freak occurrences and not represent a regular risk. On the other hand as the Council indicates, the omission of a site from such identification does not imply it is immune from flood risk, or indeed outside the flood plain, given the scale at which these maps are produced. It is open to objectors to provide definitive evidence of flooding to the

Environment Agency who are continually revising their information as necessary. Nevertheless, I consider it is entirely appropriate for such information to be based on the Environment Agency's Maps and conclude it would be inappropriate to make ad hoc changes to the flood plain information that have not been accepted by the responsible authority.

- 3.12.2 In issues two and three, upon the receipt of numerous objections to the wording of the two policies, the Council incorporated considerable alterations in the Revised Deposit following consultation with the Environment Agency (RD03.19 and RD03.20). These led to the withdrawal of all of the Environment Agency objections and largely addressed the concerns raised by other objectors but have not led to the formal withdrawal of the objections. Where the objections have not been specifically met, the Council either do not accept the criticism or the alternatives advanced. In particular they regard the suggested replacement of *significantly* with *measurably* in DP.10(i) as not adding any clarity to the Plan. Neither do they consider *adequate* in DP10(iv) can be better defined. I agree that the Revised Deposit alterations go a considerable way to addressing the objections and that the outstanding concerns do not warrant further alteration of the wording.
- 3.12.3 The two objections to the Revised Deposit wording of DP.10 contend that it lacks clarity and infringes PPG25 advice. In particular, an objector considers *maintained* in criterion (ii) should be reinstated to *provided*. However, as the Council indicates, this stems from a misunderstanding of what is intended. PPG25 indicates that flood plain areas are unsuitable for new essential civil infrastructure such as hospitals, fire stations etc and as the use of *provided* was capable of being interpreted as implying that such new development will be permitted, which is not the case, it was replaced with *maintained*. I agree with the Council that *maintained* avoids the potential for that confusion. The other objection to the Revised Deposit wording of Proposal DP.10 concerns criterion (iv) which they consider to misinterpret the impact on development in already developed flood plains. It is apparent that this criterion of the policy is intended to equate with flood zone 3a in Table 1 of PPG 25 *ie* developed areas in high risk areas. Whilst the objector regards the criterion as unclear as it does not define what constitutes *adequate* flood defences and does not state such sites may be unsuitable for all forms of development, the Council indicate that the level of flood defences could vary significantly as could what is deemed to be adequate. Hence they state it is difficult to be more definitive. However, although the Council consider it is not possible to be more prescriptive, for that reason, I detect the criticism stems from the lack of clarity in the policies regarding the sequential approach advocated in PPG25.
- 3.12.4 Issue four concerns the sequential test that should be applied when considering proposals in areas at risk of flooding. The Council advanced Further Proposed Changes FPC03.C & D to cover this, and to merge the policies, which I regard as suitably addressing the sequential approach topic, save for criterion (iv) which is merely a cross-reference to other plan policies and as such is unnecessary and should be deleted.
- 3.12.5 The representations in issue five object to the requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all new development and assert that it is inappropriate to seek developer contributions in respect of flood prevention and mitigation measures that are the responsibility of the statutory undertakers. The first objection by Southern Water requested the deletion of the first sentence of para 3.45, which was addressed by the alteration in the First Deposit (RD03.22). However, the reference to SuDS has merely been moved to the preceding paragraph (RD03.21) and their objection that such systems should be a requirement for all development is inappropriate has not been addressed. As they maintain that failure of SuDS can lead to surface water overloading the public sewerage system, I consider the objection would be met by deleting the words *in all new development* from the end of the final sentence of para 3.44. The second objection concerns the responsibility for funding the provision of flood prevention and remediation measures. The Council point to the advice in PPG25 which states that the application of the sequential test may lead to development being permitted that requires some flood prevention/mitigation works. They correctly indicate that where these measures are directly attributable to and necessary for the proposed development, it is appropriate to seek the cost of them to be borne by the developer (PPG25 para 61). As such measures are usually secured through Section 106 Agreements that are governed by the advice in Circular 1/97 which reinforces the requirement for such payments to be directly linked to the scheme in question, I am satisfied that the objector's fears are unfounded. Nevertheless, I consider it would clarify the matter if the first sentence of para 3.45 were to be preceded by the words: *In some new developments ....*

- 3.12.6 Issue six concerns the omission of DP.10(iii) to mention any precise distance buildings should be from dry valley floors and the identification of such exclusion areas on the Proposals Map, but the Council indicates that the risk and severity of flooding in dry valley varies considerably and it is thus impossible to prescribe a precise distance that development should be and each proposal will need its circumstances to be assessed individually. I consider the criterion suitably highlights the potential throughout the District for flood risk associated with dry valleys and ground water.
- 3.12.7 With regard to issue seven the objectors consider the proposed MDA at Barton Farm would not be able to meet the policy criteria, but as the Council indicate, a flood risk assessment would be just one of the prerequisite studies that would inform the consideration of detailed proposals in respect of that site. Furthermore, any planning application would be required to comply with the Plan policies in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 3.12.8 Issue eight arises from landowners with properties in functional flood plains objecting to Proposal DP11 being unduly restrictive. In particular, it is felt that some aesthetic improvements could be achieved through development and that there should not be constraints on changes of use of existing buildings in floodplains. The Council indicate it is entirely legitimate to exercise strict control over development in such areas and PPG 25 indicates that few forms of development would be acceptable here. I support the restrictive approach of the policy which is there for the clearly identifiable purpose of avoiding putting people and buildings in locations that are at risk of flooding. Any development proposals in respect of existing buildings in functional flood plains would clearly need to be assessed on their merits.
- 3.12.9 The objection in issue nine has arisen from the perceived anomaly of DP.10 restricting development on underdeveloped or sparsely developed floodplains, whereas DP.11 allows development on functional floodplains. However, I regard the misunderstanding arises from the failure of the policies to accurately reflect the sequential approach advised in PPG25. I consider the Further Proposed Changes advanced by the Council suitably addresses the point.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.12.10 That the Plan be modified:
- In accordance with FPC03.C & D (excluding criterion (iv)).
  - by deleting the words *in all new development* from the end of the final sentence of para 3.44.
  - by insertion of the words: *In some new developments ....* at the beginning of the first sentence of para 3.45

## 3.13. Infrastructure for New Development (paragraphs 3.47 - 3.49, Proposal DP.12)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.49	1434/12	Hampshire County Council
DP.12	386/9	Bewley Homes
DP.12	1434/11	Hampshire County Council

### ISSUES

- Should the Local Plan go further and spell out a broad programme of social objectives and programmes for provision of social infrastructure? (1434/11) (1434/12)
- Does DP.12 conflict with the Urban Capacity study as it is applicable primarily to large-scale developments? (386/9)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.13.1 In the first issue, in response to the criticism that there are no clear requirements specified in this policy, the Council indicate that apart from the MDAs where the Council has taken the initiative to

identify the essential infrastructure needed from service providers, they have not established a District-wide system for securing infrastructure funding. Consequently, they rely on the provisions of Circular 1/97 when seeking contributions from developers towards specific infrastructure requirements that are notified to them by the respective service providers. However I do not consider that the suggested specific reference to County Council services is appropriate in the Proposal itself, whilst it is clear that in the absence of a protocol on developer contributions agreed between the County and District Councils, it would also be inappropriate for paragraph 3.49 to refer to SPG. In any event I consider that for large scale individual developments these matters are better identified when preparing detailed development briefs.

3.13.2 Although the objector in the second issue assumes that the policy is primarily aimed at large-scale developments, the Council indicate that is not the case and intend it to be applicable to all developments, citing the Open Space contributions that are already in place. Rather than acting as a justification for identifying more large greenfield sites for development as suggested by the objector, I consider it would avoid the confusion that has crept in if the words *especially of larger scale development* were to be deleted from the penultimate sentence in para 3.49.

### RECOMMENDATION

3.13.3 That the Plan be modified by deleting the words *especially of larger scale development* from the penultimate sentence in para 3.49.

## 3.14. Pollution generating development (paragraphs 3.51 - 3.54, Proposal DP.13)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.13	1248/1	East Hampshire AONB Joint Advisory Committee
DP.13	374/9	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
DP.13	889/2	J.D.M White

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0326	175/10	Save Barton Farm Group

### ISSUES

1. Should the policy refer to light pollution? (889/2, 1248/1)
2. Whether the policy covers issues that are too similar to Proposals DP.9, DP.14, and DP.15 thus creating a lack of clarity, with overlapping and conflicting aims? (374/9)
3. Should there already be a study to show the potential polluting effects of the proposed MDA at Barton Farm? (175/10/REVDEP)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

3.14.1 In the first issue, the Council incorporated into the policy a reference to light pollution in the Revised Deposit, which I consider suitably addresses the objections and hence no further modification is necessary.

3.14.2 In response to the second issue, the Council point out the separate topics covered by the respective policies. They maintain that Proposal DP.9 seeks to ensure that the purity and sustainability of water resources are maintained. However, whilst it is apparent from para 3.40 that one of the concerns is to prevent over-extraction, there is also mention therein of pollution and I conclude therefore that there is an unnecessary duplication. I have accordingly recommended the

incorporation of Proposal DP.9 into DP.8 restricting its concerns to safeguarding water resources. I am thus content that mention of water pollution here, would not duplicate that policy. With regard to Proposals DP.14 and DP.15, respectively covering unneighbourly uses and pollution sensitive development, the Council acknowledge there could be some overlap, but they and I regard them as sufficiently distinct and different from pollution generating development to warrant separate policies.

3.14.3 Finally, with regard to Winchester City (North) MDA, the Council indicate that they produced a scoping opinion for an Environmental Statement in February 2002, which includes requirements relating to pollution. Furthermore they indicate that the Plan includes no specific proposals for the MDA and point out that an Environmental Statement has been produced to accompany the planning application that has now been submitted in respect of that site by Cala Homes. I am thus satisfied that any potentially polluting uses will be capable of being identified and measures incorporated to ensure the effects of these are satisfactorily mitigated.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

3.14.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **3.15. Unneighbourly Uses (paragraphs 3.55 - 3.57, Proposal DP.14)**

#### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
DP.14	374/10	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd

#### **ISSUE**

Whether the policy covers issues that are too similar to Proposals DP.9, DP.13 and DP.15 thus creating a lack of clarity, with overlapping and conflicting aims? (374/10)

#### **INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

3.15.1 The issue here is identical in its concerns to those expressed in relation to issue two in the preceding policy. My conclusion there is that my recommendation to delete Proposal DP.9 avoids any potential conflict with that policy, while Proposals DP.13 to DP.15 are sufficiently distinct and different to warrant separate policies. Accordingly, I do not consider there is any need for a modification to this policy or text in respect of the objection.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

3.15.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **3.16. Pollution - Sensitive Development (paragraphs 3.58 - 3.60, Proposal DP.15)**

#### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
DP.15	374/11	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
DP.15	346/4	Iain Fleming
DP.15	877/4	Kier Land
DP.15	311/6	Southern Water

## ISSUES

1. Whether the policy covers issues that are too similar to Proposals DP.9, DP.13 and DP.14 with overlapping and conflicting aims and/or lacks clarity? (374/11, 877/4)
2. Should there be defined exclusion zones around sewage treatment works? (311/6)
3. Should there be an upper limit on the number of new septic tanks allowed in one area? (346/4)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.16.1 The first issue is similar to that discussed in the two preceding policies, where I conclude this tranche of three Proposals are sufficiently distinct and separate to justify independent policies. The alteration at Revised Deposit stage to insert *pollution sensitive development* suitably clarifies the policy. PPG23 advises that development should be controlled in proximity to potential sources of pollution for the dual purpose of avoiding occupants of the new development suffering the effects therefrom and to prevent the potentially polluting use encountering unreasonable constraints on its operation. I accept this could encompass a very wide range of potential developments of differing sensitivities and that there are a multiplicity of possible pollutants with varying degrees of harmful impacts. Nevertheless, I consider this underlines the difficulty in being specific and thus I conclude this general policy suitably highlights the valid planning concerns regarding the topic and that the objections do not warrant modification to the policy or text.
- 3.16.2 In the second issue, the Council acknowledge the merits of defining areas around sewage treatment works where development would be restricted, to avoid placing development in areas recognised as having the potential to be malodorous and to prevent potential conflict between different types of uses. However, they indicate that they do not have the staff resources to investigate and define exclusion zones around treatment works and that they would therefore consult with the appropriate pollution control authorities. I am aware that other Local Plans do in fact define *cordons sanitaire* around sewage treatment works, which I regard as suitably highlighting the need for caution. However, in the absence of any such information to inform the imposition of such measures in this Plan, I can only note that the Council will continue, as recommended in PPG23, to take account of any advice they receive from relevant authorities concerning all development proposals that could be potentially adversely affected by any forms of pollution. Nevertheless, I consider the mention of smell as a possible pollutant could be added with useful effect to the end of the first sentence of para 3.58.
- 3.16.3 In the third issue, the objector seeks to impose a restriction on the amount of development in an area where they are reliant on septic tank drainage. However, as the Council indicates, tanks can be shared and Building Regulations govern the separation distances between buildings and septic tanks, while the Environment Agency issues discharge consents for each new tank. Hence, this is a matter that is covered by other legislative matters than Planning. Hence, it is unnecessary and inappropriate to introduce a policy relating to this in the Plan.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 3.16.4 That the Plan be modified by the addition of *and smells* to the end of the first sentence of para 3.58.

## 3.17. Contaminated Land (paragraphs 3.61 - 3.66, Proposal DP.16)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.16	374/12	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
DP.16	289/2	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd

## ISSUES

1. Should DP.16 be referenced to E.2 as most contaminated sites are in present or past industrial use? Also, does the policy take too little account of environmental harm caused by existing commercial uses? (289/2)
2. Does DP.16 conflict with DP.9-15? (374/12)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.17.1 In the first issue, whilst the Council accept that contamination frequently arises from past industrial operation, I agree that this is not exclusively the case. The issue of dealing with contaminated sites is also a distinct and separate matter from the considerations that would be involved in deciding whether an extant business should be redeveloped or converted to an alternative use. I thus conclude the mention of Proposal E.2 is unnecessary and inappropriate.
- 3.17.2 In issue two the objector considers the policy conflicts with Proposals DP.9-15 as it is permissive of polluting development in exceptional circumstances. However, the Council indicate that the second part of the policy does not allow for development that is polluting, but rather recognises that in some exceptional circumstances, development that does not conform with other policies of the Plan may present a means of remediation to deal with actual or perceived threats to health, safety or the environment. Alternatively it may be a means of bringing back polluted land to beneficial use and thereby minimising the potential pressure to otherwise use greenfield sites. I find this conforms with advice in PPG23 and accordingly consider no modification is necessary.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 3.17.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

# 3.18. Public Utilities (paragraphs 3.67 - 3.70, Proposal DP.17)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
DP.17	305/2	BT Plc
DP.17	229/1	Crown Cattle UK Ltd
DP.17	892/1	Judith Pope
DP.17	353/8	Sparsholt College Hampshire
DP.17	335/5	Upper Itchen Valley Society
DP.17	885/1	Vodafone Ltd

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD0330	2327/1	National Grid Company
RD0330	2315/1	T-Mobile
RD0333	66/1	Orange Ltd

## ISSUES

1. Should there be changes to the wording of DP.17? (305/2, 261/14, 66/1, 885/1, 2327/1REVDEP, 66/1REVDEP, 2315/1REVDEP)
2. Does Proposal DP.17 provide adequately for growth in telecommunications? (885/1)
3. Should the link between telecommunications, transport and social exclusion be taken into account in the supporting text of DP.17? (229/1)
4. Should there be greater consideration of a wider range of potential harm and, in particular, greater consideration of health concerns? (286/4, 335/5, 353/8, 892/1)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.18.1 In light of objections in the first issue to the failure of the Plan adequately to reflect advice in PPG8 that was published after the Deposit Plan, the Council incorporated alterations to the policy and text in the Revised Deposit Plan (RD03.30-RD03.33) to remedy this. Whilst these revisions attracted more support than opposition and largely addressed the objections, they in turn attracted further objections. The objection by Orange amounts to a correction of nomenclature insofar as the Federation of Electronics Industry no longer exists and has been replaced by the Mobile Operators Association. The Council has addressed this by a Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC03.09), which I accept in the interest of accuracy.
- 3.18.2 The objection by the National Grid Company is based on their perception that *harm to sensitive areas or the amenities of a residential area* in criterion (iii) is ambiguous and open to inconsistent interpretation. Accordingly, they advance an alternative form of wording that states: *proposals affecting sensitive environments and residential amenity will be subject to close scrutiny*. However, the Council regard this as unacceptable and I too regard it as unclear and imprecise such that it does not commend itself as being a superior alternative.
- 3.18.3 The objection by the National Grid Company plc suggests the reference to operational requirements inserted in criterion (iii) should be extended to criterion (iv) which concerns the placing of cables and pipelines underground. They also indicate that there should be a mention of economic constraints as the cost of laying high voltage lines underground is 15 to 20 times more expensive than constructing them above ground. Also, they maintain that as electricity is a national resource such a major increase in cost would have national consequences and would be dealt with by the Secretary of State rather than a Local Authority. The Council state that economic constraint should not be a basis for the Plan policies to accept potentially harmful proposals and there must be a balance between protecting the environment and ensuring the requisite utilities are provided. I agree in general with that ethos and whilst I consider the caveat *where possible* that appears at the start of the criterion would suitably cover most eventualities concerning the objector, I conclude that it would be more realistic and preferable to replace *possible* with *viable* particularly as they correctly point out some decisions in this regard may be outside the purview of the Council.
- 3.18.4 In the second issue, the objector considers the Plan fails to show all major telecommunications installations and areas suitable for accommodating such. The Council intends to produce a database and plan of all existing and proposed telecom installations and has included mention of this in para 3.70 of the Revised Deposit Plan. I consider this adequately addresses the objection and see no need for this information to be included on the Proposals Map.
- 3.18.5 The third issue derives from the perception that the link between telecommunications, transport and social exclusion has not been set out in the text. The Council acknowledge the connection, but consider that as the policy does not relate exclusively to telecommunications such a mention would be confusing. I share that view and consider such a reference would be inappropriate.
- 3.18.6 Finally, the potential harm that could arise from telecommunications equipment is a frequently voiced fear whereby the objectors seek the inclusion of preclusion zones in the vicinity of schools, hospitals and housing. However, as the Council indicate, there is no convincing evidence of health hazards upon which to base any such restrictions. It would not be appropriate to base a planning policy on unsubstantiated health concerns and to do so would invite a legal challenge. I am content that the inclusion of a new paragraph (RD03.30) in the Revised Deposit which refers to the need to take account of public concern, suitably addresses the objections.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.18.7 That the Plan be modified:
- a) in accordance with PIC 03.09
  - b) by replacing *where possible* with *where viable* at the start of criterion (iv).



## 3.19. Renewable Energy Schemes (paragraphs 3.71 - 3.74, Proposal DP.18)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
3.71	320/4	FES
DP.18	374/13	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd

### ISSUES

1. Should Paragraph 3.71 refer to the Government's national target for renewable energy generation and the findings of the South East Renewable Energy Assessment? (320/4)
2. Does the reference to DP.2 lead to a lack of clarity in DP.18 (iii)? (374/13)

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.19.1 The objection in issue one has been addressed by the inclusion of an alteration (RD03.34) in the Revised Deposit Plan including such a reference. Accordingly, I find the objection has been resolved and no further modification is necessary.
- 3.19.2 The Council also conceded in issue two that the reference to DP.2 was erroneous and they therefore replaced that in the Revised Deposit with a mention of Proposal DP.3. However, policies in Local Plans should be self reliant and not include cross-references to other policies. Indeed, it is an inherent principle of any development plan that development proposals will be assessed against all of the policies it contains. I therefore conclude that no cross-reference should be made in the body of a policy to another Plan policy and that it should thus be deleted. If the Council feel it is necessary to provide such a linkage it should appear in the text or parenthesis.

### RECOMMENDATION

- 3.19.3 That the Plan be modified by the deletion of criterion (iii).