

LPP2 EXAMINATION TOPICS

14th July 2016 hearing. Comments by John Hayter, resident of Bishops Waltham

Respondent 408914723

Matter 6: Bishops Waltham

i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and justified, including in relation to the NPPF/PPG, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impacts ?

ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

These comments affect policies and DPD's for all settlements with policy boundaries and some cases outside, not just BW.

A. Relevant Considerations from Matters 1 to 5

- Total housing supply not meet legal, NPPF and PPG requirements that pro rata requires a 65% increase in allocations. In what follows provision for this is not a consideration.
- Housing supply has to meet total housing AND the affordable housing need AND all other LPP1, LPP2, NPPF and PPG requirements.
- In practice the LPP2 numerical allocations and their characteristics are thus primarily set by meeting the 40% affordable requirement whilst also mitigating the climate change impact through the carbon footprint of the development and its travel pattern and on water supply, adapting to climate change and providing a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes that also provide for the special needs of the elderly and others.
- LPP1 has no policies setting out overall carbon footprint requirements for development, the amount this is to be mitigated by on and off site renewable energy generation and sustainable travel and other climate change mitigating actions; also the total number of affordable homes to be provided.
- Notably there is no LPP1 policy that sets the framework for deciding the priority between climate change mitigation and adaption and its frequent conflict with *character, natural and built heritage* inherent in most LPP2 DM policies and DPD's.
- Amazingly there is no LPP1 or LPP2 policy relating to flooding and water supply except a local one for Wickham
- Without overall numbers it is impossible to monitor effectiveness.
- Many LPP1 and 2 policies fail the NPPF17 test of *planning applications made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;*

- NPPF 174 requires assessment of the cumulative impact on viability and delivery of policies and DPD but has not been done. There are 32 DPD's in the form of VDS which largely relate to *character* that repeat DM policies without adding unique-to-settlement factors.

- Conversely they mostly omit settlement specific matters such as development density and other carbon footprint drivers, climate change adaptation, flood avoidance and resilience and town centre policies.

B. Introduction

4.2.1 Not recognise market town role of serving its adjoining parishes whose population greatly exceeds that of Bishops Waltham.

4.2.3 *a more sustainable community by improving the balance between housing, employment and services* does not define this balance and reflect into policy what is intended, nor in any event is *sustainable* delivered in greenhouse gas terms per NPPF 30, 37 and 47

4.2.10 There is nothing in BW5 employment site policy to ensure that the unspecified mix of housing and types of employment development will deliver 250 jobs with sufficient NPPF14 flexibility.

- No mention of the constraint that the line from above the two Ponds and downstream to Abbey Mill and the head of the Hamble river is in Environment Agency zone 3 flood plain. The completed diversion channel in the extant permission for the whole Abbey Mill site suggests development would have a reasonable chance of passing the NPPF 100 sequential test.

C. Village Design Statement (VDS)

- The *policies and proposals* now include the VDS which became a SPD on its adoption 29/2/2016 and thus subsequent to LPP2 written submissions.

- The VDS applies *to that part of the parish that lies within Winchester* within and outside the settlement boundary.

- The VDS was publically consulted on the basis that it related only to the LPP2 allocations to BW as a MTRA settlement. The public were not made aware that the VDS also applies to any extension or change of use of existing housing or other development that they and their neighbours currently occupy.

- Appendix 1 lists the LPP1 and LPP2 policies with which the VDS complies. All of the LPP2 policies are DM (5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23). There is thus no evidence that it complies with all of the policies that relate to a settlement such as BW.

- Notable omissions are :

DM2 *Dwelling sizes*

DM6 *Town Centres*

DM11 *Equestrian development*

DM26 *Conservation Areas*

DM28 *Heritage Assets*

DM30 *Locally listed Heritage Assets*

DM31 *Undesignated Rural and Industrial Heritage Assets.*

WDLPR 2006 Saved policies :

S1 BW Ponds - required

S2 Malt Lane - required

S4 Pondsides - now built

- That DM2, 6, 26, 28, 30 and 31 which particularly relate to extension and redevelopment, nothing for saved policies and nothing for flood avoidance and resilience (LPP1 CP17) are not considered is evidence that the consultation only considered development in the MTRA allocations.

D. Policies BW1 to 5

- 4 of the sites are allocated for housing and 1 for employment. LPP2 4.2.12 identifies a need for 7 different types of support infrastructure that are not required by any of the 5 site policies. The list also omits additional car parking to support and grow the town centre role as a local retail and services hub. NPPF 182 support infrastructure is not required or deliverable.

In common with most other settlements:

- No district wide LPP2 policies to implement CP16 "Biodiversity" and CP17 - Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment that per NPPF94 anticipate the impact of climate change on flooding and water supply and demand.

- Maintaining water supply under climate change is a particular problem for these sites. For most of the settlement, requiring rainfall to soak into the soil where it fell feeds the Portsmouth Water extraction at the bottom of Beeches Hill. The contours and proximity of these sites to the River Hamble upper sources means rainfall will percolate into the river with no water extraction locations before it becomes tidal at Botley.

- No district wide LPP2 policies to REDUCE greenhouse gases per NPPF30, 37 and 47 and its "carbon" equivalent in LPP1 CP8, 11, 12, 13 and 14 district wide or in individual settlements.

- No "housing density reflecting local requirements" required by NPPF47

- No overall or settlement policies for NPPF50 mix of dwelling sizes, types, tenures and location to meet demographic needs of the majority and special needs of others. These include affordable social and public housing, supporting extra care in the home, self build and homes for former armed forces with policy criteria set in a transparent way such that sites are purchased at a price which enables viable development.

- The need for these is also settlement specific particularly because of local demographics and house prices in comparison to the rest of the district.

- Particularly the "Extra Care" category requires a group of about 20 to justify on-site support. From mix considerations and also to provide neighbour support this should

not be more than about 25% of the site and thus needs to be provided on sites of 80 or more. By its nature this BW need has to be met in BW and is not deliverable in BW unless this is required within one of the allocations.

E. Missing Central Area Policies

- A new BW Central Area policy is proposed to provide for all of the following needs :

- Despite BW and neighbouring settlements being hugely dependent on BW to fulfill the "balanced community" function there is no LPP2 policy or VDS/DPD requiring its delivery. It has huge historic value and its retail, commercial and service provision must retain its viability and vitality.

- There is no NPPF 23 compliant policy to promote a competitive town centre and manage its growth over the plan period. No assessment has been carried out to assess the need to expand the scale and types of provision and ensure a sufficient supply.

- In the town centre as currently defined this cannot be delivered in a managed way.

- Some of the land in the CA between the defined town centre and B2177 opposite the Palace ruins is occupied by a derelict filling station whose site is under the same ownership as Budgens and the wooden physio clinic and youth club site recently acquired by a developer (including Fox garden machinery?). There is a very rare opportunity to redevelop this to provide for town centre uses as defined in NPPF 23 and increase the total footfalls between Budgens via the new town centre uses to the High Street and vice versa.

- NPPF 127 requires that CA's are *not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special (heritage) interest*. Designation of this site should be revoked thus also facilitating quick viable redevelopment.

- The regeneration focus is modeled on similar policies for Winchester Town.

- In any event WDLPR 2006 saved policy S2 Malt Lane should be reviewed and incorporated into LPP2.

- The two town centre car parks are frequently full and once in a car it is easy to drive to an alternative town such as Wickham. More car parking is a high priority and the field between the vineyard and Corehampton Road adjacent to but outside the settlement boundary (and inside SDNP?) should be designated for this use.

- The area S. of B2177 along Station Road comprising Abbey Field, Abbey Mill site including the mill and N. and S. Ponds has permission for supermarket and surgery development and associated parking. It is all in the ownership of the supermarket

and development has commenced but now ceased and the site is for sale. All except the main site area beyond the Mill is in the Conservation Area (CA).

- *Redevelopment of that part of the Abbey Mill site outside of the CA should meet the following :*

- Character that respects its location near the Palace and CA heritage assets and overlooking the S. Pond natural asset.
- Consistent with also delivering LPP compliant 40% affordable housing with NPPF 159 mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes.
- Include extra care group of about 20 dwellings.
- Include replacement surgery with car parking.
- Design that supports the town centre by public car parking provision but not in competition with it.
- Design that maximises the well being and carbon footprint reduction benefits from its location within easy walking distance of the town centre shopping and service facilities and the transport hub.
- Consistent with adapting to climate change by meeting flood plan requirements and drought resistant landscaping.
- Maintaining the public water supply in drought conditions is an absolute priority that due to its direct impact on ground water levels will make the drought impact on the natural environment far more severe.
- Encourage innovative design to mitigate climate change and hence its own contribution to the flooding and drought risks

- *Abbey Field*

- The extant permission includes redevelopment for community use and car parking particularly for the S. Pond fishing club and its focus on providing for those with disabilities.
- This requirement should be retained.

- *Surgery site*

- NPPF 127 requires that CA's are *not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special (heritage) interest*. Designation of this site should be revoked thus also facilitating viable relocation to Abbey Mill and make the site available for redevelopment.
- Re-use should be for the wider town centre uses defined in NPPF 23 bullet 6