

# CHAPTER 13: SETTLEMENTS

## 13.1. General Comments

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
CHPT13	227/18	Bewley Homes Plc and R C H Morgan-Giles
CHPT13	475/5	Clients of Southern Planning Practice
CHPT13	500/2	David Humphrey
CHPT13	488/1	Elliott
CHPT13	542/1	G Tull
CHPT13	503/7	Linden Homes Developments
CHPT13	503/14	Linden Homes Developments
CHPT13	483/2	M. K Carr
CHPT13	533/1	P E Richards
CHPT13	530/6	Persimmon House South Coast Ltd
CHPT13	530/12	Persimmon House South Coast Ltd
CHPT13	293/3	S and S Diesels
CHPT13	353/23	Sparsholt College Hampshire
CHPT13	540/2	Stuart Mason
CHPT13	221/5	Executors of E. S. Edwards (deceased)
CHPT13	328/3	Twyford Parish Council

### ISSUES

1. Should the Landscape Character Areas' key characteristics form part of the Plan?  
227/18
2. Should there be a general settlement policy? 475/5
3. Should the curtilage of Itchen Abbas House be included within the policy boundary?  
500/2
4. Should land at Anmore Road, Denmead be included within the settlement boundary?  
488/1
5. Should land at Ships Field Owslebury be allocated for mixed uses? 542/1
6. Should land at Sandy Lane, Waltham Chase be included within the defined  
settlement boundary? 503/7
7. Should land at Dunford's Yard, Colden Common be included within the defined  
settlement boundary? 503/14
8. Should land south east of Hampton Hill, Swanmore, be included within the defined  
settlement boundary? 483/2
9. Should Shedfield have a defined policy boundary which includes land east of  
Culverlands Bungalow. 533/1
10. Should land off Goldfinch Way, South Wonston, be included within the settlement  
boundary? 530/6
11. Should land at Kidmore farm, Denmead, be included within the settlement boundary?  
530/12
12. Should land at S&S Diesels, Waltham Chase, be included within the settlement  
boundary? 293/3
13. Should Sparsholt College have a settlement boundary? 353/23
14. Should Manor Farm, Hambledon be included within the policy boundary? 540/2
15. Should land at Inhams Lane, Denmead, be included within the policy boundary?  
221/5
16. Should land at Humphrey Holdings, Twyford, be included within the policy boundary?  
328/3

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

- 13.1.1. In the first issue, the objectors had expressed concern that the Landscape Character Areas' key characteristics in Appendix 2 of the Deposit Plan comprise too vague a basis to influence the formulation of policies. However as a Landscape Character Assessment identifying 23 Character Areas has since been prepared, adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance and incorporated in the Revised Deposit as an amended Appendix 2, I consider that the objection has been overcome.
- 13.1.2. In the second issue the objectors seek a general settlement policy to allow flexibility in meeting emerging needs during the Plan period. In the Housing Chapter of my report I generally support the Council's strategy but have recommended the inclusion of a Local Reserve in the form of specific sites to form urban extensions if these are needed to meet the housing targets. However I note that the objection refers to 'village policy' and in this regard my recommendation for a new criteria-based Proposal H.3 would allow some infilling within villages outside the Proposal H.2 settlements if a scheme would be consistent with the sustainability principles of the Plan and national guidance. In the light of these recommended modifications I see no need for a general settlement policy.
- 13.1.3. With the exception of Issue 13, all the remaining issues concerning the delineation of settlement boundaries and the inclusion of areas of land within them are dealt with in my report in the Omissions section of the Housing Chapter. As regards Issue 13, the objectors consider that Sparsholt College should have settlement status. The Council responded to this by the inclusion of RD08.20 in the Revised Deposit Plan which introduces a new policy to permit development considered essential for the operation of existing further and higher education establishments in the countryside. I agree with the Council's view that the College cannot be regarded as a 'normal' settlement and that with its location in the countryside the site would be an unsuitable location in terms of the Plan's sustainability principles for further development unrelated to the existing establishment. However the College is already there and the suggested policy sets out a range of criteria for assessing its legitimate development needs.
- 13.1.4. The policy can also be applied to other similar institutions with a countryside location and I consider it represents an adequate response to the objection. I have noted the objection by King Alfred's College to the new Proposal but it would be inconsistent with both the Plan and national guidance to permit entirely new establishments within the countryside. In cases of essential need, Proposal C.5 (as amended by Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC04.02) to paragraph 4.9) could provide for this form of development.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 13.1.5. That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **13.2. Settlements – Introduction (paragraph 13.1)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
13.001	328/1	Twyford Parish Council

### **ISSUE**

Should a special policy be included for Twyford to allow for mixed development on the edge of the settlement boundary? (328/1)

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

13.2.1 The objection here was allied to the representations that there should be a comprehensive scheme produced of housing and employment use at Northfields Farm to secure the removal of a large feed mill and redundant chicken sheds. However, I have found that the scale of development required as enabling development would be unwarranted and damaging to the countryside. Moreover, the Council indicated that they felt the present policies relating to the countryside provide adequate guidance regarding re-use of redundant buildings. In addition the locality is within the boundary of the Proposed South Downs National Park, which if designated, would have a considerable bearing on such a development proposition in this locality. Accordingly, I consider it is either inappropriate or at best premature to provide for an "S" Policy to cover the scale of development that the site owners indicate would be required to secure the objectives envisaged by the objector.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

13.2.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

# **13.3. Bishop's Waltham - Environment (paragraphs 13.2 - 13.8, Proposals S.1 - S.3)**

## **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.1	212/25	Bishops Waltham Society
S.2	211/16	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
S.2	263/2	Budgens Stores Ltd
S.2	16/1	Derek. M. Fox
S.2	261/78	Government Office for the South East
S.3	211/17	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
S.3	1200/2	C. A Bailey
S.3	261/79	Government Office for the South East

## **OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
RD1302	2277/3	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc

## **ISSUES**

1. Is Proposal S.2, relating to the Malt Lane area, appropriate in general terms and also specifically in terms of retail provision? (16/1, 263/2, 261/78; 2277/3REVDEP)
2. Should the Proposal remove the need to provide affordable housing to improve viability? (211/16)
3. Do the requirements of Proposal S.3, relating to environmental improvements of the Claylands Industrial Estate, conflict with advice in PPG 13? (261/79)
4. Are the Proposal's requirements covered by Proposal DP.3, and, if so, should the Proposal be deleted? (211/17, 1200/2)
5. Are Proposals S.1 - S.6, relating to Bishop's Waltham, sufficiently clear and are the town centre proposals consistent with the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy? (212/25)

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

13.3.1 Issues one and two concern Proposal S.2 which encourages the mixed use redevelopment of the site to the north of Winchester Road and east of Malt Lane, Bishops Waltham, subject to three provisos. The objectors include the owners of the

majority of the site, the Parish Council and an adjoining food store owner. The Council has clarified its intentions with amendments to the Revised Deposit which make it clear that any additional retail development should be of a small scale and appropriate to the modest size of the town centre. It seems to me that this is a reasonable response to the concerns of the adjoining store owner and that notwithstanding the main landowner's frustration over the lack of investment in the last decade, the Proposal and the supporting text comprise a reasonable and flexible policy basis supportive of redevelopment and its accompanying environmental benefits. In the second issue I see no need to introduce the subject of affordable housing as the housing component of any redevelopment as this is covered by Plan Proposal H5 or alternatively it may not be of the scale that requires it.

13.3.2 The third and fourth issues relate to Proposal S.3 which in the Deposit Plan proposed environmental improvements to the Claylands Industrial Estate. However in the Revised Deposit, amendments RDs 13.04-13.06 have deleted the Proposal and its supporting text and I thus consider that the objections have been met or are no longer relevant. The fifth issue relates to an objection by the Bishops Waltham Society and explains the context of other objections to specific proposals. It does not however introduce any additional item that requires my consideration.

13.3.3 Although not the subject of any specific objection, criterion (iii) in both Proposal S.1 and S.2 are merely cross-references to other Plan policies and in the latter, additionally to SPG. I consider this is both unnecessary and inappropriate and accordingly should be deleted.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.3.4 That the Plan be modified by deletion of criterion (iii) in Proposals S.1 and S.2.

## **13.4. Bishops Waltham - Employment (paragraphs 13.10 - 13.13, Proposal S.4)**

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
13.10	211/18	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
13.11	886/5	A. J Archard
13.11	1204/1	Bishops Waltham Chamber of Trade and Commerce
S.4	211/19	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
S.4	212/26	Bishops Waltham Society
S.4	1200/1	C. A Bailey
S.4	1195/1	Dorothy Quiney
S.4	261/80	Government Office for the South East
S.4	866/4	James Duke and Sons (Holdings) Limited
S.4	1201/1	R. P Wyer
S.4	372/2	Roger Hartley

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
RD1307	866/1	James Duke and Sons (Holdings) Limited
RD1308	866/2	James Duke and Sons (Holdings) Limited

#### **ISSUES**

1. Is Proposal S.4, for employment use at Abbey Mill, consistent with the advice in PPGs 6 and 13? 261/80

2. Should the site be allocated only for employment use, allowing for more intensive development, and should existing B1, B2 and B8 uses be incorporated within the requirements of the development? 211/18, 212/26, 1195/1, 1200/1, 1201/1, 1204/1
3. Should paragraph 13.11 provide for flexibility of uses, if required to achieve a viable development? 886/5
4. Should the site be allocated for mixed employment and housing uses? 212/26, 866/4; 866/1REVDEP, 866/2REVDEP
5. Should the Proposal include requirements for adequate drainage and flood control measures? 211/19, 212/26
6. Should the Proposal be amended to re-instate the requirement to make provision for access to the land to the west of the former railway line? 372/2

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

- 13.4.1 Issues 1-5 all relate to Proposal S.4 which allocates approximately 1.9ha of land at Abbey Mill, Bishops Waltham for business and general industrial development. Development proposals would be subject to seven criteria set out in the policy. In the first issue, GOSE queries whether with the inclusion of B1 business use, which includes office development, sufficient regard has been given to the sequential test in paragraphs 1.11 and 1.15 of PPG6 and the importance of accessibility in paragraph 32 of PPG13. In its Response Note the Council explains that it has and I am also satisfied that Abbey Mill's location close to the town centre of Bishops Waltham makes it suitable for offices, albeit that it is envisaged that an element of Class B2 and B8 uses would also remain. The text explains that due to its sensitive location, within the Bishops Waltham Conservation Area and Bishops Waltham Abbey and Ponds Scheduled Ancient Monument, the Council will be flexible regarding the exact proportions of different business uses that will be permitted.
- 13.4.2 Issues 2, 3, and 4 are similar and reflect the views of a number of objectors. Firstly the site owners consider that B8 uses cause environmental and traffic problems and that the modification of Proposal S.4 to permit a mixed residential and commercial development would provide the incentive needed for its redevelopment and provide benefits in the form of addition to the housing stock and environmental improvements in a sensitive location. Indeed, planning permission was granted in 2003, following an appeal for a mixed use development comprising B1 and B2 employment uses together with 30 dwellings. However, notwithstanding that commitment the Council considers that as this has not yet been implemented, the provisions of Proposal S4, requiring the site to be developed solely for employment uses should remain in the Plan.
- 13.4.3 I regard the Council's stance as untenable, having regard to the fact that the appeal Inquiry sat for five days, considering extensive evidence relating to this site, and in particular, that the Council's Chief Estates Officer independently reached the same conclusion as the owners' professional advisors that it would not be viable to redevelop the site solely for commercial uses. I also note that notwithstanding the recommendation of the Inspector at the last LPI Inquiry for a mixed use development on the site, this was not accepted by the Council at that time. Furthermore, I am aware that the site has become run-down over time despite being allocated for commercial redevelopment and the existence of a development brief for the site.
- 13.4.4 In light of the foregoing and the surfeit of employment land in the District, I conclude that clear planning benefits would derive from a mixed use scheme. I find that the approved mixed use scheme would be more likely to be implemented and not only result in an increase in commercial floorspace from around 4,000 to over 5,000sq m. at the site but it would also provide 30 additional dwellings, including affordable housing in this category A settlement. The proposal was acknowledged to be of a high quality design that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and secure removal of outmoded and dilapidated structures and greater utilisation of the underused parts of the site. Additionally, Planning Obligations relating to phasing, provision of affordable dwellings, off-site highways works, provision of a workplace travel plan, landscaping, and contributions towards

sustainable transport improvements and open space provision are in place. Accordingly, I consider the policy and its accompanying text should be deleted and entirely redrafted to provide for a mixed commercial/residential redevelopment, making reference to the extant planning permission and Planning Obligations.

- 13.4.5 In Issue 5 the suggestion of objectors that Proposal S.4 should include a reference to drainage and flood control measures was addressed by RD13.08 which includes a cross reference to Proposals DP.10 and DP.11 in criterion (vii). However as policies should not contain cross-references to other Plan policies or refer to other guidance, and as I am recommending deletion of the policy, and as this matter together with concerns relating to contamination etc are covered in conditions attached to the consent, I consider that these can be mentioned in the redrafted text.
- 13.4.6 Issue 6 is allied to the corresponding representation made by the objector in respect of Proposal RT.13, seeking the continued allocation of an indoor sports facility adjacent to Martin Street, Bishops Waltham. The area was identified in the adopted Local Plan as suitable for the development of a small indoor leisure facility to serve the southern part of the District, with access through the Abbey Mill site. However, since then a District-wide study of recreation needs confirmed such a facility was required in the southern part of the District and the choice was between a stand-alone centre at Bishops Waltham or a joint public/educational facility at Swanmore School (now Swanmore College of Technology), with the latter being the favoured option.
- 13.4.7 A scheme was subsequently approved at Swanmore School and has been partly implemented. Consequently, as the area is rural and has a low population, there is insufficient justification to warrant two such centres and the allocation at Bishops Waltham has been deleted from the Review Plan. Furthermore, although the objector maintained there was potential for a private sports/recreation centre here, planning permission has been granted for a development scheme at Abbey Mill which does not include an access reservation to the formerly reserved leisure site as the decision had been made to pursue the Swanmore option and also because it was considered by the site owners to restrict the layout options. In addition, any access from this direction would have to cross the railway line which is now used as a footpath and is owned by the County Council, whose stance on a road crossing is unknown. Hence, as I can see no likelihood of a leisure facility being implemented on the objector's land during the Plan period, I can find no justification for reserving an access to it through the Abbey Mill site.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 13.4.7 That the Plan be modified by deletion of Proposal S4 and its accompanying text and entirely redrafting a new policy and text to provide for a mixed commercial/residential redevelopment, making reference to the important issues concerning the site, the appeal, extant planning permission and Planning Obligations.

## **13.5. Bishops Waltham - Recreation and Open Space (paragraphs 13.15 - 13.17, Proposal S.5)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.5	211/20	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
S.5	261/81	Government Office for the South East
S.5	301/2	The Occupiers

## ISSUES

1. Are the requirements of Proposal S.5, which relate to the open area between Abbey Mill and Palace House, consistent with the advice in PPG 13? (261/81)
2. Should the area accommodate public parking, and should the Proposal specify how access should be provided? (301/2)
3. Should the Proposal be amended to delete "proposed" in relation to the adjacent business site, and to refer to the provision of adequate drainage and flood control measures? (211/20)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 13.5.1. All three of the issues relate to Proposal S.5 which states that the area between Abbey Mill and Palace House is suitable for development as informal public open space and the provision of a car park. GOSE raises the issue of consistency with PPG 13 but the Council has explained that the net increase in parking spaces would be balanced by more restrictions in sensitive parts of Bishops Waltham.
- 13.5.2. In response to fears in issue two of the adverse effect of access through the industrial estate on existing facilities, the Council has pointed out that the Development Brief referred to in the policy envisages access directly from Station Road. On the third issue, RD 13.09's insertion of a cross reference in the Proposal to Proposals DP.10 and DP.11 meets the Parish Council's point. However, as the policy should not rely on other policies or refer to guidance, those factors should be assigned to the text. Furthermore, as I note that Abbey Field is in the same ownership as the Abbey Mill site and the planning permission in respect of the latter has some bearing on the former, the Council might consider the efficacy of combining S.5 with S.4, but I make no formal recommendation in this regard.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 13.5.3. That the Plan be modified by rewording the policy omitting reference to other policies and the Development Brief (consigning such to the text).

# 13.6. Bishops Waltham - Transport (paragraphs 13.18 - 13.20, Proposal S.6)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
S.6	886/6	A. J Archard
S.6	1204/2	Bishops Waltham Chamber of Trade and Commerce
S.6	211/21	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
S.6	261/82	Government Office for the South East

## ISSUES

1. Is Proposal S.6, which relates to the proposed review of the traffic system in central Bishop's Waltham, acceptable in terms of the advice in PPG 12? 261/82
2. Should the Proposal refer to the need for additional off-street parking? 886/6
3. Is there a need for criterion (iii), which seeks to reduce potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles? 1204/2
4. Should two new criteria be added to Proposal S.6, to encourage walking to schools and the town centre, and to encourage trips to the town centre by non-car modes? 211/21

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 13.6.1 Proposal S.6 has been altered by RD13.10 in response to GOSE's objection in the first issue, that it did not provide a basis for the consideration of planning applications.

13.6.2 In the second issue the objection pointing to the absence of a reference to additional off-street parking in the Proposal does not attract my support as it would run counter to the thrust of the policy, in particular criterion (i). This is not however to say that adequate parking is unimportant to the viability of town centre businesses, but as the Council observes, there is nothing in the Plan that would preclude an appropriate increase in provision if this were to be considered necessary.

13.6.3 In the third issue I can see no good reason for the deletion of the reference to pedestrian/vehicular conflict as in my view this is an essential component of any traffic system in a town centre where a pedestrian friendly environment is sought for the benefit of shoppers and thereby the local economy. In the final issue the suggestions for two additional criteria to encourage non car transport, although laudable, would not be suitable for a land use policy, as explained in the first issue referring to the GOSE objection.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.6.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **13.7. Cheriton - Mixed Use (paragraphs 13.21 - 13.25, Proposal S.7)**

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
13.21	1198/1	Trustees of C and F Freeman (Deceased)
S.7	1190/1	G. J Lancaster
S.7	261/83	Government Office for the South East
S.7	448/1	Trustees of C. E. Freeman

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
RD1311	2309/2	Cavendish & Gloucester

#### **ISSUES**

1. Should the settlement boundary be extended to include additional allocated land at Freeman's Yard, in order to provide more development flexibility and to facilitate the inclusion of additional educational and community benefits? (448/1, 1198/1).
2. Should the balance between business and residential elements referred to in S.7 be changed to mitigate the transport and other effects of commercial development at this particular location? (448/1, 1190/1, 1198/1, 261/83, 2309/2 REVDEP)
3. Does Proposal S.7 have regard to the sequential test in PPG 6 and the importance of accessibility? (261/83)

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

13.7.1 All three issues relate to Freemans Yard, the former timber yard which ceased operation in 1992 and since then has been mainly unused or subject to low key business/storage uses. The adopted Local Plan provides for redevelopment of 1.1ha of land at Freemans Yard for light industry, with an indication that limited residential development may also be permitted. However the objectors indicate there has been virtually no market interest in pursuing a scheme of industrial / commercial redevelopment. Hence the Council has changed the emphasis in the Review Plan to encourage a mixed use redevelopment, together with a small part being utilised for extending the playground of the adjoining school.



- 13.7.2 Objections on behalf of the site owners seek to extend the area identified for inclusion within the settlement boundary to provide greater scope for development. However, as the site rises eastwards it affords increasingly wider views over the entire village and the surrounding countryside. Hence, the corollary applies, whereby any built development thereon would become more prominent the further east it extends. Accordingly, I do not consider that the extension of the designated area proposed by the objector's Option 1 is suitable for built development. While the smaller Option 2 would be less harmful, the impact of development on the additional land would undoubtedly be more visible than if it were confined to the area shown on the Council's Plan. Therefore, whilst there is no obvious significance of the line depicting the proposed eastern limit of development, it encompasses the main developed part of the former timber yard and I thus regard it as representing a suitable boundary to contain development and thereby minimise its potential to have an unacceptably intrusive impact. I consider this to be a particularly important criterion having regard to the village's very attractive setting which warrants its inclusion within the East Hampshire AONB and Proposed South Downs National Park. Such designation precludes major development and confers the highest status of protection in relation to its landscape and scenic beauty.
- 13.7.3 The objectors question the policy stipulation that business uses should constitute the majority of the floorspace on the site. They suggest that in view of low market demand for this use, the site's proximity to the school and dwellings, and restricted access, a proportion of 20% commercial floorspace would be more appropriate and still be sufficient to provide jobs for the community. Although I note from the text that the former timber yard employed up to 100 workers, the site has not generated that level of jobs for more than a decade. The Council reviewed this together with other employment allocations as part of the Plan Review process and introduced further wording in the Revised Deposit indicating that a reduced level of employment provision may be accepted if necessitated by constraints such as access and other Plan requirements.
- 13.7.4 I support the use of the site for an economic development scheme but in the absence of any precise identified local need, I consider it is not appropriate to specify either an unduly high or precise quantum of provision. I am satisfied that a suitable scheme should be capable of being agreed by the parties that provides a level of employment floorspace somewhere between the objector's suggested 20% and the Council's concessionary 50% that is also compatible with its proximity to the school and housing. Accordingly, I recommend rewording criterion (i) to prescribe that business uses will constitute not less than 35% of the development's floorspace.
- 13.7.5 Although GOSE questioned whether the location of this employment site complied with the sequential site search sequence advocated in PPG6, I agree with the Council that such a requirement would fail to acknowledge the circumstances of this site as a previous employment use. Moreover, it is apparent that the Council seeks to provide some limited employment opportunities in the village to benefit local residents and partly to redress those that have been lost in the past.
- 13.7.6 Access to the site is constrained in width and passes alongside the school. A transport statement produced by the Council indicates that the access limitations place a cap on the maximum size of development for the site at around 25 dwellings. I agree that this, or rather the mixed use scheme that would generate the equivalent level of traffic, represents the maximum level of development appropriate here, having regard to the limited size of the settlement, its Category B status and restricted facilities. It also reinforces my conclusion that the development area should not be extended further eastwards than shown on the Proposals Map.
- 13.7.7 Although the objector suggested providing an area of land for the school larger than is prescribed in criterion (iv) for school expansion, the education authority has confirmed that 0.075ha is all that is required to extend the playground to comply with Department for Education and Science requirements. Furthermore, however

desirable it may be to provide a school playing field adjacent to the school, it is apparent that this would serve to push the proposed housing and employment development eastwards, which I do not regard as being an acceptable outcome.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.7.8 That the Plan be modified by rewording criterion (i) to prescribe that business uses (Use Class B1) will constitute not less than 35% of the development's floorspace.

## **13.8. Colden Common - Employment (paragraphs 13.26 - 13.28, Proposal S.8)**

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.8	261/84	Government Office for the South East
H.2	503/14	Linden Homes Developments

#### **ISSUES**

1. Should land at Dunfords Yard be allocated for mixed housing and employment use and be included within the H.2 settlement boundary? (503/14).
2. Is it clear that regard has been had to the sequential test in PPG6 and the importance of accessibility in PPG13? (261/84)

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

13.8.1 The first issue, (Dunford's Yard) is covered under the Housing Omissions section.

13.8.2 In the second issue, GOSE query whether in view of the reference to Class B1 in Proposal S.8 regard has been had to the sequential test in paragraphs 1.11 and 1.15 of PPG 6 and the importance of accessibility in paragraph 32 of PPG 13. However the limited scale of provision does not in my view require any substantive re-evaluation of this established site and I see no reason for the Plan to specifically refer to these considerations.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.8.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **13.9. Curdridge – Employment (paragraphs 13.29 - 13.33, Proposal S.9)**

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

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
13.33	51/1	Trustees of H. H. Jenkyns
S.9	1427/4	Eastleigh Borough Council
S.9	261/85	Government Office for the South East

#### **ISSUES**

1. Should paragraph 13.33 be amended to show more commitment to the delivery of the Botley bypass? (51/1)
2. Is the Local Plan Review correct to allocate land at Hillsons Road Industrial Estate for employment use? (261/85, 1427/4)

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

- 13.9.1 Proposal S.9 and Paragraph 13.33 of the Plan refer to the need for the whole of the Botley by-pass to be programmed for construction by the Highway Authority before any extension to the Hillsons Road Industrial Estate goes ahead. Although the objector seeks a firm commitment within a defined time scale this depends on funding becoming available, which is outside the scope of the Plan. I therefore consider that it would be inappropriate to amend paragraph 13.33 in the way the objector suggests.
- 13.9.2 In the second issue, both GOSE and Eastleigh Borough Council point to the absence of a sequential test in respect of the proposed extension of the industrial estate in Proposal S.9. Eastleigh additionally considers that the policy should include a requirement for a Transport Assessment and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
- 13.9.3 However on the first point, from my visit to the area I am satisfied that the extension of the estate to the by-pass on the alignment proposed is the only logical use of the land and one which will bring further employment to the local area. There is not therefore a 'level playing field' in terms of a comparative evaluation with other sites which would be necessary for a robust sequential test.
- 13.9.4 On the second point RD13.12 has added criterion (v) which requires any scheme to accord with Proposal DP.3 and the latter in turn refers to Proposal T.3. However, as I frequently mention throughout my report, policies should be self-standing and not contain cross-references to other plan policies. Accordingly, I consider criterion (v) should be deleted. The inclusion of a requirement for an EIA in the Proposal would be superfluous given that its preparation or otherwise is the subject of a separate regulations.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 13.9.5 That the Plan be modified by deletion of policy criterion (v).

## **13.10. Denmead - Housing (paragraphs 13.36 - 13.42, Proposals S.11, S.12)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.12	213/7	Bovis Homes Ltd

### **ISSUE**

Should Proposal S12 and its supporting text be updated to acknowledge the existing planning permission and also to reflect the conditions and requirements which it contains? (213/7).

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

- 13.10.1 As the Bovis development is substantially built and given the Council's indication in its Response Note that Proposal S.12 could be omitted when the Plan is finally adopted if development is by then complete, I consider the policy and text should be updated or deleted as appropriate.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 13.10.2 That the Plan be modified by updating or deleting (as appropriate) Proposal S12 and its accompanying text.

# 13.11. Denmead - Employment (paragraphs 13.43 - 13.45, Proposal S.13)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
S.13	261/86	Government Office for the South East
S.13	439/1	Paul Byng
H.2	221/5	Executors of E S Edwards
H.2	397/23	Bryant Homes
H.2	488/1	Misses Elliott
H.2	530/12	Persimmon Homes South Coast Ltd

## ISSUES

1. Should Proposal S.13 and its explanatory text contain explicit references to the sequential test contained in PPG.6, or the importance of accessibility expressed in PPG.13? 261/86.
2. Should the settlement policy boundary be extended or the remaining area of intervening land at the Parklands Business Park be brought within the S.13 designation? 439/1.
3. Should the settlement boundary of Denmead be extended to include land east of Inhams Lane? 221/5.
4. Should land at Little Frenchies Field, Denmead be allocated for new housing development and included within settlement boundary? 397/23.
5. Should land to the south of Anmore Road be allocated for mixed use development? 488/1.
6. Should land at Kidmore Farm be included within the H.2 settlement boundary? 530/12.

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 13.11.1 GOSE query whether Proposal S.13 and its supporting text should refer to the sequential test in PPG6 and the importance of accessibility in PPG13. However the site is long established with commercial development and benefits from planning permissions for employment uses of which most have been built and I see no purpose in referring to such Government guidance when the use is already fully committed and largely implemented.
- 13.11.2 In issue two, S.13 has been carried through from the adopted Plan and relates to the 2.8ha employment site south of Forest Road. As the text indicates, it was formerly a pottery site and now comprises Parklands Business Park which has largely been built and consists of 28 units. The one remaining undeveloped site within the allocated area benefits from a full planning permission for 4x2-storey business units upon which construction work was expected to commence imminently. In view of this, it raises the question in my mind as to whether the policy any longer serves a useful purpose, particularly as there is a detailed Development Brief covering the site.
- 13.11.3 The objector seeks an extension of the employment allocation to encompass the undeveloped area measuring about 1.2ha that lies between it and the frontage development on Forest Road. The site is outside the defined settlement boundary and although the frontage development to Forest Road is depicted as being within the settlement boundary, that road is viewed by the Council as representing the southern limit for the built-up area of Denmead. Whilst the Parklands Business Park is fairly extensive, it is particularly well screened by mature trees and, as the name suggests it has a spacious rural campus feel and appearance. The Council indicates that the Parklands site was first allocated in the 1983 Denmead Local Plan, which provided for the objection site to be omitted deliberately because it was regarded as being too exposed for development. In fact it was to be laid out as public open space for the benefit of the public and workers at the employment premises.

13.11.4 This requirement appears not to have been stipulated in the subsequent planning permissions. Nevertheless, the land remains open and provides an attractive rural setting for the business park and an informal open amenity area as mentioned in paragraph 13.45. Erection of employment buildings on the land would remove the visual and physical separation that now exists between the estate and the main built-up area and introduce buildings onto higher land where they would be more prominent and less well screened by mature trees than those that exist. Such consolidation of development in this locality would serve to act as a major wedge extending south of Forest Road, where there has been pressure for similar land releases to the west and east during this Inquiry. Consequently, I consider development on the objection site would be regarded as creating a precedent for further greenfield development south of the road and an extension of the settlement boundary to include the objection site and the Parklands Business Park would compound that.

13.11.5 Furthermore, although it was argued that there is a need for more employment land in Denmead, I saw that it is already relatively well served and the implementation period of the Parklands site has extended over two decades and the one remaining plot is committed by a planning permission. Moreover, apart from the absence of need generally in the District for further employment land allocations, there is provision for 30ha of employment land within the West of Waterlooville MDA a short distance to the east. Consequently, I conclude that the release of further employment land in Denmead is unnecessary and that the S13 designation is no longer essential.

13.11.6 Issues 3-6 have been dealt with in the Housing Omissions section of my report.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.11.7 That the Plan be modified by the deletion of Proposal S13 and its accompanying text.

## **13.12. Durley - Mixed Use (paragraphs 13.47 - 13.52, Proposal S.14)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.14	261/87	Government Office for the South East
S.14	256/1	Trustees of the Durley Thresher Room
S.14	215/1	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd

#### **ISSUES**

- 1 Has the Proposal had regard to the sequential test in PPG 6? 261/87?
- 2 Should the proportion of employment required be reduced or should the site be allocated only for housing? 215/1
- 3 Should the Proposal require the replacement of the Church Room? 256/1

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

13.12.1 There are three objections in respect of the policy for the mixed business and residential development of the former sawmill site in Heathen Street, Durley (Proposal S.14). Firstly GOSE are concerned that the Class B1 use should comply with PPGs 6 and 13 as regards the sequential test and accessibility respectively. However I agree with the Council that the small scale of the B1 use would not necessitate a detailed appraisal against those criteria.

13.12.2 A second objector is of the view that with the employment already provided in Phase 1 of the sawmill's redevelopment the remaining land would be more appropriately developed for housing (or if there is to be an employment content, live/work units as

referred to in paragraph 13.49). With the demand for B1 units evidenced by the high occupancy rate in Phase 1 and the permission granted in November 2004 for further employment floorspace, I can see no justification for the deletion of the B1 allocation. It seems to me that the inclusion of live/work units in any scheme for the site would be a particularly attractive option. But as this is allowed for in paragraph 13.49, I see no need to amend Proposal S.14.

13.12.3 The final issue arises from an objector's request for the replacement of the church room to be included in Proposal S.14 as in Proposal S.23 in the adopted Plan, but Phase 1 of the development ensured its retention (as the Thresher Room). Although I note the objector's point that it needs replacement and that there are no funds available, I do not consider the facility has a sufficiently close link with the remaining development to justify the extra funding now needed as a reasonable requirement.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.12.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

## **13.13. Kings Worthy - Recreation (paragraphs 13.54 - 13.55, Proposal S.15)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.15	225/4	Anchor Developers
S.15	81/2	C. J. Webb
S.15	469/14	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd

#### **ISSUES**

- 1 Should the H.2 settlement boundary for Kings Worthy be extended to include land at London Road / Basingstoke Road and should Proposal S.15 and paragraphs 13.53/13.55 be amended to allocate the site for housing? 225/4
- 2 Should land south-west of Lovedon Lane be allocated for mixed use development (detailed wording proposed) and should text added to paragraph 13.53 to suggest how mixed use development could be achieved in a sustainable manner? 469/14.
- 3 Should the old railway line from Winchester Junction to Alresford and Kings Worthy be kept for future public transport use, not just as a footpath? If a Solent Metro system of heavy rail comes about it could be a very useful turnaround terminus serving Kings Worthy, with trains to Southampton/ Portsmouth, etc and might also be used for park and ride. The same applies to the wartime line to Worthy Down. 81/2.

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

13.13.1 Issues 1 and 2 arise from suggestions by objectors that land at London Road / Basingstoke Road and to the south west of Lovedon Lane should be allocated for housing and mixed uses respectively. However in my consideration of omission sites in this report I have rejected both proposed sites and accordingly there is no need for consequential amendments to Proposal S.15 and paragraphs 13.53 – 13.55.

13.13.2 In respect of the third issue I am satisfied that amendments to the Transport Chapter of the Plan provide an adequate safeguard for future non-car travel modes of transport on disused railway lines. Furthermore the policy for public footpath provision in Proposal S.15 does not in my view prejudice that longer term objective.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.13.3 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

# 13.14. Sutton Scotney - Mixed Use (paragraphs 13.56 - 13.59, Proposal S.16)

## OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
S.16	261/99	Government Office for the South East
S.16	289/15	Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
S.16	536/2	Stenoak Associated Services

## OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1315	2282/1	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1315	2279/1	John Tarvit
RD1316	2282/2	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1316	2279/2	John Tarvit
RD1316	2006/1	Maxim Taylor
RD13.16	1428/1	Wonston Parish Council
RD1317	2282/3	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1318	2282/4	Associated Properties Uk Ltd
RD1318	2279/3	John Tarvit
RD1319	2282/5	Associated Properties Uk Ltd
RD1320	2282/6	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1320	2279/4	John Tarvit
RD1321	2282/7	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1322	2282/8	Associated Properties UK Ltd
RD1322	2279/5	John Tarvit

## ISSUES

1. Has the Proposal taken account of the sequential test in PPG 6, in proposing B1 office uses? 261/99
2. Should the development on the former Station Yard, Sutton Scotney, contain a proportion of employment use, and, if so, is the proportion required appropriate? (2279/3REVDEP, 2282/1REVDEP, 2282/2REVDEP, 2282/3REVDEP, 2282/6REVDEP, 2282/7REVDEP, 2282/8REVDEP). Should the means for determining the proportion of employment form part of the Proposal rather than the text? (2282/1REVDEP, 2282/2REVDEP, 2282/3REVDEP, 2282/4REVDEP). Should the site be developed solely for housing? (289/15, 536/2, 2279/2 & 3REVDEP)
3. Should the area covered by Proposal S.16, and the required Design and Development Brief, include the former Station Yard and the adjacent coach works site, or should the sites be treated as separate entities? (1428/1REVDEP, 2006/1REVDEP, 2279/1 & 2REVDEP, 2279/4 & 5REVDEP)
4. Does the Proposal generate a need for off-site highway, footpath and recreational improvements? (536/2)
5. Are the footpath improvements specified in the Proposal and text appropriate? (2282/5REVDEP)

## INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

13.14.1 All the issues relate to Proposal S.16 for a mixed business and residential development at the former Station Yard and adjoining Coach Works in Sutton Scotney which has attracted a number of objections. On the first issue I concur with the Council's view that because of the relatively small scale of B1 uses there is no need to amend the policy having regard to Government Guidance in PPG's 6 and 13 regarding the sequential test and accessibility respectively.

13.14.2 At the Deposit Plan stage, Proposal S.16 related to a mixed business and residential development on the former Station Yard only. This was a change from a full employment use in the adopted Local Plan and attracted support (from the Parish Council) and objections which put forward housing as a more appropriate use. A further objection suggested the expansion of the allocation to include the adjoining coach works and this was accepted by the Council through RD13.6 of the Plan. The Revised Deposit Proposal S.16 seeks the majority of floorspace as Class B1 but indicates acceptance of a reduced level of employment provision if justified by constraints or other considerations.

13.14.3 Issues two and three respectively address the employment content of any redevelopment and whether the two sites should be considered as one. On the first point I am satisfied that proviso (i) of the policy includes the flexibility required to ensure that the eventual redevelopment of the site includes a level of employment use appropriate for Sutton Scotney. I have noted the revised view of the Parish Council that the circumstances of the site are such that a wholly residential development is the most appropriate option. But the publication of a Design and development Brief, and public consultation thereon, is to my mind a sensible method of securing implementation of Proposal S.16 in the form most appropriate to meeting local needs, in terms of both employment and housing.

13.14.4 On the issue of single or combined sites, it is clearly in the interests of good planning for the more comprehensive approach to be adopted, albeit that the Development Brief should recognise that the Station Yard is likely to be developed first and should not prejudice the continued operation of the Coach Works. As I understand it, the Brief adopts this approach and whilst events may have moved on since the Council drafted its Response Note, on the information before me I can see no justification for amending Proposal S.16 in response to the objections on these issues.

13.14.5 As regards off-site highway, footpath and recreational requirements, I consider that the provisos of the Proposal when considered and applied in more detail through the Development Brief will ensure that appropriate provision is made through conditions or undertakings attached to a planning permission.

**RECOMMENDATION**

13.14.6 That no modifications be made to the Plan.

## **13.15. Waltham Chase - Mixed Use (paragraphs 13.60 - 13.64, Proposal S.17)**

**OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
S.17	1448/1	C. Morgan and Sons
S.17	261/88	Government Office for the South East
S.17	354/6	Hallam Land Management
S.17	446/1	Linden Holdings Plc
S.17	1203/1	R. C Morgan

**ISSUES**

1. Has adequate consideration been given to the sequential test of PPG6, or the importance of accessibility expressed in PPG13? (261/88)
2. Does S17 seek an appropriate mixture of uses on this site, including adequate consideration of the existing uses on the site? (354/6, 446/1, 1203/1 & 1448/1)
3. Does Proposal S17 provide for adequate access and parking to the adjacent school? (446/1 & 1448/1)



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

13.15.1 The site measures approximately 2.2ha and lies entirely within the defined settlement limit. The majority of the land is already in business use comprising a vehicle breakers yard and Rosehill Garage, together with two dwellings. The adopted Local Plan allocates the undeveloped north western part measuring about 0.72ha for employment use, but despite that being carried through from the preceding Plan and having been designated for employment use for more than 15 years it has not been implemented. I was advised at the Inquiry that this is largely due to the requirement to construct a roundabout junction and site access from Winchester Road to serve the entire site, which produced a negative land value. The Council reassessed the allocation and concluded it is not a strategically important employment site and accepted it had limited marketability in its present form. They concluded there would be more likelihood of development progressing if it were to be combined with the remainder of the site and allocated for a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment.

13.15.2 Although GOSE question whether the site meets the sequential test of site selection criteria advocated in PPG6, I agree with the Council who do not regard it appropriate to apply those criteria given the circumstances of this extant employment site. Indeed, the outcome of the policy, if implemented, would reduce the area of land that is devoted to employment use.

13.15.3 Having heard the debate at the Inquiry, I am not persuaded that the premise upon which the policy has been based is accurate. I was advised that the entire S17 site is owned by the extended Morgan family who have lived and worked in the locality for more than four generations. Although the text suggests parts of the site are likely to become available, I was informed that the garage will remain for the foreseeable future and the breakers yard is one of the few commercial vehicle dismantlers in Hampshire that has an Environment Agency licence. Whilst EU Regulations covering such enterprises are becoming increasingly more stringent, the operator wishes to continue the business, which includes a significant export element and he states that it would not be compatible to retain it with a mixed use development on the land. Therefore, I disagree with the Council's assessment that this is not a strategically important employment site and I am also aware that these types of enterprises are notoriously difficult to relocate. In the absence of any clear evidence of an alternative site for this thriving and useful business, I cannot envisage the proposed mixed use development has any likelihood of being implemented during the Plan period. Furthermore, utilising just the undeveloped area for housing would result in an unsatisfactory living environment for the occupiers of those dwellings that would abut the breakers yard and garage.

13.15.4 Linden Homes indicate that they have been in discussion with the site owners for over 5 years and suggest that in view of the lack of demand for B1 Uses in this locality, it would be preferable to utilise about 0.5ha for business use and 1.7ha for housing. Whilst I accept that there is the potential to create a similar number of jobs as now on a smaller proportion of the site than is currently occupied by business uses, albeit of a different nature, I am concerned that there is no evidence of demand for such and that it would necessarily displace the existing thriving enterprises and jobs. Moreover, it appears that B1 Use was advanced by the Council to be compatible with any potential new dwellings rather than in response to an identified requirement. On balance therefore, in light of the evidence and as the identification of part of this site in successive Plans for employment use has not attracted new business enterprises to Waltham Chase or stimulated redevelopment of the site, I conclude the policy serves no useful purpose and should be deleted. This would not prevent proposals being submitted in respect of the site should the circumstances of the existing businesses change in the future as the entire site falls within the settlement boundary where development or redevelopment is acceptable in principle.

13.15.5 With regard to representations about access and parking for the adjacent school, I note that the employment uses on this site existed prior to the school being built and that the site owners expressed concerns about potential conflicts that could arise, but

these clearly were not viewed as being matters that prevented the approval and construction of the school here. Although the policy and text refer to the formation of a footpath through this site to the school, I consider the implementation of this through the objection site is unlikely without redevelopment and it occurs to me that the possibility of providing this on land to the north could be explored.

**RECOMMENDATION**

13.15.5 That the Plan be modified by the deletion of Policy S17 and its accompanying text.

## 13.16. Whiteley (paragraphs 13.65 - 13.66)

**OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
13.66	261/90	Government Office for the South East

**ISSUE**

In referring to Supplementary Planning Guidance in paragraph 13.66, is the Local Plan Review correct to infer that the guidance does not generally override policies contained within the Plan? (261/90)

**INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

13.16.1 GOSE object to the implication in Paragraph 13.66 that Development Briefs could override the policies of the Plan when as Supplementary Planning Guidance they should be consistent with the Policies of the Plan. Although a small point, I agree that the paragraph could be better worded so as not to cause any misunderstanding.

**RECOMMENDATION**

13.16.2 That the Plan be modified by the deletion of the third sentence in paragraph 13.66 and rewording the following sentence to read: 'Development briefs are intended to amplify .....

## 13.17. Whiteley - Housing (paragraphs 13.67 - 13.71, Proposals S.18, S.19)

**OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
13.67	322/9	North Whiteley Consortium
S.18	261/89	Government Office for the South East
S.18	330/6	The Wildlife Trusts
S.19	261/91	Government Office for the South East
S.19	1434/43	Hampshire County Council

**ISSUES**

1. In providing for the continued expansion of Whiteley Farm, does Proposal S.18 afford sufficient protection in avoiding any possible environmental impact? 330/6
2. Is the Plan Review correct to make reference to the development of Whiteley as a 'whole', given the new community is divided between two Authorities? 261/89, 261/91
3. Is the Local Plan Review correct in continuing to designate land north of Whiteley as countryside? 322/9
4. Are the requirements of S19 and its accompanying text reasonable? 1434/43

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

- 13.17.1 In the first issue, the objector expresses dissatisfaction with the impact of urban growth that has already taken place on the environment. However it seems to me that these concerns relate more to the process of physical development than the policy framework and I regard the provisos contained within Proposal S.18 to represent an adequate basis for the implementation of development without compromising the landscape and ecology of the area.
- 13.17.2 As regards the reference in the second issue to 'Whiteley as a whole' in Proposal S.19, as the Plan does not make any specific proposals for land in Fareham, I can see no objection to using the disputed term as it merely reflects that notwithstanding administrative boundaries, as a community Whiteley is a single entity.
- 13.17.3 In the third issue, whilst the 1987 adopted Whiteley Local Plan referred to a possible northern extension to the development proposals envisaged in the Plan, no such provision has been made in the Hampshire Structure Plan (Review) as other strategic sites were found to be better options. Accordingly, it is entirely appropriate that the area to the north of Whiteley is designated as countryside.
- 13.17.4 In issue four, I agree with the objector that the contents of paragraph 13.71 which proposes holding back the release of this site in favour of brownfield sites is unreasonable and illogical, being the only site already allocated in the adopted Local Plan and within a defined settlement boundary subject to such a measure. Therefore, I recommend deletion of the entire paragraph.
- 13.17.5 The objector further questioned the criteria in S19 and considered that some of these also were unreasonable and unnecessary. It is apparent that the criteria are the same as have been applied to sites at Whiteley since its inception and the Council indicated that where they are found to be unnecessary at the development control stage, they would not be applied. I consider such an approach to be less than satisfactory. With regard to those specifically challenged by the objector, (i) requires a 20m tree belt, which they consider to be arbitrary and it is apparent that this was not imposed upon housing to the east. Moreover, it refers to the requirement being for noise attenuation, when other measures could be employed to address this aspect. However, whilst I accept that to be the case, paragraph 13.70 suggests landscape issues may be equally relevant. Therefore rather than delete the criterion, I propose re-wording it to encompass the landscape issue and advance my suggested wording in the recommendation below.
- 13.17.6 With regard to criterion (iv) the objector was concerned that the reference to *fully served by public transport* could be interpreted to require provision of a bus service along a cul-de-sac. However, whilst the Council conceded that it was intended to ensure the entire development at Whiteley was well served by public transport and that buses now run in the area, they did not consider those factors justified removal of the criterion. Thus, in order to provide clarity, I consider the phrase: *and for the development to be fully served by public transport* should be re-worded to read: *and for the development to have convenient access to public transport*.
- 13.17.7 Finally, criterion (v) was challenged regarding the requirement to provide neighbourhood greens. It is apparent that the criterion has again been transferred from the entire Whiteley Green area and applied to this site. It is evident that part of the site is intended for the provision of a neighbourhood green under Proposal T3 and thus the use of plurals is inappropriate.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 13.17.7 That the Plan be modified by:
- a) rewording criterion (i) to read  
*includes provision for landscaping and tree planting belts of at least 20metres adjoining the M27 to protect the amenities of occupiers of the proposed housing from noise and to screen the development from external views.*

- b) rewording the final part of criterion (iv) to read:  
*and for the development to have convenient access to public transport.*
- c) rewording criterion (v) to read:  
*provides a neighbourhood green within the new housing area (see also Policy T3)*
- d) deleting paragraph 13.71.

## 13.18. Whiteley - Employment (paragraphs 13.72 - 13.83, Proposals S.20 - S.22)

### OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
S.20	261/92	Government Office for the South East
S.20	1191/1	Justin Chard
S.21	321/1	Arlington Property Developments Ltd
S.21	261/93	Government Office for the South East
S.22	489/1	Frobisher Developments
S.22	261/94	Government Office for the South East
S.22	289/1	Frobisher Developments

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1325	2272/1	J Sainsbury Developments Ltd
RD1326	2272/2	J Sainsbury Developments Ltd

### ISSUES

1. Should the defined area of Proposal S.20 be amended to allow for the continuation of the footpath from Hill Coppice to the RT.1 area to the west of Whiteley Way? 1191/1
2. Has Proposal S.20, by including B1 office use, given proper regard to the sequential test in PPG6 and the issue of accessibility? 261/92, 261/93
3. Should criterion (i) be deleted from Proposal S.21? 321/1
4. Should criterion (ii) of Proposal S.22 be amended to remove the requirement of the site being accessed from the west? 489/1
5. Are the changes to S.21 and paragraph 13.79 included within the Revised Deposit Local Plan appropriate? 2272/1/REVDEP, 2272/2/REDVEP
6. Does Proposal S.22, relating to Little Park Farm, Whiteley, have regard to the sequential test in PPG 6 and the importance of accessibility, and is criterion (ii) in accordance with PPG 12, as it relates to land outside the District? 261/94

### INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 13.18.1 In the first issue, the objection has been overtaken by events in that development has already taken place without the loss of the footpath. Although the Council agreed to amend the Plan to reflect this, they omitted to do so due to an oversight. Hence, the Council has advanced a Further Proposed Change (FPC13.D) to Inset Map 43 to address this matter.
- 13.18.2 In issue two, GOSE query whether the inclusion of a BI office use in Proposal S.20 has had proper regard to the sequential test in PPG6 and guidance on accessibility in PPG13. However the fact that Proposal S.20 is intended to complement the long established employment use in this area indicates that the continuity of existing policies rather than a fresh evaluation of optimum location in the light of more recent guidance is the only realistic option.

13.18.3 In issue three, the Council has advanced Further Proposed Change FPC13.E to meet the objection by deleting criterion (i) as Solent 1 is now completed.

13.18.4 In respect of issue four, I agree with the Council that the objection has already been addressed in the Revised Deposit Plan through RD13.27 and RD13.28.

13.18.5 In the fifth issue the objector considers that the third criterion in Proposal S.21 is inappropriately worded in that it is inconsistent with the Development Brief and the planning permission. However I agree with the Council that this additional criterion incorporated in the Plan through RD13.25 provides safeguards for landscape and ecology when Solent 2 is developed. However, I regard the cross-reference to Proposal DP.5 unnecessary as is the entire criterion (iv).

13.18.6 In respect of the final issue, essentially the same considerations as set out in paragraphs 13.7.2 and 13.7.3 above apply to this site.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.18.7 That the Plan be modified:

- a) in accordance with Further Proposed Changes FPC13.D and FPC13.E.
- b) by deleting in accordance with Proposal DP,5 in criterion (iii)
- c) by deleting criterion (iv).

## **13.19. Whiteley - Transport (paragraphs 13.85 - 13.86)**

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN**

<b>Proposal/ Paragraph</b>	<b>Rep Number</b>	<b>NAME</b>
13.85	322/8	North Whiteley Consortium

#### **ISSUE**

Should the Plan make provision for development at North Whiteley to facilitate completion of Whiteley Way?

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

13.19.1 The Revised Deposit Plan was amended to incorporate a reference to the County Council's desire to seek a continuation of Whiteley Way to provide a link between the M27 and A3051 Botley Road to the north. I consider this meets the objection and no further modification is necessary.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

13.19.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.