

INTRODUCING EAST HAMPSHIRE

PARAGRAPH 2.1

Objections

First Deposit

1692/7704 Alton Friends of the Earth
1622/8393 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1976/9072 Environmental Project Consulting Group

Second Deposit

1622/12322 English Nature, Hampshire and Isle of Wight
1289/12600 Hampshire Wildlife Trust

Main Issue

Whether the SDDP sufficiently emphasises the importance of such matters as bio-diversity and whether the policies would be enforced with enough rigour.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.1 Bio-diversity is an interest of acknowledged importance as Policy GS1 demonstrates. The adopted Local Plan will be based upon the key principles of sustainability, which include respect for environmental objectives. It must, however, be recalled from Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 1 that sustainability does not mean the prevention of all development.
- 2.2 There is no reason why the Council should not have proper regard to its development plan policies in the determination of planning applications and in its other powers of control.

Recommendation

- 2.3 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.3

Objections

First Deposit

1278/6823 CPRE

Second Deposit SD2.004

1286/14241 Four Marks Parish Council

Pre Inquiry Change PIC001.2

1706/15061 Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.2 (page 14).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether locating houses near railways, and businesses near homes, reduces the need to travel;
- 2) Whether the Watercress Line should be regarded as a Transport Corridor.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.4 There is no guarantee that the approach indicated in the first issue will result in the desired result, and people cannot be forced to live where they do not wish to do so. Nevertheless, the allocation of land for housing near public transport routes where the services are good or have the potential for being so does provide choice and opportunity to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Locating business uses close to residential areas does not guarantee that all or most of the workforce will live near their place of work, but again the choice and opportunity is there and may be increasingly realised in the longer term. In principle, these objectives are important aspects of sustainable development.

*

2.5 On the second issue, I agree that at present the Watercress Line is more for enthusiasts and leisure purposes than a District Transport Link in the normally accepted sense of the term. That should be made clear. Map No TL1 should also acknowledge that the A31 road, not the Watercress Line, is the District Transport Link from Alton to Winchester.

Recommendation

- 2.6 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC001.2), by the deletion on Map TL1 of the Watercress Line as a District Transport Link, thereby clarifying that the A31 road is the District Transport Link from Alton to Winchester.

PARAGRAPH 2.4

Objection

First Deposit

1694/9324 The Blackmoor Estate

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should refer to a “crisis-torn” agricultural industry and redundancies that result from its restructuring.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.7 The SDDP notes that some sectors of this industry are experiencing difficult times and are restructuring and diversifying. In view of local and national policies that encourage agricultural, forestry and farm diversification and the re-use and adaptation of existing rural buildings, I consider that SDDP paragraph 2.4 includes a fair summary of the difficulties facing parts of the agricultural industry. I agree with the Council that paragraph SD2.005 makes the reasonable points that the Objector puts forward, and that it is in suitably less emotional terms.

Recommendation

2.8 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - OVERALL STRATEGY FOR EAST HAMPSHIRE

PARAGRAPH 2.5

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1673/7710 | Mr G G Nicholas |
| 1289/7940 | Hampshire Wildlife Trust |
| 1692/9188 | Alton Friends of the Earth |
| 1660/9808 | Voluntary Action for East Hampshire |
| 1039/9929 | Ms P Cullen |

Second Deposit SD2.007

| | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| 511/11573 | Headley Parish Council |
| 910/14347 | Headley Residents' Association |

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the principles of sustainability can or will be effectively implemented in much of East Hampshire and whether they are being diluted;
- 2) Whether the paragraph should include a reference to the *global environment and distant communities, both present and in the future*;

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.9 It is clear from PPG 1 that sustainability does not preclude all development. It seeks to deliver the objective of achieving, now and in the future, economic development to secure higher living standards while protecting and enhancing the environment. A strategy of sustainable development should, amongst other things, provide for the nation's needs for commercial and industrial development, food production, minerals extraction, new homes and other buildings while respecting environmental objectives. The SDDP, as I recommend that it be modified, does provide that framework. I note the representations in support of this paragraph and the other contents of the SDDP that refer to sustainable development. The Sustainability Appraisal at its Appendix B is a useful basis for the assessment of its policies and proposals and I have given further consideration to these matters in my examination of the Objections.
- 2.10 The concept of sustainability implies that development that is required must be located in the best places. Following the identification for development of previously-developed and other land in the built up areas, the next sustainable option is urban extensions that would make the best use of existing infrastructure and public transport. A greenfield development is not, therefore, necessarily contrary to that approach. For those reasons, the phrase *as far as possible* is, at best, unnecessary. More to the point, however, it serves to undermine the strategy of sustainability that the SDDP worthily adopts. I agree with the **Headley Residents' Association** on this point.

*

2.11 On the second issue, I suggest that the global environment does include distant communities and that it is implicit that a Local Plan does, by definition, look to the future. Even so, the SDDP must be primarily concerned with East Hampshire and it would be unrealistic to expect it to solve the world's pressing problems of poverty and distress. The suggested reference would be superfluous.

-0-

2.12 On other matters, I deal with policies and proposals for Alton later. I note here, however, that it does have a wider range of services and facilities than most other settlements in the District and that this does provide some basis for additional development.

Recommendation

2.13 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion from Paragraph 2.5 of *as far as possible*.

NATIONAL CONTEXT

PARAGRAPH 2.10

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.008

749/11776 National Farmers Union

749/12712 National Farmers Union

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should reflect PPG 13 paragraph 43 concerning the promotion of adequate employment opportunities in rural areas.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.14 I can see little point in repeating sections of this, or of any other PPG, in the Local Plan. The Council would presumably determine applications for planning permission for the conversion or re-use of farm buildings for other business purposes in accordance with the provisions of its development plan and with regard to any other material considerations. In all probability those considerations would include the national policy to which the **National Farmers Union** refers. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 outlines the Government's policies for the re-use and replacement of buildings in the countryside. Furthermore, this Chapter is concerned with general strategy and many of its themes are developed in more detail in later chapters. Policy C14, for example, is within that part of Chapter 3 that deals with rural diversification.

Recommendation

2.15 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD2.009

Second Deposit SD2.009

511/11574 Headley Parish Council
1523/11891 Mr A J Williams
3820/14305 Dalton Warner Davis
910/14348 Headley Residents' Association

Main Issues

- 1) Whether site-specific allocations should be judged against the need to maintain, enhance or improve the environment, rather than just protect it;
- 2) Whether the paragraph should refer to PPG 3 paragraph 46 that refers to the promotion of more sustainable residential environments.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.16 The test in the first issue is a useful start, but others should include proximity to public transport services. Indeed, all the policies and proposals of the Local Plan should be based upon a strategy of sustainable development. A key test in the determination of most planning applications, however, is whether the proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. The emphasis must usually, therefore, be on this approach.

*

2.17 On the second issue, again I can see no need to repeat sections of a PPG. The 5 objectives to which PPG 3 paragraph 46 refers should guide the Council in its promotion of more sustainable residential environments. I take account of this national policy in my examination of all the objections concerning individual sites, both allocations and omissions.

Recommendation

2.18 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

REGIONAL CONTEXT

PARAGRAPH 2.12

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.011

511/11575 Headley Parish Council
910/14352 Headley Residents' Association

Main Issues

Whether land at The Paddock at Headley should be allocated as a Reserve Site for 30 or so dwellings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.19 The Objectors support the aims of this paragraph, especially the need to concentrate development in places that are well-served by public transport and on previously-developed land. These are some of the considerations that I take into account in my examination of the objections to this particular allocation. They lead to my recommendation that it should not be allocated for residential development.

Recommendation

2.20 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – KEYNOTE POLICY

POLICY GS1 & PARAGRAPH 2.19

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 1.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC002.2 (page 16).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Policies GS1-GS4 are unnecessary repetition of later, more detailed policies and hence add nothing to the substance of the Local Plan;
- 2) Whether the Local Plan should provide more flexibility to enable the right development to take place at the right time;
- 3) Whether there should be a clearer vision about the future role, shape and quality of settlements, especially the larger ones like Alton, Bordon and Petersfield;
- 4) Whether the Policy places too much emphasis on the availability of public transport and not enough on the maintenance and creation of balanced communities;
- 5) Whether the Policy is of sufficient rigour and accords too much weight to environmental considerations and not enough to the need for development to meet social and economic objectives;
- 6) Whether the Policy gives sufficient encouragement for small scale development in the villages, in order to maintain village life;
- 7) Whether it should refer to bio-diversity, *both local and global*;
- 8) Whether *unacceptable adverse effect* is a suitable criterion in the Policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.21 These 4 Policies provide a useful basis for the determination of planning applications for a wide variety of development proposals throughout the District. They are augmented by the usually more detailed policies that come later in the SDDP, but that does not make them superfluous. I recommend modifications to them, but I agree with their general thrust. The Council is right in that these Policies are necessary to provide the context for the rest of the Local Plan and to ensure that development proposals are determined within a strategy of sustainability. There is considerable support for these policies, especially Policy GS1.
- 2.22 There is no need for Policy GS1 to state that it is to provide for the development needs of the District within the plan period. It is clear from the Chairman's Introduction to the SDDP that it covers the period up to 2011. Paragraph 1.10 notes that it has been prepared to conform with the Hampshire Structure Plan Review (1996-2011). I would suggest, however, that the title of the Local Plan include these years, as does that of the Structure Plan.

2.23 Some Objections draw attention to particular sites and settlements including Deerleap at Rowlands Castle and are more concerned with site-specific matters than the drafting of the Policies. I deal with these Objections and Omission sites in more detail later, taking into account the various aspects of sustainability to which the evidence refers. This includes the weighting that should be accorded to accessibility to various destinations.

2.24 **Fastnet Properties Limited** suggests an alternative drafting of the last sentence of Policy GS1 that would stress the need to locate development *so as to provide the greatest accessibility to the principal trip generators by public transport, bicycle and on foot....* This valid point is covered by paragraph SD2.017 with its *potential to minimise the length and number of trips that will be made by car*, and in my recommended modification of the Policy.

*

2.25 On the second issue, I consider that the Local Plan, and in particular Policy GS1, does provide sufficient flexibility to allow judgements to be made on the particular circumstances of each case. Moreover, there is always the possibility that the provisions of the development plan can be outweighed by other material considerations, as the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38(6) allows. The combination of rigorous, clearly drafted policies, the intent of this part of the SDDP and the Act should provide the right balance between certainty and flexibility in terms of both type and timing of development.

2.26 Market forces are likely to be the chief factor in the timing of development. Nevertheless, the SDDP rightly gives priority to the re-use of suitably located previously-developed and other land in the built up areas and introduces the phasing of development in accordance with the policy in PPG 3 of plan, monitor and manage. The SDDP goes as far as it should in the timing of its proposals, although I recommend in Chapter 5.7 of my Report on the ranking of Reserve Sites.

*

2.27 I turn now to the third issue. These are very much matters of subjective judgement, and it must be remembered that policies in a Local Plan should concentrate on those matters that are likely to provide the basis for considering planning applications and for determining conditions to be attached to planning permissions. Policy GS1 does, however, set out useful guidelines in these matters, with the emphasis on sustainability, intrinsic character, distinctiveness and heritage.

*

2.28 On the fourth issue, convenient access to public transport offering a good service or with the potential for doing so is an important aspect of sustainable development. So, too, is the re-enforcement or creation of balanced communities where the need to travel is minimised. The Policy rightly refers to both of these complementary objectives. The importance to be attached to each one will vary according to particular circumstances, and the Policy does not prevent that judgement from being made. Importantly, the Policy also refers to other aspects of sustainability. I take all these matters into account in my conclusions and recommendations concerning all sites put forward for development and to which objection is made.

*

- 2.29 On the fifth issue, I agree that the Policy is not as rigorous and certain as it should be, and my recommended modification should bring it more into line with national advice in the Good Practice Guide. In the determination of a planning application, a judgement invariably has to be made between competing objectives. National policy in PPG 1 concerning sustainability acknowledges that this is so, in that it accepts that provision must be made for the nation's needs for commercial, industrial, residential and other development. This implies that there will be occasions when the need for development will outweigh the need to conserve natural resources like the countryside.
- 2.30 It is on this basis that some greenfield development in East Hampshire must be countenanced. Policy GS1 should anticipate that eventuality and provide the platform upon which a judgement can be made on competing demands and objectives. **Professor Withers** considers that the SDDP fails to address the key factors cited in the Policy, but my recommendations should ensure that the strategy in the adopted Local Plan will be soundly based upon the principles of sustainability. Policy GS1 will be a useful start in the determination of planning applications in that context.
- 2.31 The **CPRE** would like to see less emphasis on development for inward investment from outside the District. I sympathise with this concern where it would result in undue erosion of the countryside or cause other harm. But as the Council says, there should be policies in place to meet the reasonable needs of existing employers and to provide for new businesses that would match the skills of the existing workforce. This approach has the potential to reduce travelling times and commuting.

*

- 2.32 The sixth issue concerns small-scale residential development in villages. I am not convinced that this type and scale of development necessarily makes a village and its services more viable. It may instead result in more people being dependent upon jobs, services and facilities elsewhere and a consequent greater reliance upon the private car in travelling to them. The search sequence advocated in PPG 3 takes this general point into account, with priority being given to the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings within urban areas, then urban extensions and finally new development around nodes in good public transport corridors. National policy envisages only a limited amount of housing in expanded villages, with most proposals for additional housing in the rural areas comprising infilling or peripheral expansion. Subject to my recommendations upon particular proposals, that is the strategy of the SDDP and I support it. In general, residential development outside settlement policy boundaries should be resisted and the countryside thereby protected for its intrinsic character.
- 2.33 Criteria are set out for the identification of those villages considered suitable for accommodating significant additional housing, and the Government is concerned that there should be adequate housing provision in rural areas to meet the needs of local people. This is another example of where a balance must be struck between competing objectives. The Council accepts that some limited development would be appropriate, with some villages taking more growth than others. Generally those larger villages for which development boundaries have been defined will take the greater share of development in rural areas. The Council must take care, however, that it does not result in the equivalent of “town cramming” that the Policy seeks to prevent.
- 2.34 Some Objectors consider that Settlement Policy Boundaries are defined for too many rural settlements. Generally, I find them tightly and suitably drawn around the main built up areas. For this reason, and in view of the need for any development or redevelopment within them to respect the surroundings, I do not consider that the

number defined would result in anything more than the limited number of additional dwellings suitable for site and location. It is a matter that I consider in more detail in my examination of the Housing Distribution Strategy, of the objections made to proposals for particular villages and the extent to which there is conformity with national policy in PPG 3.

- 2.35 On a similar matter, the **Liss Parish Council** suggests amendments to the Policy. In principle, development should be located in sustainable communities. Sustainability is, however, the strategy upon which the policies and proposals of the adopted Local Plan should be based. This is explained in paragraph 2.15 and I see no need for repetition. Convenient access to a range of local facilities is an important consideration, but the Policy already refers to the minimisation of both energy consumption and the need to travel. There is no need for further elaboration.

*

- 2.36 On the seventh issue, I think that the reference to bio-diversity will suffice. It could be inferred that it includes global bio-diversity, but spelling it out could imply that the Local Plan will have a significant world-wide influence. That I doubt. Even so, its emphasis on such matters as a reduction in the consumption of energy and the need to travel should make a modest, though important, contribution to protecting the wider environment. But the SDDP is rightly concerned mainly with the use and development of land in East Hampshire.

*

- 2.37 On the final issue, within which I include the drafting of the Policy as a whole, I consider that the advice in the Good Practice Guide is a useful start. This states that plan policies should say what kind of development will be permitted, subject if necessary to certain criteria, or permitted only in certain circumstances. The use of such expressions concerning whether the development would cause harm is usually sufficient. In my opinion, there is no need to qualify harm by such terms as *serious* or *significant*, because harm must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission. The qualification is, at best, superfluous. Guidance on this point should be included in the adopted Local Plan, perhaps in Chapter 1 at The Purpose of the Local Plan. This would ensure that prospective developers appreciate that the omission of these qualifications does not diminish the force of this, and other, policies.

- 2.38 By the same token, I do not think that *unacceptable adverse effect*, a somewhat inelegant phrase, is helpful. I suggest that in the determination of a planning application, the Council should take into account this Policy with its various criteria, together with other relevant policies and material considerations. A judgement should then be made as to whether the proposal is acceptable. To include *unacceptable* within a particular criterion or policy appears to me to prejudge the issue. I do not, therefore, support the Latest Proposed Change (PIC002.2).

- 2.39 There is, I think, a potential conflict between the first and second parts of the SDDP Policy. The first part promotes development, subject to certain provisos, but the second rules it out where there would be *an unacceptable adverse effect* on various interests. The recommended modification should provide a better basis for judgements to be made.

-0-

- 2.40 There are other matters. **English Heritage** draws attention to the possible implications of *enhancement* and *improvement* in so far as Listed Buildings are concerned. The Policy is couched in general terms, however, and it does not purport to override the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This Act, together with other Local Plan policies, would be of considerably greater importance in the Council’s commitment to Listed Buildings in East Hampshire. Even so, the Policy should anticipate those cases where that legislation is relevant.
- 2.41 **Fastnet Properties Limited** suggests amplification of the last sentence of the Policy to include, for example, reference to principal trip generators, as to work, shopping, community services and leisure. This would add little to the Policy, but the considerations would no doubt be taken into account in assessing the suitability for development of particular sites in particular settlements. The main point is that development should be located in such a way that the need to travel is minimised. No doubt likely trips to work and for shopping and leisure purposes, and indeed to a range of local services and facilities, would be taken into account within that context and as a way of maximising sustainability. But there is no need to labour the point in the Policy.
- 2.42 The **Alton Society** draws attention to recent demands on natural resources, particularly water, and various local problems concerning sewage treatment. But the Policy, modified as I recommend, would be as specific as it should be. The Society’s comments are a reminder of the judgements that have to be made in the determination of planning applications, and of the need to ensure that adequate infrastructure is or could be provided for the development(s) proposed. The **Farringdon Parish Council** refers to open land between the 2 parts of the village known as Lower and Upper Farringdon. I deal with this matter in Chapter 3.
- 2.43 Social needs and amenity could be construed to include matters of health and safety where they are subject to planning control. The Policy should make this clear.

Recommendation

- 2.44 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the addition of the plan period to its title, by the inclusion in Chapter 1 of guidance to the effect that harm must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission and as follows:

POLICY GS1

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE IT WOULD MEET THE HOUSING, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL NEEDS OF EAST HAMPSHIRE AND WHERE IT WOULD CREATE WELL BALANCED COMMUNITIES, PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD RESPECT THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AND, WHERE REQUIRED, TO PRESERVE OR ENHANCE THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT. IT MUST BE READILY ACCESSIBLE BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT, BICYCLE AND ON FOOT AND MUST BE LOCATED SO AS TO MINIMISE THE NUMBER AND LENGTH OF TRIPS THAT WOULD BE MADE.

IN ITS DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS, THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE ESPECIAL REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT THEREON:

- A) NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING WATER, AIR AND SOIL QUALITY AND BIO-DIVERSITY;***

- B) THE OVERALL APPEARANCE, INTRINSIC CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF THE COUNTRYSIDE AND ITS LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS;*
- C) THE CULTURAL AND HISTORIC HERITAGE;*
- D) THE DISTINCTIVENESS, INTRINSIC CHARACTER, SETTING AND INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY OF SETTLEMENTS;*
- E) THE AMENITY, INCLUDING HEALTH AND SAFETY, OF THE COMMUNITY; AND*
- F) THE MINIMISATION OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND THE NEED TO TRAVEL, ESPECIALLY BY CAR.*

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD2.018

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.018

| | |
|------------|---|
| 1926/11780 | Squires Bridge Homes Ltd |
| 1279/12463 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1620/13198 | Whitehill Town Council |
| 1293/13617 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 3886/13708 | Squires Bridge Homes Ltd / Wates Landmark |
| 1645/13727 | Mr N D Paren |
| 781/14243 | Dr F Rose |
| 1278/14480 | CPRE |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC003.2 (page 17).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether development briefs should be prepared in consultation with the prospective developer;
- 2) Whether town and parish councils should always be involved in the preparation of briefs.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.45 There can be no doubt that the Council should prepare these briefs in consultation with the prospective developer(s) of the site. That should limit scope for disagreement at the planning application stage. As a general rule, they should be prepared as soon as possible and in anticipation of applications.

*

2.46 On the second issue, these briefs should in principle be prepared in consultation with town and parish councils, whose local knowledge can be vital. The prospective developer should also be involved, as the Latest Proposed Change indicates. Any exceptions to that rule should be so rare as to make it unnecessary to refer to them. Where development proposals come forward before the preparation of a brief, the Council may be able to give some outline guidance, as the **Whitehill Town Council** suggests. I see that, however, as more a matter of negotiation between the main parties in the normal course of development control than as a requirement of the Local Plan. The Latest Proposed Change suitably reflects the advice in PPG 12 paragraphs 3.15 – 3.18, and I endorse it.

Recommendation

2.47 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC003.2).

LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

POLICY GS2

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|---|
| 572/6582 | Worldham Parish Council |
| 1278/7040 | CPRE |
| 1272/7109 | East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry |
| 1286/7441 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1948/9449 | Beechcroft Developments Ltd |
| 1874/10138 | House Builders Federation |
| 1704/10375 | Greene King Plc |
| 1953/15452 | Hawthorne Kamm |
| 1171/6648 | Richard L Stubbs MRTPI and Barry Read RIBA |
| 1093/6333 | Mr and Mrs Vincent |
| 1929/9233 | Danbuild Southern Ltd |
| 1877/8051 | The Treloar Trust |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC004.2, PIC005.2, PIC006.2, PIC010.2, PIC011.2, PIC007.2, PIC019.2, PIC008.2 and PIC009.2 (pages 17 and 18).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy suitably refers to relevant criteria.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.48 These Objections and the Latest Proposed Change relate mainly to particular settlements with which I deal later in this Chapter. They do, however, raise a number of important points that I believe should be set out in the Policy. It would also make clear that, even if a proposal is for development within a SPB, there are still important criteria to be met. It would be better to spell them out, rather than to rely on a cross-reference to other policies.

Recommendation

2.49 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY GS2

IN ITS DETERMINATION OF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A PROPOSAL ON LAND WITHIN A SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARY, THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- A) THE FULL AND EFFICIENT USE OF LAND;*
- B) SYMPATHY WITH THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA AND THE SUITABILITY IN SCALE, MASSING, DESIGN, APPEARANCE, MATERIALS, LAYOUT AND SITING, BOTH IN ITSELF AND IN RELATION TO NEARBY BUILDINGS, SPACES AND VIEWS;*
- C) LANDSCAPING;*
- D) PROTECTION OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF EXISTING AND FUTURE RESIDENTS FROM, FOR EXAMPLE, NOISE, DOMINANCE AND LOSS OF LIGHT AND PRIVACY;*
- E) SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY;*
- F) ANY OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS.*

THESE SETTLEMENTS ARE.....

NOTE:

THIS POLICY APPLIES TO SPECIFIC SITES ALLOCATED WITHIN AND ON THE EDGE OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES SET OUT IN THIS PLAN

PARAGRAPH 2.19

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| 458/5566 | Mr R E Newland |
| 760/6619 | Mrs C Burns |
| 1763/7795 | Miss A.D Scott |
| 1290/7989 | Rydon Homes Limited |
| 1921/8201 | Rydon Homes Limited |
| 1280/8332 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 910/8672 | Headley Residents' Association |
| 1929/9227 | Danbuild Southern Ltd |
| 1673/9918 | The Alton Society |
| 1607/15450 | Cllr Mrs Halstead |
| 622/8260 | Cllr MrsT M Jamieson |

Second Deposit SD2.060

511/11577 Headley Parish Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether infilling in rural areas could significantly reduce the pressure for development on greenfield land;
- 2) Whether the strategy would create more over-development;
- 3) Whether there should be a policy for the re-use of previously-developed land beyond settlement boundaries;
- 4) Whether the strategy should ensure that previously-developed land within settlements will be re-used only where this would create or maintain a good living environment and other worthy objectives.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.50 There may be a limited number of instances where infilling in the rural areas may be acceptable. These might include the development of a single plot in an otherwise built up frontage. But other important considerations are likely to include proximity or otherwise to a public transport service, shops, schools, employment opportunities and other usual requirements. For the most part, this type of development in the rural areas is likely to result in too great a reliance on the private car, contrary to Policy GS1 and national policies.

2.51 The development of well-located greenfield land in the form of urban extensions is more likely to accord with the principles of sustainability, as PPG 3 indicates. Infilling in rural areas and of the type that Mr Newland suggests is unlikely to reduce significantly the pressure identified, and in any event for the above reasons it is not an approach that I support. Moreover, the consolidation of short ribbons of development and other small groups of buildings beyond settlement policy boundaries would be likely to result in

urban intrusions into the countryside. National and local policies are more conducive to sustainable development than is the approach outlined.

*

- 2.52 On the second issue, there is no reason to suppose that the strategy outlined in the Paragraph would result in over-development within settlement boundaries. The SDDP includes policies that reflect national guidance by seeking to ensure a good standard of design. The proposed allocations should be accompanied at some stage by Development Briefs or similar to show how the sites concerned should be developed, taking into account the character of the surroundings. Policy GS1 should provide a useful start in ensuring that development proposals respect that character. Subject to my more detailed conclusions and recommendations, I consider that the SPBs are defined on the basis of clear and useful criteria. I agree, for example, that where large gardens merge into, and in effect form part of the countryside, they should not be included within those boundaries.

*

- 2.53 On the third issue, I am not convinced that there is much previously-developed land beyond SPBs that could be re-used in accordance with the principles of sustainability. Its location away from, for example, a public transport service and the usual requirements of a modern community would be all too likely to result in greater dependence upon the private car, contrary to national and local policies that seek to discourage its use.

*

- 2.54 National policy in PPG 3 accepts that not all previously-developed land, even within settlement boundaries, may be suitable for re-use for housing. There is no doubt, however, that priority should be given to it where suitably located before the development of greenfield land. It is also national policy that good design and layout of new development can help to achieve the Government's objectives of making the best use of such land and of improving the quality and attractiveness of residential areas.
- 2.55 In its determination of planning applications for re-use, the Council will take account of national and local policies for good design and a good living environment. Individual parts of the Local Plan should not be relied upon in isolation, but due weight should be given to each relevant provision. For that reason, there is no need to amplify the strategy as **Rydon Homes Limited** suggests.

-0-

- 2.56 There are other matters. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is an important, though not necessarily over-riding, consideration in the allocation of land for housing. The obligation to meet Structure Plan housing local requirements must be weighed in the balance with the primary objective of conserving the natural beauty of the landscape. That requires a judgement that I have to make in dealing with objections to certain of the SDDP's proposals.
- 2.57 I accept that need can be a somewhat over-worked term and difficult to define with much precision. It can include affordable housing. The main point, however, is that in the search sequence for the identification of land for housing, only a limited amount can be expected to be accommodated in expanded villages.

- 2.58 It would be quite wrong to allow development in and around settlements on the doubtful assumption that it would support local services etc. It would too often encroach into the countryside and, as the Council says, undermine the whole strategy of sustainability. I do accept, however, that limited development may be suitable in and around a few selected villages where a particular and pressing need can be demonstrated. The strategy rightly acknowledges the point.
- 2.59 The Latest Proposed Change (PIC012.2) is a useful update, and I endorse it overleaf in my consideration of SDDP paragraph 2.20.

Recommendation

- 2.60 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.20

Objection

First Deposit

1286/7439 Four Marks Parish Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC012.2 (page 18).

Main Issue

Whether the references to urban areas and urban extensions in Planning Policy Guidance is applicable to rural Hampshire.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.61 Terms are less important than the thrust of national planning policies. The SDDP, as I recommend that it be modified, is soundly based upon the principles of sustainability and in achieving that objective the Council has had regard to national policy. The references to these terms are deleted in the SDDP, and I support the change to the text. The Latest Proposed Change usefully updates the status of PPG 3. In my view, and in the context of a development plan, an urban area is essentially a mainly built-up area. It is in no way a pejorative term.

Recommendation

2.62 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC012.2).

A) MAKING THE BEST USE OF LAND WITHIN THE DISTRICT'S TOWNS AND VILLAGES

PARAGRAPH 2.21

Objections

First Deposit

511/6406 Headley Parish Council
1578/8856 The Petersfield Society
1921/9082 Rydon Homes Limited

Second Deposit SD2.064

1286/14246 Four Marks Parish Council
1871/14884 Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Limited

Second Deposit SD2.065

1278/14548 CPRE

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC6, FPC7 and FPC8 (page 19).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether existing public and private open spaces and playing fields within SPBs should be protected from all but development for recreational purposes;
- 2) Whether more previously-developed land could be identified for beneficial re-use;
- 3) Whether the SDDP should better reflect national advice about the potential constraints upon previously-developed land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.63 As a general rule, these open spaces should be protected from all but recreational development, whether in public or private ownership. As PPG 17 notes, open spaces, sport and recreation all underpin people's quality of life, and SDDP Policy R2 seeks their protection. I deal with particular sites later in my Report.

*

2.64 On the second issue, I remain to be convinced that yet more previously-developed land remains to be identified for beneficial re-use. The Urban Housing Capacity Study appears to me to be a thorough and comprehensive assessment of this resource, although only at a given time. It may be that some land will fall into that category during the rest of the plan period and come forward as windfall sites. Other similar land, in East

Hampshire and elsewhere in the County, will no doubt be identified as this and other Local Plans are monitored. It could then make a worthwhile contribution to local housing requirements.

- 2.65 Subject to my Conclusions below, there is no need to set out a special strategy for pro-active negotiations with the Ministry of Defence concerning the redevelopment of any of its land, should such land become redundant. There is no reason to doubt that the Council would continue to take a responsible approach in these circumstances in accordance with national and local policies for the adoption of a search sequence in identifying suitable land for housing and/or other purposes. In my covering letter to the Council’s Chief Executive, I refer to the urgent need to prepare and adopt a Masterplan for Whitehill/Bordon.

*

- 2.66 For the third issue, there is nothing that I can add to my above conclusions. Perhaps the most significant point is that previously-developed land should be well located if it is to take development.

Recommendation

- 2.67 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD2.066

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.066

| | |
|------------|---|
| 1874/11779 | House Builders Federation |
| 1622/12318 | English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight |
| 1289/12594 | Hampshire Wildlife Trust |
| 1289/12612 | Hampshire Wildlife Trust |
| 1305/13187 | Bovis Homes Limited (SE Region) |
| 1620/13201 | Whitehill Town Council |
| 1293/13629 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 1878/14720 | Prowting Projects Ltd |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC6, FPC7 and FPC8 (page 19).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether large windfall sites should trigger a statutory alteration to the Local Plan;
- 2) Whether paragraph SD2.066 could be taken to imply that any Defence Estates land, including greenfield land, could be given preferential consideration over other greenfield land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.68 Any Defence Estates land declared surplus to requirements would have the potential to make a significant contribution towards, and perhaps above, the District's housing requirements. Even so, it must be stressed that at the time of writing no such declaration has been made. It is not possible at present for the Council to identify redundant/surplus Defence Estates land/buildings at this stage in the local plan process, as **English Nature** suggests. Indeed, the Defence Estates is not suggesting the allocation for development of any particular land. So it would be wrong to expect the Council to undertake such work as the preparation of development briefs that might be abortive.
- 2.69 As *Planning to Deliver* (DTLR July 2001) makes clear, windfalls can complicate the managed release of sites and could throw the planning strategy off course. They should be tested against the criteria in the plan to assess their suitability for development and release. Provided that they met these criteria, and given that they can help reduce the need to develop greenfield land, they should normally be released for development. Should Defence Estates land be declared surplus to requirements, I would expect the Council to treat it as a windfall and to adopt this approach.
- 2.70 The above mentioned guidance advises on the possible consequences of an application to develop a substantial windfall site whose housing capacity was substantially in excess of the estimated windfall allowance. Such land might also be able to accommodate much of a local authority's planned housing requirement. Even with the recent adoption of a local plan, it might be prudent to review and alter it and thereby, for example, avoid the unnecessary development of greenfield land. That process would also allow the

Council to compare any such surplus land with other allocated sites, previously-developed or otherwise, in terms of both suitability in principle and time of release, and make any alteration(s) to the plan should that be deemed necessary. This should be explained, as I recommend.

- 2.71 Such a comparative assessment of sites and settlements should take account of existing and likely future services, facilities and infrastructure, a point well made by the **Whitehill Town Council**. “Reserve” sites are for housing, and there is no need to repeat the point.
- 2.72 **English Nature** is concerned that this approach of making sure that the release of any Defence Estates land is *subject to the usual environmental considerations* would prevent a proper examination of the likely impact of development in combination with other plans and projects. There is no convincing evidence to substantiate these fears, but as much of the land lies within or close to heathland habitats that are of international ecological importance, I agree that the phrase should be made more rigorous.

*

- 2.73 **Bovis Homes Plc** raises the second issue. The fears are unjustified because any land declared surplus would be considered for development in accordance with the Local Plan strategy and policies. Other material considerations would no doubt include PPG 3 with its emphasis on the search sequence and principles of sustainability. This would be reasonable, not preferential, consideration. To avoid any possible doubt, however, I recommend a modification to the paragraph that should encompass the valid points that the Objector makes. Land includes buildings.

-0-

- 2.74 The Council and the **Whitehill Town Council** agree that a new paragraph should be added after SD2.066. It is FPC8. In principle, I endorse it. At its session of the Inquiry on 16th March 2004, I invited the Defence Estates to comment on paragraph SD2.066 and my suggested re-draft. It suggested that the paragraph should start *If the development of the land is acceptable,...* That conclusion could be properly reached, however, only after the comparison outlined.
- 2.75 I have considered all the suggested changes to the text, drawing on the Objectors’ and the Council’s views. I believe that my recommendation achieves the right balance of information, guidance and brevity.

Recommendation

- 2.76 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (FPC6, FPC7 and FPC8) subject to:

Paragraph SD2.066

The Ministry of Defence, however, owns large areas of land in the District, particularly in the Whitehill/Bordon area. Much of this land has extensive areas of buildings whilst other areas remain undeveloped. Should Ministry of Defence buildings or other previously-developed land be declared surplus to requirements and be brought forward for development, it would be re-assessed according to the strategy and policies of the Local Plan and national policies. If appropriate, and subject to environmental constraints, statutory and other requirements and considerations, the Council would release it for development before greenfield sites.

Depending upon the potential scale of redevelopment and the seriousness of its implications for the general strategy set out in this Chapter, the Council might deem it necessary to review and alter the Local Plan, even if recently adopted, or to prepare an

Action Area Plan under current legislation. Either way, there would be a comparison of the land concerned with allocated baseline and reserve sites and a re-assessment of the order in which lands should be released for development.

Then add new paragraph

In considering proposals for the re-use of buildings and other previously-developed land within or outside the settlement boundary of Whitehill/Bordon, the Council will give priority to a mix of uses that would serve to create a more balanced community and improve or meet a current deficiency in infrastructure and/or facilities in the town.

PARAGRAPH 2.22

Objections

First Deposit

853/7114 Greatham Parish Council
1929/9229 Danbuild Southern Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether there should be greater flexibility for the conversion of former agricultural and light industrial buildings in the rural areas for business uses;
- 2) Whether there should be more emphasis on steering employment uses to places that provide businesses with locational advantages rather than just to the larger settlements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.77 I agree with the **Greatham Parish Council** that locating business uses near residential areas is no guarantee that the local residents will have the necessary skills to work nearby. Nevertheless, this approach can result in longer term opportunities and a greater choice to achieve that objective and hence to reduce commuting. In deciding whether a material change of use of rural buildings should be permitted, the Council will often have to strike a balance between competing objectives like making good use of empty space yet seeking not to increase significantly journeys to work especially on rural roads ill-suited to cater for them. The advice in PPS 7 is that re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but conversion to residential use may be more appropriate in some locations. National and local policies provide a good basis for these decisions, and those in the SDDP should not be modified.

2.78 The **Greatham Parish Council** considers that light industrial uses in rural areas may cause harm to the environment through machinery and heavy traffic. Light industry, however, is usually regarded as a use for any industrial process that can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration and fumes etc. Again, however, the need to reduce travelling, especially by car, may be an especially important consideration.

*

2.79 On the second issue, I agree that policies and proposals should take account of the locational needs of businesses, and the SDDP acknowledges the point. Whether this means that land should be allocated on the edge of particular settlements, smaller or otherwise, is another matter. I deal with it in my consideration of the objections and settlements concerned.

Recommendation

2.80 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.24

Objections

First Deposit

1895/9724 English Heritage

Second Deposit SD2.072

1620/13202 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

Whether *and quality of life* should be added to paragraph SD2.072.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.81 The paragraph already refers to the amenity of local residents which is essentially about protecting their quality of life. There is no need to labour the point with repetition.
- 2.82 The deletion in the SDDP of *whatever scale of development is environmentally acceptable* presumably meets the objection lodged by **English Heritage**.

Recommendation

- 2.83 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.25

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7039 CPRE
1521/10001 Professor M J Withers

Main Issues

- 1) Whether settlement policy boundaries are defined with sufficient care;
- 2) Whether set-aside land should be classed as brown field sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.84 I have much sympathy with the CPRE's comments. One of the criteria in defining the mainly built up area should be to discourage unsuitable development in the gardens of the larger houses, gardens whose openness relates them more to the countryside than to the built up area. I agree also that farm buildings at the edges of villages should not usually be treated as parts of the built up area and by implication suitable for development or redevelopment. Fingers and larger areas of countryside that extend into villages often contribute a good deal towards their character, Bentley being a good example of these circumstances. I do not doubt that the Council accepts these general principles, but I bear them in mind when I adjudicate on relevant objections.

*

2.85 On the second issue, I am guided by the definition of brown field or previously-developed land in PPG 3 Annex C. It does not include set-aside land and so this is not a consideration in favour of its development for business, retail, housing and educational purposes as Professor Withers suggests.

Recommendation

2.86 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

B) CONCENTRATING GREENFIELD DEVELOPMENT AT ALLOCATED SITES ON THE EDGE OF LARGER SETTLEMENTS, AND ON THE EDGE OF SMALLER VILLAGES WHERE A SPECIFIC NEED HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED

PARAGRAPH 2.29

Objections

First Deposit

1921/15451 Rydon Homes Limited
1929/9230 Danbuild Southern Ltd
1666/9864 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD2.076

511/11583 Headley Parish Council

Second Deposit SD2.077

511/11584 Headley Parish Council

Main Issue

Whether the plan should make explicit reference to making the best use of allocated sites, land within settlement boundaries and previously-developed land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.87 The SDDP does make clear this important part of its general strategy. A section in this Chapter concerns the making of the best use of land within the District's towns and villages, and it is a point that I emphasise in my recommendation concerning Policy GS2. It includes the need for good design and layout for new development, and that presumably includes schemes for land allocated for it. Priority, it says, should be given to the re-use of previously-developed and other land within settlement boundaries. It is difficult to see how yet more emphasis could be given to these matters which are in line with national policy in PPG 3.
- 2.88 I agree with **Rydon Homes Limited** that not all previously-developed land is, by definition, suitable for redevelopment. As PPG 3 explains, its potential and suitability for housing should be assessed against stated criteria that include the ability to build communities. Again, I confirm that I take this point into account in my examination of the relevant objections.

-0-

- 2.89 There are other matters. The points that **Councillor Mr Clegg** makes about the need to take account of the shape of a village in defining its edge are generally covered in my response to the objections made to SDDP Paragraph 2.25. The existing shape of a village is not the only criterion, however, in deciding if and where it should be

expanded. Convenient access to shops and other facilities may be more important.

- 2.90 I agree with the **Headley Parish Council** that the urban extensions to which PPG 3 refers are not likely to be appropriate to those villages in East Hampshire with a limited range of services and facilities.

Recommendation

- 2.91 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.30

Objections

First Deposit

1620/8145 Whitehill Town Council
1929/9231 Danbuild Southern Ltd

Second Deposit SD2.078

1620/13203 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether low cost housing should be distributed throughout East Hampshire to ensure a balance in all types of tenure;
- 2) Whether, in considering the balance between housing and jobs, there should be more emphasis on the scale of development on greenfield and other sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.92 The emphasis should be on providing low cost and/or other affordable housing in those parts of the District where the identified need is greatest. The settlements concerned may, or may not, already have a significant amount of this type of accommodation. A more even distribution could result in providing it where it is not much needed. I consider this subject in more detail in my examination of Policy H11.

*

2.93 On the second issue, the seeking of this balance must include matters of scale as well as of location. The paragraph deals primarily with greenfield land and so any consideration of other types of land would be better included elsewhere. The **Whitehill Town Council** considers that the last part of paragraph 2.30 overrides the direction in Policy GS1 that development will be permitted *where it meets the housing, economic and social needs of East Hampshire and where it creates balanced communities*. I do not share this view. In its determination of a planning application, the Council will take account of every relevant provision in the development plan and attach due weight to it. The correct approach is therefore one of selection and weighting, not of one provision overriding another.

2.94 In the case of Whitehill/Bordon, I would expect the Council to identify any need for affordable housing and then to weigh that in the balance with other material considerations including Circular 6/98 and the extent to which the settlement is or is not “well-balanced”, however that might be defined. If there is a need for affordable housing in Whitehill/Bordon, as is averred, it should not be ruled out in principle. The emphasis should be on the amount required in this settlement, and the implications for any proposals for residential development. The SDDP should not, therefore, be modified as the **Whitehill Town Council** suggests.

Recommendation.

2.95 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.31

Objections

First Deposit

572/6570 Worldham Parish Council
1929/9232 Danbuild Southern Limited

Main Issues

Whether homes and jobs should be put close together.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.96 Presumably the **Worldham Parish Council**'s objection is substantially met as a result of the deletion in the SDDP of the first part of this paragraph. Even so, as I have previously mentioned, suitable employment and residential uses can be close to each other provided that living conditions are not prejudiced. Indeed, there is a trend towards more and more people working from home. An advantage is the reduction in the need to travel, especially by car.
- 2.97 I agree with **Danbuild Southern Limited** that the requirement to reduce the need to travel is a factor in determining the scale, as well as the location, of development. In my judgement, the strategy makes this point evident and I see no need to labour the point further in this paragraph.

Recommendation

- 2.98 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PROTECTING THE COUNTRYSIDE POLICY GS3

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|--|
| 1278/7042 | CPRE |
| 1171/7047 | Richard L Stubbs MRTPI and Barry Read RIBA |
| 774/7061 | Mr B W Evans |
| 1278/7170 | CPRE |
| 1863/7973 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1929/8227 | Danbuild Southern Ltd |
| 910/8683 | Headley Residents' Association |
| 1953/9473 | Hawthorne Kamm Ltd |
| 1680/9974 | Mr B Read |
| 1874/10139 | House Builders Federation |

Second Deposit SD2.085

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1279/12465 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1639/12929 | East Hampshire AONB Office |
| 1960/13969 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1278/14550 | CPRE |

Pre Inquiry Change PIC13.2

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 1279/15072 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1960/15230 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1872/15306 | Hampshire County Council |

Second Deposit SD2.086

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1639/12930 | East Hampshire AONB Office |
| 1278/14551 | CPRE |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC013.2 (page 20).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should be made more exacting;
- 2) Whether it, or an additional policy or criterion, should allow for infilling;
- 3) Whether it should include another criterion to ensure that a proposed development would not cause harm to the natural environment.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.99 Some of these objections are concerned more with particular sites than the generality of the Policy. I deal with them in greater detail later.
- 2.100 Both Mr Broyd and I have been impressed by the beauty of the countryside in East Hampshire. Whether or not particular parts of it are protected as a result of special designations, it should be protected for its intrinsic character as far as is consistent with other objectives in accordance with national policy. Prospective developers, and others, should be in no doubt about the Council's commitment to protect it, and the SDDP rightly includes this Policy. There is no need for it to distinguish between the countryside in general and the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). That latter designation gives an additional layer of protection and relevant national and local policies would be brought to bear in the determination of any planning application concerning land within it.
- 2.101 Some development of greenfield land, beyond existing settlement boundaries, will have to take place to meet Structure Plan housing requirements. Nevertheless, development in the countryside should be permitted rarely. The Good Practice Guide advises that policies should usually be framed in positive terms, but in view of the above remarks I consider that in this case a negatively worded policy would be better. My reservations about *unacceptable adverse impact* remain. I recommend on that basis, making the Policy somewhat more exacting.
- 2.102 **Mr Evans** refers to development at the borders of settlements and says that it should be permitted only if the volume of traffic generated would not have an adverse impact upon the countryside. Provided that the boundaries were clearly marked, which they are, it should be possible to apply the principle of development within them and generally to restrict development beyond it. In both cases the Council would have regard to the likely type and volume of traffic generated and its effect upon the environment both within and outside the settlement. Policy G3, and others, allows the Council to do so.
- *
- 2.103 On the second issue, there may be instances where infilling in an otherwise developed frontage would be acceptable. From my journeys around the District, however, I would expect those instances to be limited. It is not just a matter of physical characteristics, but of such sustainability considerations as convenience of access to services like shops, schools and public transport and the need to reduce, not increase, travelling especially by the private car. In some cases, these matters may have to be balanced with the potential to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. A policy that envisaged infilling outside settlement boundaries, Conservation Area or not, would be an unfortunate hostage to fortune. It would be better to treat any such suitable proposal as an exception to the general, and exacting, policy of restraint in the countryside. In these circumstances, reference to paragraph SD2.091 might be appropriate.
- *
- 2.104 Thirdly, I see no need for the suggested additional criterion. The natural environment is a valuable asset and part of the overall character, quality and appearance of the countryside. It would be protected by other policies including GS1 and those in Chapter 3 of the SDDP. Moreover, the Local Plan should be read and applied as a whole. Similarly, I agree that the Policy should not refer to the conversion and re-use of rural buildings. That subject also is in Chapter 3.

-0-

- 2.105 There are other matters. An additional policy or criterion is suggested to protect those especially tranquil parts of the countryside, or its general tranquillity. The Policy already refers to the overall character and quality of the countryside and so the Council would be obliged to take account of these aspects, in general and in particular, in coming to its decision on a planning application. I would suggest that character and quality includes attributes such as its tranquillity, however measured. Its inclusion is not vital, but on balance and to avoid any lingering doubt, I endorse it. Hence my recommendation includes the Latest Proposed Change. It should also include certain criteria from Policy C1, thereby obviating the need for that Policy.
- 2.106 There is no need for the Policy to say that new development will be permitted on sites allocated in the Plan. That would be stating the obvious, and I should prefer the Plan to be shorter, not longer. Reserve sites, being beyond Settlement Policy Boundaries, should be treated as part of the countryside unless and until resolved otherwise.

Recommendation

- 2.107 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY GS3

THE COUNTRYSIDE, DEFINED AS THE AREA OUTSIDE SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES, WILL BE PROTECTED FOR ITS INTRINSIC CHARACTER AND BEAUTY. PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN IT UNLESS ALL THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE MET:

- A) IT IS NECESSARY FOR FARMING, FORESTRY, COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION, SMALL SCALE TOURISM OR ANY OTHER GENUINE AND PROVEN NEED FOR WHICH A COUNTRYSIDE LOCATION IS ESSENTIAL;***
- B) IT WOULD NOT HARM THE OVERALL CHARACTER, QUALITY, TRANQUILLITY AND APPEARANCE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE;***
- C) IT WOULD NOT HARM THE INTRINSIC LOCAL CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE, SENSE OF PLACE OR LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS; AND***
- D) THE TYPE AND VOLUME OF TRAFFIC GENERATED WOULD NOT RESULT IN DANGER OR INCONVENIENCE ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY, OR HARM THE RURAL CHARACTER OF LOCAL ROADS.***

PARAGRAPH 2.33

Objections

First Deposit

1304/8681 Country Landowners Association
1694/9327 Blackmoor Estate

Main Issue

Whether the SDDP suitably acknowledges the needs of the farming industry and its present difficulties.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.108 It does. Paragraph 2.39 refers to proposals to diversify the economic base of farms and rightly says that they will be judged on their merits and the impact that they would have on the character and appearance of the countryside. Consideration can be given to the proposed re-use and alteration of existing buildings. The SDDP rightly accepts that PPG 7, since superseded by PPS 7, remains a material consideration. The type of proposals that the Objectors imply are likely to vary in type and location and the emphasis would no doubt be on judging each one on its individual merits. This paragraph goes as far as it should in this respect and, bearing in mind the more detailed policies on this subject in Chapter 3, I see no need for it to be modified.

Recommendation

2.109 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.34

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.089

1622/12339 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
3886/13712 Squires Bridge Homes Ltd / Wates Landmark
3820/14309 Dalton Warner Davis

Pre Inquiry Changes PIC14.2

3832/15361 Erringham Investments Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC014.2 and FPC5 (page 21).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the text should include a reference to candidate Special Areas of Conservation;
- 2) Whether the Council should give reasons for identifying Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), and whether the owners of land to be identified should be notified of the Council's intention;
- 3) Whether the level of importance of the various designations should be clarified.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.110 It should include such a reference, as in the Latest Proposed Change (PIC014.2).

*

2.111 On the second issue, I consider that the criteria for their identification that are set out in the SDDP at Appendix C equate with the requested reasons and surveys. In response to my request for additional information, the Council sets out the stages that since 1994 have led to the identification of SINCs. The criteria have been adopted by local planning authorities throughout the County, including the Hampshire County Council.

2.112 Landowners should be, and are, notified that the Council intends to designate their land as a SINC. They are made aware that formal designation will be through the local plan process, and there is the usual right of objection that has been exercised in the case of this Local Plan.

2.113 More detailed information is included in the Council's note of 25 July 2003 to the Programme Officer. I have attached it to the Council's Proof of Evidence CD13/10/GS3. It convinces me that the process towards identification is thorough and fair, and that there is no need to modify the SDDP on this count.

*

- 2.114 Thirdly, I agree that the level of importance should be clarified, generally as the Latest Proposed Change provides. Additionally, the distinction between statutory and non-statutory designations should be made even clearer. There is no evidence to suggest that the Council does not endorse PPG 9 paragraphs 1, 3, 12-13 and 24-26.
- 2.115 I doubt the need for FPC5. It repeats FPC4, and should not proceed.

Recommendation

- 2.116 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC014.2) and by making even clearer the distinction between statutory and non-statutory designations.

PARAGRAPH 2.40

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7043 CPRE
1953/9474 Hawthorne Kamm Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Council should be more flexible in permitting the re-use of former farm buildings;
- 2) Whether the Policy should offer more encouragement to re-develop buildings, including those in Conservation Areas, that are derelict or functional but with no scope for conversion.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.117 There is little that I can add to my conclusions at paragraph 2.108. In a remote rural area, proposals for conversion to residential use should be considered not only upon the possible merits of using an existing building, but on such sustainability issues as convenient access to public transport and other services. It would be better to determine each proposal on its merits rather than to try to anticipate the individual circumstances of each case by framing a policy for it. The policies in Chapter 3, augmented by the advice in PPS 7, provide a useful basis for the determination of these proposals.

*

2.118 On the second issue, I am doubtful about the merits of a land use policy that sought to encourage certain types of development. This would be contrary to advice in the Good Practice Guide. As PPG 1 advises, the emphasis should be on taking into account whether a proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. The test for proposals in a Conservation Area is different, but relevant national and local policies would apply in those circumstances.

Recommendation

2.119 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD2.091

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.091

511/11591 Headley Parish Council
1278/14552 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether *enabling development* should refer to particular sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.120 It would be difficult to identify all the sites where this paragraph might apply and be the basis of an acceptable proposal. It is better for it to remain as a general provision, to be brought to bear as and when relevant. I agree that the circumstances where some limited enabling development might be acceptable would be exceptional, and the Council would need to be convinced that it would be justified. An environmental cost-benefit analysis as well as other evidence might be needed to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposal, but it would be better not to seek to anticipate all that might be relevant.

Recommendation

2.121 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 2.41

Objection

First Deposit

1278/7045 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should make it clear that its criteria should apply especially to the development of affordable housing in the countryside.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.122 Good design and the use of suitable materials should apply to every type of development that is permitted in the countryside and everywhere else. At best, it would be unnecessary to single out any particular type of development. At worst, it might imply that a lower standard would be appropriate for those types of development not mentioned.

Recommendation

2.123 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

MAKING THE MOST OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES

POLICY GS4

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|
| 90/5658 | S E Water PLC (Dynamco) |
| 88/6183 | Thames Water Property |
| 1278/7046 | CPRE |
| 293/8053 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 1948/9456 | Beechcroft Developments Ltd |
| 1660/9811 | Voluntary Action for East Hampshire |
| 1071/9971 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 1874/10140 | House Builders Federation |
| 1644/10244 | Alton Town Council |

Second Deposit SD2.093

1885/13337 Fastnet Properties Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC015.2 and FPC9.

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy is necessary, is too restrictive and whether it suitably accords with national policy;
- 2) Whether it is consistent with Policy GS1.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.124 Planning obligations, or planning contributions as they are defined in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, may be the only way in which development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner and the Local Plan should make it clear that this is so. The Policy is therefore necessary in some form. Its thrust is not too restrictive, but it should be redrafted in a way that would better reflect national policy in Circular 1/97. The Circular, including its 5 tests for planning obligations, must remain a material consideration. Not surprisingly, as is demonstrated in Core Document 13/2, the Council is well aware of the Circular, its tests and requirements. There is no need to set them all out in the Policy, but my recommendation makes clear that it is based upon them. Nor is there any need for *directly attributable* which is not specified in the Circular, although I consider that its purpose is included within the tests. The all-embracing test is reasonableness.

*

2.125 On the second issue, it is suggested that Policy GS4 b) implies a greater importance

upon the provision of facilities both on and off-site to rectify local deficiencies than on an objective assessment of sustainability. It is alleged that paragraph SD2.093 undermines the basic purpose of Policy GS1 which is to steer development towards sustainable locations. The deletion of *directly attributable*, but now proposed to be reinstated in the Latest Proposed Change (FPC9), is said to reveal an approach to site selection which is based not so much upon an objective assessment of sustainability but more upon a desire to fulfil “wish lists”. The Council stands accused of selecting and giving priority to housing sites to reflect its emphasis on meeting local needs.

- 2.126 Apart from the proposed allocation at Clements Close, Binsted, I do not accept that this is so. The 2 Policies complement each other. I agree that the general strategy must be to locate development in those places with the widest range of services and facilities with especial emphasis being placed upon good, or potentially good, public transport. Within that context, the Council may have to seek to enter into agreements with developers to ensure that their schemes are provided with all the necessary infrastructure, both on and off-site. Circumstances are likely to vary from scheme to scheme and from settlement to settlement, but there is no fundamental conflict between the 2 Policies. Due weight must be given to each one as they are applied to the circumstances of the individual case. Nevertheless, the fact that a developer is willing to provide a village hall, or similar, does not necessarily make the overall scheme acceptable in sustainability terms.
- 2.127 My recommended redraft of the Policy accommodates PIC015.2 but rejects FPC9.

Recommendation

- 2.128 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY GS4

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT ONLY IN THOSE LOCATIONS WHERE:

- A) ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND/OR FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE AND WOULD BE USED MOST EFFICIENTLY; OR***
- B) THE DEVELOPER HAS MADE ARRANGEMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY, FAIRLY AND REASONABLY RELATED IN SCALE AND KIND TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REASONABLE IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS TO PROVIDE OR TO IMPROVE INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES, ON AND/OR OFF-SITE.***

IN SEEKING TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE DEVELOPER TO PROVIDE INFRASTRUCTURE ETC AND/OR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS, THE COUNCIL WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ANY RELEVANT CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF DEVELOPMENT.

PARAGRAPH 2.42

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.098

511/11597 Headley Parish Council
3820/14308 Dalton Warner Davis

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC016.2 (page 22).

Main Issue

Whether the Local Plan should seek to *minimise* or *mitigate* the effects of development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.129 Definitions of mitigate in the OED include *to alleviate*, *to reduce the severity of* and *to moderate the severity of something*. *Mitigation* is used in Circular 11/95 and I agree with the Council that it would be the more appropriate.

-0-

2.130 On another matter, I note the **Headley Parish Council's** point that the type of infrastructure mentioned in the paragraph has not always been provided as a result of small scale developments. A judgement must be made in each case, however, on the suitability of a planning agreement in the light of local and national policies. And again, reasonableness will be the key test.

Recommendation

2.131 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC016.2).

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPHS SD2.099 AND SD2.100

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.099

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| 511/11598 | Headley Parish Council |
| 511/11599 | Headley Parish Council |
| 1899/12259 | Bewley Homes Plc |
| 1279/12469 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1645/13730 | Mr N D Paren |
| 68/14179 | Environment Agency |
| 3820/14310 | Dalton Warner Davis |
| 910/14364 | Headley Residents' Association |
| 1278/14558 | CPRE |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC017.2 (page 22).

Main Issue

Whether Paragraph SD2.099 should be made more explicit.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.132 The provision or improvement of landscape management might be a relevant matter to be included in a planning obligation (contribution). There should be a reference to it. Both it and countryside management would presumably include **Mr Paren**'s point about tree and hedge planting, but it should be made explicit. There should also be a reference to water supply and sewage disposal. The Latest Proposed Change suitably covers these points.

-0-

2.133 Some Objectors' points are covered in my examination of Policy GS4. Additionally, I agree with **Bewley Homes Plc** that small developments like infilling are unlikely to bring forward any significant provision or improvements of the type to which the paragraph refers. On the other hand, I do not accept that community benefits are likely to be delivered only from modest expansions of 25 or more dwellings. Much will depend upon local circumstances and the type and scale of provision necessary for the development proposed, and so it is better not to put a number on the dwellings.

Recommendation

2.134 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC017.2).

PARAGRAPH 2.43

Objection

First Deposit

1666/9865 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Main Issue

Whether Parish Councils should be among the parties agreeing to measures of improvement.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.135 I have no doubt that the Council values the views of a Parish Council in its determination of planning applications. Nevertheless, it is the District Council that is the local planning authority and its decisions in these matters must not be subject to a parish or town council's views and agreement.

Recommendation

2.136 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD2.103

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.103

3012/10522 Southern Water
1874/12831 House Builders Federation
820/14312 Dalton Warner Davis

Pre Inquiry Change PIC018.2

1899/15275 Bewley Homes Plc
3820/15298 Dalton Warner Davis
1874/15302 House Builders Federation
568/15337 Cove Construction Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC018.2 (page 23).

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should acknowledge the possibility of more than 2 phases of a large development scheme and be re-drafted accordingly.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.137 The points that **Southern Water** makes are good ones, in that there could be more than 2 phases of a scheme.
- 2.138 The **House Builders Federation**'s point about uncertainty whether a later phase will be undertaken is also valid. Developers must be assured that later phase(s) will go ahead before they can be expected to make any commitment to it. A planning condition, Grampian-style or otherwise, and the permission to which it is attached, should normally relate to an entire scheme. An obligation (contribution) should be a matter of agreement between the main parties, and a developer would enter into it only on the basis of certainty and where convinced that the terms of the agreement would not undermine the viability of the scheme.
- 2.139 It would not, therefore, always be reasonable for all improved and/or new infrastructure and facilities to be in place and operational before the start of the first phase of the development. The Latest Proposed Change appears to me to accommodate the valid points of objection, but I think that it could be made more explicit. Policy GS4 and Circulars 11/95 and 1/97 would remain material considerations.

Recommendation

- 2.140 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

Paragraph SD2.103

Where development is phased and where it is reasonable to do so, the Council will attach a planning condition and/or seek to enter into agreement(s) to ensure provision of the necessary infrastructure for the second and any subsequent phase of the development before work starts on the second or any other later phase.

PARAGRAPH 2.44

Objections

First Deposit

1010/6658 McCarthy & Stone Developments Ltd
774/8367 Mr B W Evans

Main Issue

Whether the Local Plan should include Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.141 National policy set out in PPG 12 is that SPG does not form part of a local plan. Local circumstances in East Hampshire do not outweigh that policy. This Guidance should, however, be publicly available and I have no doubt that that is the case with the Council's "Guide to Developers' Contributions".

-0-

2.142 I endorse the amended reference to Circular 1/97 in the SDDP.

Recommendation

2.143 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES

ALTON

INSET MAP 1A

Objections

First Deposit

1922/8206 Alton Convent School

Second Deposit

4115/13088 Mr and Mrs Burgess

4116/13090 Mr and Mrs Hobbs and Mr and Mrs Burgess and Mrs Wettone

4117/13090 Holybourne Development

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the SPB is drawn too tightly around the buildings of Alton Convent and School;
- 2) Whether part of the rear garden of Nos 208-212 London Road should be brought into it.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.144 The SPB is drawn tightly around the Convent and School buildings in acknowledgement of the extent of the built-up area and of the Local Gap between Alton and Holybourne, the subject of SDDP Policy C12b. This gap, about 200-700 m wide, includes all the open land between these 2 settlements. The Council confirms that, under SDDP Policies HC3 and R11, the reasonable expansion of educational establishments can be permitted in a Local Gap subject to 3 provisos. These comprise need, absence of satisfactory alternative land in the SPB and suitable siting in relation to the built-up area. There is undeveloped land in both the SPB and the Convent/School grounds, and so I am not convinced that the Local Plan would unreasonably penalise the **Alton Convent School**. In addition, these Local Gaps serve to maintain the identity of settlements and so are particularly important parts of the countryside. I am keen to ensure their protection for that reason.

2.145 Land at the rear of Nos 208-212 London Road, Holybourne lies beyond the rear boundaries of the majority of the 35-60 m deep plots along this road. It includes 2 or 3 garden sheds and 2 agricultural type buildings, but its extent, location and general openness gives it a more rural than urban character. To include it in the SPB would result in an awkwardly defined and incongruous boundary that would invite backland development. It would jut out into the countryside that should be safeguarded. The Objector cites Field Cottage as a precedent, but I do not regard it as an example that should be followed. The SPB includes this dwelling and its curtilage in a somewhat unexpected way. This land it is not the subject of an Objection, but the Council may wish to reconsider the SPB here and treat the dwelling as being in the countryside.

Recommendation

2.146 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

ALTON

INSET MAP 1B

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|--|
| 190/5204 | Grey Friar Public House |
| 4112/13081 | Mr C & Mrs R Gavin |
| 1939/9350 | Lord Mayor Treloar Hospital Company (LMTH Co) & Maybourne Projects Ltd |
| 1862/9631 | Chawton Parish Council |

Main Issues

- 1) Whether No 60 Wilsom Road, Alton should be brought into the SPB;
- 2) Whether the Grey Friar Public House car park at Chawton should be brought into the SPB;
- 3) Whether *Chawton* should appear on the title of the Inset Map;
- 4) Whether the mix of uses proposed at the LMTH site should be shown on the Map.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.147 No 60 Wilsom Road is a long, narrow plot with a substantial amount of trees and shrubs. It is about 130 m wide and about 50 m deep. It includes one detached dwelling that is set back from the road. There is open land to its south and rear. The extent of this plot, its prevailing openness and that of much of its surroundings gives it a closer affinity with the countryside and the rural setting of the town than with the main built-up area. Correctly, the land is beyond the SPB and there is no cause for modification.

*

2.148 Secondly, this car park lies beyond an access road that suitably defines the extent of the built-up area on the west side of Winchester Road. It adjoins a public car park and both mark the start of the open land and countryside that provides the attractive rural setting to this delightful village. Although the public house car park is surfaced with tarmac, it is an integral part of the open land that encircles and in some cases sweeps into the village. The abundance of trees and shrubs around and within the car parks adds to the impression that they are part of that rural setting. The SPB is correctly defined. Any proposal to develop the land should be considered on the basis of the present alignment of the SPB, the appearance and character of the Conservation Area, the rural setting of the village and any other material considerations.

*

2.149 On the second issue, the Council accepts the **Chawton Parish Council**'s point about the title of the Inset Map. I agree.

*

2.150 The 2 main types of uses proposed at the LMTH site already appear on the Inset Map. That is sufficient for the Local Plan. A Development Brief will no doubt elaborate.

Recommendation

2.151 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by including *Chawton* in the title of Inset Map 1B

BEECH

INSET MAP 2

Objection

First Deposit

1112/6430 Mrs J Gillies

Main Issue

Whether land at No 20 Wellhouse Road should be brought into the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.152 **Mrs Gillies** says that the 1910 OS Map shows a dwelling on the land to which her objection relates. The Council confirms that neither the 1982 Inset Map for Beech, nor the 1997 OS Map, retains any indication of this former dwelling.

2.153 In 1992, an appeal was dismissed following the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a dwelling and triple garage on this land. The Inspector accepted that there had been a dwelling on the land at some time in the past, but concluded that there was no evidence to show that it had been habitable during the then recent past. The main point is that the SPB should be defined to reflect current and relevant planning circumstances. The extent of the land, its present openness and its position beyond the main built-up area gives it a closer affinity with the countryside than with that of the built-up area. The lack of many local services and facilities is another compelling reason why additional development should not generally be encouraged in this village.

Recommendation

2.154 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BENTLEY

INSET MAP 3

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|------------------------|
| 1292/8023 | Bentley Parish Council |
| 1898/8140 | Linden Homes Ltd |
| 1898/9760 | Linden Homes Ltd |
| 1898/9762 | Linden Homes Ltd |
| 1899/9766 | Bewley Homes Plc |

Second Deposit SD2.046

3053/11077 Mr P Wonson

Main Issue

Whether the 4 areas to which the **Bentley Parish Council** refers should be excluded from the SPB, and whether the SPB should be modified in any other way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.155 The inclusion of the substantial group of dwellings on the eastern side of the southern end of Rectory Lane acknowledges the fact that it is a part, albeit a small one, of the built-up area. Furthermore, it is close to the main part of the village. These dwellings therefore have a closer affinity with the main built-up area than with the countryside. Any proposals for development outside the SPB would be considered against policies for the protection of the countryside. Similar considerations apply to the long row of dwellings and other buildings that lie opposite the southern end of School Lane.
- 2.156 Crocks Farm Cottages lie opposite that part of the main built-up area that extends along the northern side of the main village street, but they are well set back in their front gardens. They can best be described as a small group of dwellings in the countryside, and the SPB should acknowledge the fact by excluding them from it.
- 2.157 Despite their proximity to residential development, the agricultural buildings at Bentley Gardens Farm have a closer affinity with the countryside than with the built-up area. This is due to their character and appearance. The narrow access and the concealed drives would not assist any proposal for more intensive development of this land. Rightly the SDDP in its Change No SD2.046 excludes them from the SPB.
- 2.158 I deal with the remaining objections in Chapter 5.4 of my Report, recommending against the allocation of the Omission Sites concerned. There is no need to modify the SPB to include them.

Recommendation

2.159 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of Crocks Farm Cottages from the SPB.

BENTLEY STATION

INSET MAP 4

Objection

First Deposit

1578/8853 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether the Binsted area should be considered as a general area for development, with a road link from Bentley Station to the A31 road and Bordon.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.160 There is nothing that I can add to my recommendations concerning Binsted and Bentley in Chapter 5.4 of my Report. Transport links to and from Bordon should be examined as part of the preparation of the urgently needed Masterplan for the Bordon/Whitehill area.

Recommendation

2.161 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BLACKMOOR

INSET MAP 6

Objections

First Deposit

1694/9385 Blackmoor Estate
1694/9392 Blackmoor Estate

Main Issue

Whether land at The Grange should be brought into the SPB, as well as dwellings in the southern part of the village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.162 I deal with land at The Grange in Chapter 5.6 of my Report, concluding that the SPB should not be extended to include any of it. The SPB should stay as the Council defines it. Areas A, B and C that the Objector identifies are a scattered group of dwellings and their curtilages that bear little physical relationship with the main part of the village that the SPB identifies. This group is more of the countryside than of the built-up area and the Local Plan should acknowledge the fact by continuing to treat it as part of the safeguarded countryside.

Recommendation

2.163 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BUCKS HORN OAK

INSET MAP 8

Inspector's Note

2.164 I deal with objections concerning this settlement in Chapter 5.6 of my Report. There I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion from the SPB of all land to the east of the A325 road.

EAST WORLDHAM

INSET MAP 9

Objections

First Deposit

1378/6962 Agent – Mr Rowe
3829/11645 Gregory Gray Associates

Second Deposit SD2.048

1278/14504 CPRE
68/14924 Environment Agency

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the SPB should be extended to include farm complexes at Shelley's Barn, Park Farm, Manor Farm and St Mary's Church, East Worldham House and Parish Cottages;
- 2) Whether the SPB should be as indicated under Change No: SD2.048 (Map No: SPB5) or as previously defined.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.165 East Worldham is a small settlement about 4 km east of Alton. It has few of the facilities needed for the day to day requirements of most people. The bus service is limited, even more so on those days when there are no buses to and from Alton College. Any new residents would be too often dependent upon private transport for journeys for shopping, employment, leisure and other usual purposes. That is contrary to Government policy. These limitations mean that East Worldham does not qualify for significant additional residential development. That is the basis upon which I consider these Objections.
- 2.166 The SPB is suitably defined reasonably tightly around the main built-up area. The lands identified above are of a generally agricultural appearance that relates them to the countryside, and/or are of a scattered nature and often at some distance from the nucleus of the village. They are part of the rural setting of East Worldham and any proposals for them should be judged on the basis that they are in the countryside. Policies concerning exception sites for affordable housing and the conversion and re-use of agricultural building might be applicable, although the limited degree of sustainability would remain an important consideration.
- 2.167 In total, the lands are extensive. Their development would just about double the built-up area defined by the SPB if included within it. The Council's unchallenged estimate is that another 100 or so dwellings could be accommodated in such an enlargement. That should be strongly resisted on grounds of limited sustainability and intrusion into the countryside.

2.168 **Gregory Gray Associates** suggests a more limited extension to the SPB to the north-east of St Mary’s Church. But even this would encourage development in a settlement ill-suited for it. It would extend the built-up area into the countryside and would be likely to detract from the setting of the Church. Much the same considerations apply as set out in the preceding paragraphs.

*

2.169 On the second issue, Change No: SD2.048 extends the SPB to include the rear garden of Old House Farm. It is about 0.25 ha in area and includes a pond. The inclusion of land in a SPB does not determine its future use but, as agreed on numerous occasions at the Inquiry, it is a good start for a proposed development. In this case where the land is open, at the edge of the village and includes an attractive water feature, I consider that the SPB should more tightly encompass the built-up area. This land would be better excluded from the SPB, as previously intended.

Recommendation

2.170 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by deleting Change No: SD2.048 (Map No: SPB5) thereby excluding land at Old House Farm from the SPB.

FOUR MARKS

INSET MAP 10

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|---|
| 454/5562 | Mr K Loosemore |
| 481/5593 | Mr K Broughton c/o Mr A Broughton |
| 506/5632 | Mrs V J Kattall |
| 570/5777 | Mr K R Hobbs |
| 1283/6837 | Four Marks Village Design Group |
| 1311/6890 | H & L Bethell |
| 1312/6891 | Mrs M J Comley |
| 1325/6904 | Mrs M Bouner |
| 1286/7452 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1287/7637 | Mrs A Storey |
| 1713/7742 | Bentworth Parish Council |
| 1716/7745 | Mr J W Hawley |
| 1775/7814 | Mr A R Powell |
| 1853/9586 | Mr P Disborough |
| 1862/9633 | Chawton Parish Council |
| 1658/9802 | Janet Carne |
| 1286/14244 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1286/14248 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1286/14252 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1286/14253 | Four Marks Parish Council |
| 1287/14276 | Mrs A Storey |
| 1956/11650 | Mrs Tew, Mr and Mrs Preston and Mr and Mrs Cheesley |

Second Deposit

| | |
|------------|-------------|
| 3872/15468 | Mr R Hutton |
|------------|-------------|

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the SPB is too generous in its inclusion of buildings and other land that would be better regarded as part of the countryside;
- 2) Whether land at Gloucester Close should be included in the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.171 Several Objectors, including the **Four Marks Parish Council**, **Mrs A Storey** and **Mrs M J Comley**, consider that the SPB is too large and that this would encourage unacceptable infilling. I have no doubt that in this case the Council found it particularly difficult to distinguish between the mainly built-up area, including the baseline allocation, and the countryside. This is mainly because the density of development varies so much in and around Four Marks. But in my judgement the SPB does a good job in correctly distinguishing between them. It suitably includes the more densely

developed parts of the settlement and rightly excludes the looser arrangements of dwellings that generally surround the more urban parts. In particular, the **Four Marks Parish Council** objects to the inclusion in the SPB of ribbons of development along Telegraph Lane especially south of Alton Lane and at Lymington Bottom. Despite their size of gardens, the spaciousness and the amount of trees and other vegetation, these small localities are more urban than rural in character. They adjoin other built-up parts of the settlement and are closer to the village centre than the more dispersed, outlying parts of the Parish. They are appropriately included in the SPB.

- 2.172 Generally, long gardens have been excluded especially those whose scale and character give them a closer affinity with the countryside and where development would intrude into it. That is the correct approach. These long gardens can be regarded as previously-developed land where they form the curtilages of the dwellings concerned, but that does not make such land suitable for development where it would damage the rural setting of the village. There is nothing necessarily illogical or otherwise wrong in including dwellings within the urban area and their long gardens outside it as, for example, at Blackberry Lane. No doubt these were considerations that the Council took into account in its preparation of this part of the SDDP. It should be congratulated for the realistic way in which it has defined the SPB for this settlement.
- 2.173 I support the Objectors worthy desire to discourage unsuitable development within the SPB, but the inclusion of land within a SPB is not the only consideration in assessing the suitability of a proposed scheme. There are also national and development plan policies that seek to ensure satisfactory design, appearance and layout so that any new buildings are in harmony with their neighbours and the wider surroundings. This combination of policies should provide the basis for good development within the correctly drawn SPB. It should also serve to protect the surrounding countryside beyond it from cul-de-sac or any other intrusive development.
- 2.174 The Council refers to the inclusion of agricultural buildings within the SPB at the south-western end of Lymington Bottom. I agree with the Council that this *appears to be contrary to Criterion 8* (of the Council's list of criteria for establishing SPBs in Document CD13/2) *which excludes such buildings from the periphery of built-up areas*. The land concerned should be excised from the SPB.

*

- 2.175 The second issue concerns the rear gardens of Nos 1, 2 and 3 Gloucester Close, and the objections lodged by **Mrs Tew, Mr and Mrs Preston and Mr and Mrs Cheesley**. In many parts of the fringe of the main built-up parts of the village, the SPB is correctly defined about 25 m behind the dwellings. This generally distinguishes the immediate curtilages from the more open and expansive parts of the rear gardens that have a closer affinity with the countryside. It also discourages development in back gardens that would be a damaging intrusion into the countryside. As I have indicated, I support that approach.
- 2.176 These 3 gardens can be vitally distinguished from those circumstances in that they are well within the existing and proposed main built-up area. Although open and large, their location gives them a closer affinity with the main built-up area than with the countryside beyond it. Again, this is a crucial difference when this location is compared with that of the long gardens at the edge of the built-up area, as at Blackberry Lane.

There is therefore no real risk of creating the unfortunate precedent that the Council fears.

- 2.177 Various lines have been drawn at different times of the SPB behind the dwellings, as the Objectors' Plan PR102/1956/1 indicates, but only their suggested SPB can be identified on site. It is the most logical one, especially now that the proposed area of Public Open Space has been deleted by virtue of SD7.146 Map No: Hlth & Comm 3, and I commend it. Whether the previously-developed land thus enclosed would be suitable for residential development depends upon such usual matters as suitable access, layout and design. I strongly agree with the Council on this point.

-0-

- 2.178 There are other matters. Some Objectors refer to lands where development has since taken place, including at Friars Oak in the Parish of Medstead. Others object to the scale of development that the Council proposes, a matter that I consider in Chapter 5.4 of my Report.

- 2.179 Inset Map 10 includes parts of the Parishes of Medstead and Chawton. Its title should be modified to clarify the matter.

Recommendation

- 2.180 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion from the SPB of the agricultural land and buildings at the south-western end of Lymington Bottom, by the inclusion within it of the gardens of Nos 1-3 Gloucester Close and by entitling Inset Map 4 as follows, or similar:

FOUR MARKS, SOUTHERN PARTS OF MEDSTEAD AND WESTERN PARTS OF CHAWTON.

KINGSLEY

INSET MAP 12

Objections

First Deposit

175/5187 Miss Baigent-Blaber
940/6527 Mr T Blaber

Main Issues

Whether the Old Piggery site and land at Sickles Farm should be brought into the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.181 The Old Piggery site is in a prominent position on rising land. It is used as a paddock and is part of the countryside. There is no justification for extending the built-up area into it. The SPB should remain as defined.
- 2.182 I deal with land at Sickles Farm in Chapter 5.6 of my Report. The limited degree of sustainability of this village and the incursion into open countryside that would result from development on this land are compelling reasons to reject the Objector's suggestion.

Recommendation

- 2.183 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

UPPER & LOWER FARRINGDON

INSET MAP 13

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| 646/5914 | Ms A De Ledesma |
| 777/6204 | Mrs M Barnett |
| 1013/6662 | Commander L J Pearson RN |
| 2028/8954 | Mrs S Maltby |
| 1899/9769 | Bewley Homes Plc |
| 1899/9771 | Bewley Homes Plc |

Second Deposit SD2.049

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 4008/11958 | Councillor Dr A Ludlow |
| 1822/12816 | Farringdon Parish Council |
| 4021/14064 | Mr B H F Cobb |
| 1278/14505 | CPRE |

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.184 Several of these objections, including that made by **Mrs S Maltby**, relate to land east of Crows Lane. I recommend in Chapter 5.3 of my Report that no land in this locality should be allocated for development. So it should not be included within the SPB. The same considerations apply to the land south of Woodside Lane and east of the former railway track, the subject of the objection by **Bewley Homes Plc**.
- 2.185 **Mrs M Barnett**'s land at The Orchards includes several buildings that appear to be used as part of the enjoyment of this bungalow. But the dwelling is the most easterly of the group of dwellings at and near the cross-roads. Beyond it, the rest of this large garden is essentially open and relates more to the countryside than to the main built-up area. It is part of the attractive rural gap between Upper and Lower Farringdon. The SPB was correctly defined in the FDDP and should revert to it.
- 2.186 **Commander L J Pearson RN** refers to paddock land at the rear of farm buildings to the west of Junes Cottage. Owing to its size and openness, it relates more to the countryside than to the built-up area. It should stay outside the SPB. No party has objected to the inclusion of these farm buildings within the SPB, and so I make no recommendation. But the Council may wish to consider whether they are rightly included in the SPB.

Recommendation

- 2.187 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion from the SPB of garden land at The Orchards.

MEDSTEAD

INSET MAP 14

Objections

First Deposit

1903/8147 A S Cray and Sons
706/12990 Kebbell Homes

Second Deposit SD2.050

706/12931 Kebbell Homes

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be extended.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.188 The objection lodged by **A S Cray and Sons** relates to an Omission Site at Roe Downs Road. I recommend in Chapter 5.4 of my Report that this land should not be allocated for development, and so it should not be included in the SPB. The same applies to the land at the rear of Junipers.
- 2.189 **Kebbell Homes** considers that the Council’s Change No: SD2.050 does not form a logical boundary to the SPB and suggests that the land generally between its 2 parts should be included. I see nothing illogical in having what amounts to 2 SPBs in this part of the Parish. It simply reflects the fact that there are 2 main built-up areas. To include the large area of essentially open land between them would, at best, achieve little in that it is doubtful whether the Council would allow any significant development on Medstead Green. At worst, it would be misleading and create a most unfortunate hostage to fortune. The SPB should not be extended beyond its definition in the SDDP, although the Council may wish to have another look at the long gardens on the eastern side of Roe Downs Road.

Recommendation

- 2.190 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

ROPLEY

INSET MAP 15

Objection

First Deposit

1451/7142 Mr T M Jones

Main Issue

Whether land north of Lyeway Lane should be brought within the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.191 The southern side of Lyeway Lane comprises a ribbon of detached dwellings that the SPB rightly includes. Although there is one building and what appears to be the remains of another on the land to which the Objection relates, the area north of the Lane is rural in character. The consolidation and extension of the built-up area along its northern side would be a prominent and unjustifiable incursion into the countryside. There is no cause for extending the SPB to include the land.

Recommendation

2.192 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SELBORNE

INSET MAP 17

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| 1545/7379 | A M Allan |
| 1546/7382 | R D Allan |
| 1547/7383 | D K Turney |
| 1552/7415 | Mr J Murphy |
| 1555/7419 | R Jenkins |
| 1595/7517 | Mr R G Allan |
| 803/7646 | M F Jackman |

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Selborne needs a SPB;
- 2) Whether, if it does have one as defined, it should be extended to include land between Gosling Croft and Burlands Field and the rear part of the garden of Whites Cottage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.193 The main built-up area of Selborne is large enough and sufficiently compact to require a SPB, an approach that complies with Structure Plan Policy C1. Its correct definition will serve to stop the encroachment of the built up area into the countryside that here, owing to its great beauty, should be safeguarded. This is particularly important in a village which derives its quality from the character and appearance of its historic core, its relatively limited size and the felicitous and complementary nature of its built-up area and rural setting. I am in no doubt that the SPB for Selborne should stay.

*

2.194 I deal with the representations concerning land between Goslings Croft and Burlands Field in Chapter 5.6 of my Report. I recommend that it should not be allocated for residential development. It follows that the SPB should not be extended to include it. The rear part of the garden of Whites Cottage, which is near the car park of The Queens Hotel, relates more to the countryside than to the main built-up area. This is because of its appreciable extent and its prevailing openness. The SPB hereabouts correctly follows the rear boundaries of the majority of properties that front Selborne Road.

Recommendation

2.195 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

UPPER FROYLE

INSET MAP 18

Objections

First Deposit

1291/7992 Froyle Parish Council
1877/10167 The Treloar Trust

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Upper Froyle should have a SPB;
- 2) Whether, if it does have one as defined, it should be extended to include land owned by the Treloar Trust, i.e a walled garden and land to the south of the school.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.196 Upper Froyle should have a SPB for essentially the same reasons that apply at Selborne. The distinction between the main built-up area and the surrounding countryside is especially important for the ensuing certainty concerning the contrasting planning policies that must be applied. I therefore agree with the Council that it does have a recognisable physical core that is sufficiently large and compact to qualify for its SPB.

2.197 The village has a narrow range of services and facilities that comprise no more than a large residential school, a church and some space for employment in former agricultural buildings. This limited sustainability makes it unsuitable for a significant addition to its housing stock, for reasons already exhaustively explored.

*

2.198 The Council defines the SPB tightly around the more compact parts of the village. This is the right approach, in that a more generous definition would invite proposals that would no doubt be described as infilling or rounding-off and which would be alien and intrusive in the attractive village scene. One of the Council's criteria in the definition of SPBs is that gaps in frontages should be included within it only where they are suitable for infilling. That is an especially important approach in this village. Owing to its openness and extent, the walled garden between Froyle House and Froyle Cottages makes an important contribution to the rural character of the village. Rightly, the SPB does not include it.

2.199 **The Treloar Trust** suggests that land to the south of the school be brought into the SPB to reflect an extension to it for which planning permission has been granted and the development has taken place. The SPB should be re-defined to include the new extension within it.

2.200 The Objector continues that more buildings may be needed here to cater for further expansion of the School. Similar circumstances apply here as at Alton with respect to

Alton Convent School. Policies HC3 and RI1 in the SDDP can provide for the reasonable expansion of educational establishments. Any application for planning permission should be determined on its merits, having regard to the provisions of the development plan and any other material consideration. Those considerations should not be anticipated by way of an allocation and/or extension of the SPB.

Recommendation

- 2.201 I recommend that the SDDP be modified at Inset Map 18 to include within the SPB the recently erected extension to the south of the School.

HEADLEY, ARFORD & HEADLEY DOWN

INSET MAP 19

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 3.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC008.2 (page 18).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether land west of Headley Fields and at the Holme School should be excluded from the SPB;
- 2) Whether any modification should be made to the SPB at Arford;
- 3) Whether the SPB should be modified in any other way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.202 The land west of Headley Fields, although comprising a well-landscaped, low-density residential development, has a closer affinity with the mainly built-up area than with the countryside. I say this because of its location and the significant number of dwellings within it. It is part of the settlement and it should remain in the SPB in acknowledgement of that fact. It does, however, have a most attractive and special character that is well worth protecting. I recommend in Chapter 5.7 of my Report that it be subject to Policy H9 as an Area of Special Housing Character. That would preclude infilling and, as **Mr Williams** accepted at the Inquiry, the Policy would achieve essentially the same effect as excluding the land from the SPB.

2.203 The Holme School is at the north-west edge of the settlement, and I appreciate the concerns of a number of Objectors, including **Mr and Mrs Leonard**, that its playing fields should be retained for educational purposes. The School buildings and open spaces do, however, for the most part adjoin residential development to the east, south and west and the campus is close to the village centre. In terms of location, character, appearance and function, the entire School lands relate more to the main built-up area than to the countryside. The SPB should reflect this by including it within its bounds. The County Council has expressed no wish to dispose of any of the land for residential or any other development and there is no proposal to allocate any part of it for any type of development.

2.204 National and local policies for the protection of playing fields and the Government's concerns about the health of our children should continue to provide effective protection of these valuable playing fields. Presumably Policy R2 for the Protection of Open Space applies to the open areas. The playing fields should carry that designation.

*

2.205 Turning now to the second issue, I conclude from my inspections that Arford possesses a good deal of rural charm that emanates from the styles and limited number of dwellings, their sylvan settings and the gradients and winding nature of the narrow country lanes that serve it. The general absence of footways and street lights emphasises that charm.

A particular attraction in this rural scene is the open, mainly paddock and wooded land at the centre of the “Triangle”. Its development, either in whole or in part, as **Squires Bridge Homes** suggests, would substantially erode and damage the sylvan, rural scene. Rightly and with the support of a number of local people, Change SD2.051 removes this area from the SPB. Arford is a most delightful part of the District and its character and status as a Conservation Area could all too easily be eroded and destroyed by any significant scale of development within or close to it. I am very much against it.

- 2.206 I agree with **Mrs Gaskell** and others that yet more traffic on these narrow lanes would be most unfortunate and any new housing that would generate it should be discouraged. I also agree with **Dr and Mrs Cantopher’s** comments that this *lovely village...deserves to have some empty spaces around it that have no use other than to give pleasure and complement the village*. On the doubtful assumption that there is scope for limited infilling within the SPB, I must stress that any proposal must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area that is centred on Arford Road. That quality, and indeed of the whole settlement, stems a good deal from the features that **Mrs Carole Burns** for the **Headley Residents’ Association** describes. I have much sympathy with the views of **Mrs J M Ostenk** and others that all Arford *should be taken out of the Local Plan*. On balance, however, I think that its SPB should be kept in some form in acknowledgement of the fact that some of it is a mainly built-up area, albeit a small one.
- 2.207 The SPB for the most part reflects the extent of the mainly built-up area at Arford. I do, however, have my doubts about the inclusion of the especially low-density residential development south of Bowcott Hill. These dwellings are substantial in size, several are set well back from the road and they are all within sylvan gardens and grounds of goodly size. Such an arrangement is not uncommon in a rural area, and I consider that they relate more to the countryside than to the built-up area. They extend from Bowcott Rise in the east to Arford House in the west, and they should not be included in the SPB. If they are excluded, it would then make sense for the Local Gap to be extended northwards up to Bowcott Hill. The SPB should then be defined along the rear boundaries of properties fronting Beech Hill Road, Arford Road and the north side of Bowcott Hill, as shown in the SDDP at Map No SPB8. The attractive open land within The Triangle would thus rightly be confirmed as countryside.
- 2.208 **Mr Snell** requests the inclusion in the SPB of his property Badgers Croft, Barley Mow Hill. I agree with the Council, however, that properties that lie beyond Arford Road on Barley Mow Hill, owing to their position and the extent and open character of their gardens, relate more to the countryside than to the main built-up area. They contrast with those on Arford Road which relate to, and hence are seen in the context of, other dwellings along this road, including Wheatsheaf Cottages. The SPB should not be extended to include them.

*

- 2.209 I come now to the third issue. The SPB at Inishowen Lodge, Furze Vale Road, Headley Down is defined to include the dwelling and its immediate curtilage. This rightly acknowledges the fact that the dwelling is part of the main built-up area. But any extension of the SPB to include more of its large garden would imply its suitability for residential development. This would result in intrusion into land that because of its extent and openness has a closer affinity with the countryside than the main built-up area. The SPB as defined correctly acknowledges this distinction.
- 2.210 Similar considerations apply to **Mr & Mrs S Glynn’s** land at Tanglewood, Furze Hill Road, Headley Down. Whilst the SPB shown on Inset Map 19 is to some extent arbitrary in that it does not follow clearly defined features on the ground, it distinguishes

between the immediate curtilage of the dwelling and the rest of the garden. This, owing to its extent and openness, relates it more to the countryside than to the built-up area. Any extension of the SPB would encourage proposals for residential development and that would result in a harmful intrusion in a generally westerly direction. The SPB should stay as it is. The suggested extension of land to which Policy H10 applies makes no difference to that conclusion.

- 2.211 **Mr and Mrs Phillips** request that land fronting, and to the west of, Churt Road, Headley Down be included in the SPB. It is an open, mainly wooded, area and although there is low-density development further to the west, its inclusion would invite a consolidation of development that would extend the settlement into, and substantially damage, the essentially rural setting of the village. There is no need or other justification for such intrusion.
- 2.212 Some similar considerations apply to **Mrs Ostenk's** 1.44 ha site at the former Headley Nurseries, Headley Down on the opposite, eastern side of Churt Road. About 20-30 dwellings are envisaged. Part of the site comprising the bungalow and its curtilage can be treated as previously-developed land, but the majority is mainly open grassland with some small trees and shrubs. No dwellings would be sited on the woodland part of the site. Even if it could be convincingly demonstrated, contrary to the Council's view and reasons for it with which I am inclined to agree, that the entire site is previously developed, that would not overcome the basic objections to her proposal. They concern the encouragement of development in a settlement of limited sustainability and extending the built-up area into a locality whose essential openness relates it more to the countryside and which provides part of the attractive rural setting of Headley Down. These considerations are of more moment than matters of any previous development.
- 2.213 I note that this land has indeed previously been described as a brownfield and sustainable site, though not by the Council. More to the point, however, the Government since then has continued to stress the importance of sustainable locations for development. Owing also to the limited range of services and facilities in the village and infrequent public transport services, this description should be revised. It is not now a point in favour of any extension of the SPB.
- 2.214 Land at Alder Road, Headley Down, previously used as a refuse tip, is included in the SPB by virtue of Change No: SD2.056. **Mrs Ostenk** says that it was tipped to a depth of 15-20 m, and I share her concerns about likely contamination and stability. An appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed in May 2002 essentially because of its natural appearance. The Council's Proposed Change PIC008.2 rightly returns the land to the countryside, as shown on the Amendment to Inset Map 19, and I agree with this course of action.
- 2.215 **Mr D Alrich-Blake** seeks encouragement for the erection of a large dwelling on his land at Hartfield House, Frensham Lane, Headley. This might be achieved, he says, either by a suitably drafted policy, by allocating land for that purpose or by extending the SPB to include his land. Current national guidance in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 is that an isolated new house in the countryside may also exceptionally be justified if its design *is truly outstanding and ground-breaking*. Such a judgement is more for the realms of development control, but I am not persuaded on the evidence so far that such a high standard is achieved. I am far more convinced by the Government's strong discouragement of development in the countryside, and I would urge the Council to safeguard this particularly attractive and somewhat remote part of it. The SDDP should not be modified in any of the ways suggested.

- 2.216 There are other matters by way of overall conclusions. I explain in Chapter 5.4 of my Report that Headley is not a sufficiently sustainable settlement to take a significant amount of further development. Thus the limited range of local services and facilities, including employment, and the consequent heavy dependence upon the private car for commuting, is another good reason why the SPB should not be extended to encourage more residential development.
- 2.217 I accept that any new houses would find ready purchasers, but that does not mean that they would be in the right location in terms of sustainability. They would not. The status of some sites as previously-developed land is of little consequence where other aspects of sustainability are of limited achievement. Nor is enclosure and screening of land of much consequence where, as here, location and actual presence take precedence.
- 2.218 I recommend in that same part of my Report that land at The Paddock should not be allocated for residential development. All the “pink” land on Inset Map 19 should therefore be excluded from the SPB.

Recommendation

- 2.219 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC008.2), by the deletion from the SPB of dwellings including and between Bowcott Rise and Arford House on the southern side of Bowcott Hill at Arford and by the extension northwards of the Local Gap notation to include those properties.

BRAMSHOTT

INSET MAP 20

Objections

First Deposit

4086/12081 Mr J W Greaves
4094/12093 Mr D E Findley

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Chinthay Cottage, Rectory Lane, should remain in the SPB;
- 2) Whether The Oaks, Woolmer Lane, should be included in the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.220 Chinthay Cottage, the dwelling as opposed to its curtilage, stands at some distance from the majority of the built-up area. This is a borderline case, but on balance I think that this individual cottage resembles more a single dwelling in the countryside than a part of the built-up area. I agree with **Mr Greaves** that it would be better for it to be outside the SPB in recognition of its siting and character. I do not agree, however, that additional land here should be included in the SPB as that would encourage new residential development in a settlement with few services and facilities and generally accessed by narrow country lanes ill-suited for more traffic.

*

2.221 On the second issue, I note that **Mr Findley**'s garden at The Oaks is large and open with a fine selection of various types of trees and shrubs. As the photographs clearly demonstrate, those at the boundaries give it a sense of enclosure. This is a not unusual characteristic of gardens and other sites in the countryside. Although for the most part neatly cultivated, its size and open character give it a closer affinity with the rural setting of the village. To extend the SPB here would be to encourage more residential development that would intrude into the rural setting of the village, a settlement that is not blessed with a good range of services and facilities. The SPB here is somewhat arbitrary in that it seldom follows clearly defined features, but it rightly distinguishes between the immediate curtilage of the dwelling and the rest of this large garden that, owing mainly to its location in this small settlement, is unsuitable for residential development. The SPB should stay as it is.

2.222 I have no doubt that a suitable access drive could be provided, and that much care would be taken in the preparation of any residential scheme for the land. That does not, however, overcome the basic objections to extending the SPB in this settlement.

Recommendation

2.223 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion of the property known as Chinthay Cottage from the SPB.

GRAYSHOTT

INSET MAP 21

Objections

First Deposit

832/6328 G J Nichols & A Thompson
1667/7700 G Cupitt
1668/7701 Mr Theobald

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the rear gardens of Tawney Croft and Tawney Orchard, Crossways Road should be brought into the SPB;
- 2) And the rear garden of Bede Cottage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.224 These rear gardens are on a steep sided, wooded valley. Access to any development on them would have to be from Stoney Bottom, a narrow lane and ancient drovers way. A scheme here could be achieved only by widening the track, and that would seriously detract from the rural character of the lane and its surroundings. The SPB is rightly defined about 25 m back from the dwellings and thereby discourages backland or any other unsuitable form of development off Stoney Bottom. Some garages and a few houses have been built on other plots, but they do not set a precedent for more buildings.

*

2.225 On the second issue, I agree with the Council that the SPB should be defined approximately 25 m from the rear of the buildings. This discourages unsuitable backland and similar development and, in the case of Bede Cottage, is especially apt in that it serves to protect the Local Gap that rightly includes this land.

Recommendation

2.226 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

LIPHOOK

INSET MAP 23

Objections

First Deposit

1499/7256 Mr J F Walters
1302/8578 R Northcott
3807/11529 Mr M E Gilbert

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the garden of the Royal Anchor Hotel should be excluded from the SPB;
- 2) Whether land south of Longmoor Road should be brought into the SPB;
- 3) Whether an SPB should be defined along Hewshott Lane.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.227 The garden of the Royal Anchor Hotel is within the built-up core of the village. The Bohunt School, its playing fields and a modern housing estate lie between the Hotel and the open country. Due to location and surroundings, it is appropriately included in the SPB. It also lies within the Liphook Conservation Area, and this would be an important consideration in the determination of any proposal affecting its character and appearance.

*

2.228 The land to the south of Longmoor Road is subject of objections that promote it for residential development. I deal with them Chapter 5.3 of my Report, and rule against them. Accordingly, the SPB should not be modified to include this land.

*

2.229 Hewshott Lane is in the countryside, to the north-east of Liphook and about 2 km from its centre. The locality is more rural than of a main built-up area, and residential development should not normally be encouraged in such places. It comprises sporadic housing, including a small estate of about a dozen dwellings (Hewshott Grove) that extends about 0.8 km along the lane. It is too remote from the main built-up area to be treated as part of it. It has no identifiable core in the sense outlined in the Council's useful criteria for selection of SPBs (Document CD13/2 Appendix 2). No SPB should be defined here.

Recommendation

2.230 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PASSFIELD COMMON

INSET MAP 24

Objections

Second Deposit SD2.057

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| 4031/12005 | Joyce & Ronald Parfitt |
| 1950/12751 | Linden Homes Southern Ltd |
| 3888/13866 | Gammans and Claxon |
| 1706/14093 | Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd |
| 3889/14134 | Marechaux Ltd |
| 3824/14479 | Hawthorne Kamm Ltd |
| 1278/14509 | CPRE |
| 1696/14889 | Village Green Plc |
| 68/14925 | Environment Agency |

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC009.2 (page 18).

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should include Thornhill Fields.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.231 I deal with the contents of these Objections in Chapter 5.6 of my Report, and recommend that Thornhill Fields should not be allocated for residential development. Hence it should be excluded from the SPB, as the Latest Proposed Change shows.

Recommendation

2.232 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC009.2).

WHITEHILL/BORDON

INSET MAP 25

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 93/5678 | Councillor Mr J Crowhurst |
| 479/7593 | Mr & Mrs H S G Martin |
| 1578/8852 | The Petersfield Society |
| 3820/14306 | Dalton Warner Davis |

Second Deposit SD2.058

| | |
|------------|------------------------|
| 3728/11340 | Mr & Mrs Zeberdee |
| 1293/13626 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |
| 1293/13627 | George Wimpey (UK) Ltd |

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified in any way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.233 **Councillor Mr Crowhurst** considers that Whitehill/Bordon should take no more residential development until there are better retail facilities. It is, however, one of the most sustainable settlements with a good range of employment. It is suitable in principle for more housing, hence my recommendation concerning land at Hogmoor Road. Proposals for any more substantial development on or off Defence Estates land should be considered in the light of the Masterplan for this settlement and its environs. See also Chapter 6 paragraph 6.15 (3820/14330 Dalton Warner Davis)
- 2.234 **Mr and Mrs Martin** refer to land at Lemon Grove and its wildlife interest. It is within the SPB but that does not guarantee its development. The determination of any planning application would have to take account of those, and any other relevant matters.
- 2.235 I agree with **George Wimpey (UK) Ltd** that land at Walldown Triangle should not be allocated for residential development, for reasons given in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. It should therefore be deleted from the SPB.

Recommendation

- 2.236 I recommend that land at Walldown Triangle (HAR3) be deleted from the SPB.

GREATHAM

INSET MAP 27

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 794/6249 | P & A Ballard |
| 835/6338 | N Davis |
| 853/6373 | Greatham Parish Council |
| 855/6375 | Mr R Nelson |
| 1115/6445 | Mrs A Dale-Harris |
| 1025/6680 | Mrs P Knocker |
| 1492/7246 | Mr & Mrs D Self |
| 1676/7714 | Mr C Etherington |
| 1916/8187 | Mr F Momber |
| 1972/8256 | Mr J Dale-Harris |
| 1905/8980 | Eurotec International Plc |
| 1691/10022 | D W Redman |
| 1864/10285 | Defence Estates |

Second Deposit SD2.021

| | |
|------------|-------------------|
| 1278/14511 | CPRE |
| 1115/14559 | Mrs A Dale-Harris |
| 3887/14966 | Mr P Catt |

Second Deposit SD2.022

| | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1639/12924 | East Hampshire AONB Office |
| 1278/14481 | CPRE |

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the southern part of the village should be deleted from the SPB;
- 2) Whether the SPB should be modified in any other way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.237 The **CPRE, P & A Ballard** and others consider that this southern part should be so deleted. This is a borderline case, but I agree with the Objectors. The dwellings along this road are generally in large, wide gardens and grounds and in my opinion their well-dispersed arrangement and the consequent pervading spaciousness give this part of the village a closer affinity with the countryside than with the main built-up area.

2.238 The **Greatham Parish Council's** views on this matter are especially compelling. Furthermore, this essentially rural quality complements the open, agricultural scene on the other side of the road. Conservation Area and Listed Buildings policies should preclude unsuitable development, but the inclusion of this part of Greatham in the

countryside should make assurance doubly sure. The southern part of the SPB, south of Greatham Primary School and on the eastern side of Petersfield Road, should be deleted. If the Council accepts this conclusion, it would make sense to delete Swain Cottage from the SPB. This means that the open land at the rear of the Church, the subject of **Mr Momber**'s objection, should not be included in the SPB.

*

- 2.239 On the second issue, the **Defence Estates** says that the SPB should be extended along Longmoor Road to include 4 or so dwellings beyond Sundale Cottages. They are, however, at an appreciable distance from the main built-up area and relate less to it than to the countryside. They are relatively isolated dwellings in the countryside and should be considered accordingly.
- 2.240 I recommend in Chapter 5.6 of my Report that land at Liss Nursery, the subject of the objection by **Mr Catt**, should not be allocated for residential development. This land lies between the School to the south and Bakers Field to the north. It includes a dwelling as well as glasshouses and various ancillary buildings that support the horticultural use which, in planning terms, is included within the definition of agriculture. For the most part, it is open in character. This openness, its use and its significant extent along the Petersfield Road frontage, persuade me that this land has more in common with the countryside than with the mainly built-up area. The SPB should not be modified to include it.
- 2.241 The **Greatham Parish Council** considers that land forming part of the long rear gardens of Kingshott and Broadleigh Cottages should be excluded from the SPB. I think that there could be difficulties of assembling enough plots for a viable scheme and, owing to its lack of a good range of facilities, this settlement is not suitable for a significant increase in development. Owing also to the length of the gardens that much relates them to the countryside and the intrusion into it that could result, I agree with the Parish Council. I deplore the double negative, but I can see no good reason why the 25 m guideline should not apply here. It implies only a minor modification, but it is another example of making assurance doubly sure.
- 2.242 The sliver of land at the former Silver Birch Inn appears to have been used in conjunction with this public house and it therefore in visual and functional terms relates closely to the main built-up area. Though now looking somewhat sorry for itself, this land appears to have been partly used as an access, if only to allow patrons side entrance to the bar. Change No: SD2.022 in the SDDP (Map No: SPB 15) acknowledges the fact by including it in the SPB. I endorse the Change.

Recommendation

- 2.243 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by changing the SPB as follows:
- a) by deleting from it land to the south of the Greatham Primary School on the eastern side of Petersfield Road, and Swain Cottage on its western side;
 - b) and by redrawing the SPB at the rear of Kingshott and Broadleigh Cottages along a line about 25 m from the back of the dwellings.

HIGH CROSS

INSET MAP 28

Objection

First Deposit

1639/10100 East Hampshire AONB Office

Main Issue

Whether a SPB for this settlement is justified.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.244 The dwellings and other buildings in parts of this settlement are sufficient in number, and close enough in arrangement, to qualify for a SPB. The facilities at High Cross include a school, shop/post office, church, village hall and recreation land. There seems to be little local employment, and the village is approached for the most part by narrow country lanes. Small-scale development or redevelopment within the SPB and compatible with the limited degree of sustainability of the settlement would be acceptable in principle, should there be any such suitable opportunity for it. Important considerations in the determination of applications for planning permission would be likely to include access, design, appearance and the need to retain the rural character of this small, pleasant settlement.
- 2.245 Its location in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) does not preclude its having a SPB, although that aspect of its character would need to be taken into account in the Council's assessment of any development proposal. Even so, I have my doubts about the suitability of the western part of the settlement for inclusion in the SPB. The inclusion in it of the paddock near the Church would be too much of a hostage to fortune and could invite a development scheme inconsistent with the limited sustainability. And owing to their location and spacious rural surroundings, the 2 dwellings on the north side of Privett Road have a greater affinity with the countryside than with a built-up area. This part of the village is decidedly more rural in character than the eastern part that includes Dellfield.
- 2.246 The Council should have another look at this SPB. Although the High Cross development comprises 8-9 dwellings, I consider that the exclusion of land west of the Church would better reflect planning circumstances and guard against unsuitable development in this rural location.

Recommendation

- 2.247 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion from the SPB of land west of the Church, including the 2 dwellings north of Privett Road.

LANGRISH

INSET MAP 30

Objections

First Deposit

1429/7088 A J Barnes
1484/7232 B R & E C Stevens
1695/7717 Tooling Products Ltd

Second Deposit SD2.020

3827/11642 Breamore Developments

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be extended, supplemented, remain as it is as shown on Inset Map 30, or be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.248 This settlement, owing to its limited number of buildings and facilities and the modest size of its mainly built-up areas, is best described as a hamlet than a village. It has an employment site, a church and hotel and is on a bus route to and from Petersfield. Its nearest primary school, however, is at Stroud. The absence of a school at Langrish is an important distinction when compared with High Cross. There is no shop or post office. Langrish is not sufficiently sustainable for the encouragement of further dwellings or other such significant development. The Council proposes Change No: SD2.020 that suitably deletes the SPB. That deletion is thus now part of the SDDP. Applications for planning permission should be determined on the basis that Langrish is part of the countryside.

Recommendation

2.249 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

LISS, LISS FOREST & WEST LISS

INSET MAP 31

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| 555/5762 | Mr & Mrs Waters |
| 1279/6829 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1449/7132 | C W Payne |
| 1450/7136 | K Payne |
| 781/7169 | Liss Conservation Volunteers |
| 1282/7576 | Agent - Terence O' Rourke Plc |
| 1960/8162 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1296/10421 | Merlion Land Ltd |
| 1642/10424 | Mr S & Mrs A Kendall |
| 1960/10425 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1960/13965 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1278/14516 | CPRE |

Second Deposit SD2.026

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| 313/11911 | Mr J Bean |
| 1279/12464 | Liss Parish Council |
| 1639/12925 | East Hampshire AONB Office |
| 3983/13492 | Mrs W Bean |
| 1643/13711 | Wing Cmd (Rtd) J C Meader RAF |
| 1645/13728 | Mr N D Paren |
| 1646/13792 | Mrs M A Paren |
| 3888/13867 | Gammans and Claxon |
| 1960/13950 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1960/13966 | Liss Village Design Group |
| 1706/14094 | Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd |
| 3889/14135 | Marechaux Ltd |
| 351/14207 | Mr V G Carter |
| 781/14247 | Liss Conservation Volunteers |
| 1278/14487 | CPRE |

Second Deposit SD2.029

| | |
|------------|--------------------|
| 1960/13949 | Gammans and Claxon |
| 1278/14490 | CPRE |

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the SPB should exclude land east of Forest Road, Liss Forest, that includes 4 dwellings and their gardens;
- 2) Whether any other modification should be made to the SPB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.250 The southern edge of the main built-up area in this part of Liss is, and should be defined along, the southern boundary of Ryecroft and the dwellings at Pine Walk. Land to the south includes the Recreation Ground and 4 dwellings, Oaklands, Oak Cottage and Nos 62 and 64 Forest Road and their long rear gardens. This land is for the most part open and has a greater affinity with the countryside than with the built-up area. The definition of the SPB across these gardens, following no clearly defined features, is an unsatisfactory compromise. I accept that these dwellings and their curtilages constitute previously-developed land, but that is not the only criterion for including all or part of them within the SPB. It would be better to return to the SPB of the First Deposit Draft Plan (FDDP) which more accurately reflects features and character in this part of Liss Forest.
- 2.251 The SPB in the FDDP also reflects, and complements, the prevailing openness of land on the western side of Forest Road that my recommendations concerning Holly Wood and Forest Brow are designed to retain. It is important to acknowledge the rural, sylvan character of this part of Liss Forest and to ensure that it is kept. **Messrs Gammans and Claxon**, the **Liss Village Design Group** and others convincingly make these and similar comments, and I agree that the Local Gap should be extended up to Forest Road and the northern edge of the Recreation Ground. The inclusion of this locality in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) underscores my conclusions.
- 2.252 **Mr Carter** makes valid points about the arbitrary nature of the SPB in the SDDP, and I confess that I found it difficult to identify the boundary on his land at No 62 Forest Road. As I explain above, however, it would be better to revert to the SPB in the FDDP. The need to define the SPB across his long garden does not, therefore, arise. These are a row of 4 dwellings in the countryside, a not unusual occurrence. Although the surroundings are pleasant, this is not a housing area of special character. There is therefore no cause for a Policy H9 designation.
- 2.253 It is a moot point whether, in the light of my conclusions, Nos 75 and 77 Forest Road should remain in the SPB. They are close to the residential estate to the north, rather than being separated from built development by a recreation ground as are the 4 dwellings along the eastern side of Forest Road. On balance, Nos 75 and 77 should stay in the SPB and outside the Local Gap.

*

- 2.254 I turn now to the second issue. **Mr and Mrs Clark** request the inclusion of Little Hunts and Clarks Cottage in their entirety in the SPB. There is a clear distinction between the more compactly arranged dwellings along the southern side of The Ridings and the spacious settings enjoyed by St Helens and Little Hunts to the south. The prevailing openness of their sylvan surroundings relates them more to the countryside than to the built-up area. Indeed, there is a distinct change in character at about the end of the 1.5 – 2 m high wall alongside The Ridings from a somewhat urban to a more rural environment. The inclusion of these 2 dwellings in the SPB would invite a consolidation of development that would intrude into the rural scene. The Council has drawn the SPB correctly by virtue of Change No: SD2.023, and I support it.
- 2.255 The objection also relates to Clarks Cottage. This dwelling is at an appreciable distance from the edge of the main built-up area and it resembles a single dwelling in the countryside rather than part of the built-up area. There is no case for extending the SPB

- to accommodate it, and inviting yet more consolidation of development between it and The Ridings.
- 2.256 Land next to the pond at East Liss that **CPRE** identifies should be deleted from the SPB on account of its openness, as the Council proposes in Change No: SD2.024 in the SDDP.
- 2.257 North Lodge should be excluded on account of its large curtilage and general openness. It has a closer affinity with the countryside than with the built-up area, as the SDDP now acknowledges.
- 2.258 **C W and K Payne** object to proposals for large scale development in Liss. They will note my recommendations in Chapter 5.3 of my Report and hopefully draw some comfort from them. Briefly, the SPB should not include the Baseline Site at Holly Wood, and I recommend that the Reserve Sites be deleted. They would, in any event, be outside the SPB.
- 2.259 With regard to the objection by the **Liss Conservation Volunteers** and **Liss Parish Council**, I comment upon St Mary's Road in Chapter 5.6. It is part of the built-up area of Liss and there is no reason to exclude it from the SPB. Matters of flooding and wildlife in the gardens would be material considerations in the determination of any planning application for development in this locality.
- 2.260 The **Liss Parish Council** considers that Cranmere and Dormers, 2 dwellings on Rake Road, should be excluded from the SPB. I agree with the Council, however, that these dwellings and their immediate curtilages are part of the mainly built-up area and that the SPB suitably reflects that fact.
- 2.261 Old Rectory Cottage at West Liss, the subject of an objection by the **Liss Parish Council**, relates more to the adjoining mainly built up area to its north than to the countryside. It is correctly included in the SPB.
- 2.262 I recommend in Chapter 5.3 that land at Wyld Green Farm is not allocated for development. There is no need to extend the SPB to include it. Indeed, SD5.270 (Map HAD4) deletes this previously proposed allocation.
- 2.263 My conclusion on this second issue is that, apart from at Liss Forest, the SPB should remain as it is in the SDDP.

Recommendation

- 2.264 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by deleting SD2.026 so as to return to the SPB of the FDDP, and by extending the Local Gap notation to cover the area concerned.

PETERSFIELD

INSET MAP 32a & 32b

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|-----------------------------|
| 1284/7370 | Louise Haines |
| 1285/7401 | Mr P Haines |
| 404/5953 | Petersfield Town Council |
| 691/5973 | Mrs M Errington |
| 692/5981 | Mr N Errington |
| 1281/6831 | Mr I Noble |
| 1923/8209 | Mr J Day |
| 1578/8851 | The Petersfield Society |
| 1948/9452 | Beechcroft Developments Ltd |
| 1959/9539 | The Rushforth Family |
| 1899/9777 | Bewley Homes Plc |
| 1899/9779 | Bewley Homes Plc |
| 1899/9781 | Bewley Homes Plc |
| 977/9818 | Mr A Greenwood |
| 1878/10168 | Prowting Projects Ltd |

Main Issue

Whether Petersfield, due to its position within the AONB, should be required to take further large housing allocations and, in particular, whether the SPB should be extended to include lands at:

- a) Causeway Farm;
- b) The Broadway Mobile Home Park;
- c) to the north of St Mary's Church, Sheet;
- d) at Causeway House;
- e) north of Station Road;
- f) south of Tilmore Road;
- g) south of Sussex Road;
- h) south of Larcombe Road and Test Close;
- i) west of The Causeway and south of Mapledown;
- j) west of the Causeway between the SPB and the IB1 allocation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.265 In considering all housing allocations, whether proposed by the Council or as suggested by Objectors, I have been acutely aware of their sensitivity where their development would affect the countryside and the AONB. I have to accept that, with a paucity of suitable previously-developed land and with such a large part of the District being in the AONB, it is impossible to meet Structure Plan housing requirements without identifying land for housing in the rural areas and, in some cases, in the AONB. I regard the AONB as a vital part of the character of East Hampshire, although other considerations like range of services and facilities must be taken into account.

2.266 In making my recommendations to the Council, I have sought to minimise the consequent impact on those areas. Hence I recommend that all the lands concerned in

Petersfield, with the sole exception of land north of Station Road which is well within the main built-up area, be reserved for development should they be needed. I very much hope that more suitable, and previously-developed, land will be found elsewhere in the County and that these reserve sites will not be needed.

- 2.267 I deal with the Objections concerning the lands identified in some detail elsewhere in my Report, mainly in Chapter 5.3. I respectfully refer my readers to it. Reserve Sites should not be included in the SPB, and I endorse the Latest Proposed Change at FPC48 (Document CD11/12 page 84). They are in the countryside and should be treated as such until such time as they are required for development. Their exclusion from the SPB should make clear their status as land to which policies for the protection of the countryside apply. Similarly, countryside policies will apply to Omission Sites not allocated for baseline provision. Neither should they be included in the SPB.
- 2.268 The treatment of mobile home parks needs to be consistent. Policy H18 Mobile Homes applies to a park at Hogmoor Road, Whitehill/Bordon and to another at London Road, Horndean. Both are outside the SPB. Most mobile homes are subject to temporary planning permissions due to their inherent transitory character and non-permanent construction. In theory they could be moved, or removed, at any time. It would seem sensible, therefore, not to include them in SPBs. This would also reinforce Policy H18 that seeks to prevent them from being developed for permanent housing and thereby keeping a stock of affordable homes.
- 2.269 The southern part of the objection site west of The Causeway, that is the land lying to the west of Nos. 169-209 The Causeway, is part of the countryside setting of the town and as such should be protected from development. A change to the SPB is not appropriate.
- 2.270 The Council confirms that the land west of The Causeway (adjoining No 247 The Causeway) is occupied by former farm buildings, one of which is now used as a mechanics workshop on a temporary basis. Permanent permission is being sought for the use to be relocated into another building within the group. The Council accepts that the SPB should be extended to include these buildings. I agree, on the assumption that a permanent permission is granted. I recommend accordingly.

Recommendation

- 2.271 I recommend that, subject to my assumption in paragraph 2.270, the SDDP be modified by extending the SPB on Inset Map 32b to include land at No 247 The Causeway.

STROUD

INSET MAP 34

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|------------------------|
| 9/5008 | Stroud Parish Council |
| 179/5193 | Mr A E & Mrs J M Perry |
| 1060/6724 | T Mills |
| 1061/6725 | Mr P Mills |
| 1842/7916 | K J & M E Hall |
| 744/12027 | C Wright |

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified to:

- a) include the land covered by planning permission granted (27/4/99) for a new village hall;
- b) exclude land to the rear of Ramsdean Road;
- c) exclude land south of the garage (60 Winchester Road);
- d) include land south of Willowdale Close.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.272 The Council reasonably considers that a SPB should not be modified to include land the subject of an unimplemented planning permission, because it defines the main built-up area of the settlements as it exists. The grant of planning permission does not guarantee that development will follow. It may not. There is no cause here to depart from that reasonable practice.

2.273 With regard to the land to the west of properties fronting Ramsdean Road (Nos. 1-7, Solent & Pippins) the Council proposes, under SD2.028 (Map No. SPB23) that it be excluded from the SPB. It accepts that it is outside the residential curtilages of these frontage properties, and I agree.

2.274 The Council states that the land south of the garage on Winchester Road is used in conjunction with the garage and forms part of that site. Despite repeated attempts, the Programme Officer has not been able to contact the Objector and so I have been unable to view the land. On the assumption that the Council's assessment is correct, I do not disagree with its conclusions. I therefore agree that it is appropriately shown within the SPB.

2.275 I deal with the Objection concerning land south of Willowdale Close in Chapter 5.6 of my Report. Irrespective of its history, it has the character and appearance of countryside.

Recommendation

2.276 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BURITON

INSET MAP 35

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|
| 656/5924 | Mr P Coxson |
| 669/5937 | Mrs J Ashworth |
| 684/5964 | Mrs A Beeson |
| 686/5968 | Mrs K M Luxton |
| 707/6020 | C Wood |
| 726/6074 | Mr P Beeson |
| 854/6374 | Miss L N Hodgson |
| 1114/6434 | Mr M J Ayling |
| 906/6471 | Mr & Mrs D Bower |
| 978/6592 | Village Design Group |
| 985/6606 | Mrs M Ditmas |
| 1172/6649 | Buriton Estates Ltd |
| 952/6654 | Mrs M Kelsey |
| 1077/6747 | Mrs B E Wright |
| 1326/6905 | Mr P Kelsey |
| 1515/7288 | Mr & Mrs L Waller |
| 1791/7832 | Buriton Village Association |
| 1808/7849 | F Lambert |
| 1833/7900 | J G Jones |
| 1919/8195 | Buriton Estates Ltd |
| 938/8529 | Buriton Parish Council |
| 2024/8663 | Buriton Parish Council |

Second Deposit SD2.030

3873/13247 K M A

Second Deposit SD2.031

1639/12928 East Hampshire AONB Office
1278/14491 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified to:

- a) exclude the green finger of land behind Bones Lane and North Lane;
- b) exclude land within the curtilage of 45a North Lane and land between that property and 69 North Lane;
- c) include the Hangers Way footpath.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.277 The Council says that the SPB should not include this land behind Bones Lane and North Lane. I agree that it is not part of the curtilages of the adjoining residential plots. It makes a positive contribution to the rural setting of the village, and is part of an attractive green finger that comes into its built-up area. SD2.030 (Map No. SPB24) appropriately excludes the land from the SPB.

*

2.278 On the second issue, the Council takes the view that land to the rear of 43a North Lane is part of its garden and should be treated as previously-developed land and part of the built-up area. Similarly, it considers that the land between No 43a North Lane and the neighbouring No. 69 is not part of the countryside. It proposes an amendment to the Inset Map under SD2.031 (Map No. SPB24). The **East Hampshire AONB Office** objects to this change on the grounds that the land is greenfield within the AONB and should be kept free of development. My inspection leads me to agree with the Council's assessment. This modest sized area of land is curtilage or similar. It therefore relates more to the built up parts of the village than to the open countryside that lies to the north of the strong conifer boundary that encloses the land subject to the Objection. Whether this land is suitable for residential development in such a small village with few facilities is, of course, another matter.

*

2.279 Thirdly, the Inset Map does not show all public footpaths and rights of way. It is based on an Ordnance Survey base that may or may not show that information. The purpose of the Inset Maps is to show policies and proposals for future development, not to show definitive public rights of way and public footpaths.

Recommendation

2.280 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

HORNDEAN, BLENDWORTH & LOVEDEAN

INSET MAP 36

Objections

First Deposit

| | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 381/5483 | Ms R Singleton |
| 426/5532 | Agent - Gillings |
| 1174/6653 | Mrs P Fudge & Family |
| 1274/6809 | Mr B Hopcraft |
| 1299/7810 | Maurice Hill Ltd |
| 1300/7813 | Miss K O'Brien |
| 1871/8013 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1915/8184 | J M Seaward |
| 1303/8671 | Borrow Dental Milk Foundation |
| 1978/8946 | St Michael's Convent |
| 1871/10112 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1871/10113 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1871/10114 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1871/10115 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 1871/10116 | Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd |
| 4029/12003 | Mrs J Gibbons |
| 1915/12008 | J M Seaward |
| 4095/12095 | W A Jones |

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified to:

- a) exclude land known as “The Dump”;
- b) follow the recently changed boundary between 21 Rowlands Castle Road and Blendworth Lodge;
- c) include the recreation ground and school grounds to the west of Five Heads Road;
- d) include the site used for business uses and the storage of caravans at Lucky Lite Farm, off Catherington Lane;
- e) include Blendworth House;
- f) include the rear 20 m of the back garden of The Farmhouse Cottage, Catherington Lane;
- g) include land west of Lovedean Lane and north of New Road;
- h) include land north of Randell’s Farm;
- i) include Dell Piece West;
- j) include land to the north of James Copse Road and Ashley Close;
- k) include land east of Lovedean Lane and south of Coldhill Lane;

- l) include land west of Lovedean Lane and south of New Road;
- m) include land to the rear of 115-123 Frogmore Road; and
- n) include land at Parsonage Farm.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.281 The land known as “The Dump”, between Nos 70 and 74 Five Heads Road, is overgrown pasture land between 2 residential areas at the northern edge of Horndean. The Inset Map includes it in the SPB. There is a 80 m or so gap between these dwellings, but if the side garden of No.74 is excluded it reduces to about 50 m. Although a greenfield site, it would lend itself to infill development without significant harm to the setting of the settlement or the nearby countryside.

2.282 In dealing elsewhere in Chapter 5 with land for housing, I accept that Horndean is a reasonably sustainable settlement where additional housing could, in principle, be located. This site is only about 1 km from a wide range of facilities, including schools, the village centre and bus routes. The nearest supermarket and employment opportunities are only about 1.6 km from it. In comparison with other settlements in the District, this constitutes good accessibility. The site adds little to the Local Gap and there is no good reason why it should not remain in the SPB as the Council intends. It should stay there, hence I do not support any modification to the SPB.

*

2.283 I turn now to b). In the vicinity of 21 Rowlands Castle Road, the SPB is defined tightly around the buildings that comprise the core of the settlement. To the east of No 21, the boundary encloses the group of buildings that includes Letcombe House. To the west, the SPB follows the west side of Church Path. This course takes the SPB across the plot of No 21 and thereby separates the dwelling from its rear garden. That is not an unusual situation at the edge of a settlement where it is right to protect its setting and to discourage unsuitable backland development. In this particular case, there is no need to depart from the general approach. Any extension to the SPB, as **Agent-Gillings** seeks, would be to bring within the SPB land that has a greater affinity with the countryside than with the main built-up area. The SPB as currently defined suitably reflects circumstances on the ground.

*

2.284 On c), the exclusion from the SPB of the recreation and school grounds west of Five Heads Road does appear anomalous in that it is almost entirely surrounded by built development. Such grounds are often to be seen in urban areas. This large area, together with the surrounding residential development, could either be included within the SPB as **Mrs Fudge and family** request, or excluded together with the properties that front Bridle Path and which become of generally lower density towards the west. The former is the better approach, but these grounds should be made subject to Policy R2 for the Protection of Open Space. That is a more relevant basis for the determination of any planning applications than policies for safeguarding the countryside.

2.285 In my examination of Policy R2, I recommend that all the Open Spaces that the Council intends to protect should be so designated on Inset Maps. That would make it clear that the Council would resist any proposals for residential or other built development upon them. Here, Policy HC1 for the protection of cultural, leisure and other uses would also

apply. I therefore agree with the Council that this land should remain open, for the reasons that it gives. I trust that my recommendation concerning Policy R2 will give the correct basis and reasons for that protection.

*

2.286 For d), Lucky Lite Farm is used for a combination of caravan storage and light industry, the latter taking place in former agricultural buildings. I agree with the Council that the storage of caravans on the scale found here is more likely to occur in the countryside than in a built-up area where the value of land is usually higher. Owing to its extent of just over 3 ha, the nature of the uses upon it and the inherent character of caravans that can be moved from place to place, this land has a closer relationship with the countryside than with the built-up area. The good range of services and facilities in Horndean do not alter that conclusion. It is not unusual to find business uses in the countryside, often in converted buildings. That is the case here, and any proposals for development would rightly be considered under SDDP Policy IB3 (Industrial and Business Development in the Countryside) and any other material consideration.

2.287 **Mr Hopcraft** says that this is previously-developed land. Whilst I agree that the former agricultural buildings might now have achieved that status, I disagree that the great majority of the land used for the storage of the caravans has done so. The definition of this land in PPG 3 Annex C is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings), and associated fixed surface infrastructure. Irrespective of any permanent planning permissions, caravans are not permanent structures. The site is reasonably well enclosed by tall, thick hedges and other vegetation along much of its boundary but, again, such circumstances are not uncommon in the countryside and are no justification for treating it as urban or similar land. It should not be brought into the SPB on these, or any other, grounds.

*

2.288 I turn now to e), the land at Blendworth House. It is located north of the small settlement of Blendworth and detached from its main built-up parts. The House is large, stands in extensive grounds and is used as offices. These circumstances are not unusual in the countryside, and the Council rightly treats the land as being within it. There is no justification for including the building and its grounds in the SPB.

*

2.289 On f), a tall hedge marks the rear and side boundaries of The Farmhouse Cottage, 240 Catherington Lane. The land to the rear is in the Local Gap. For consistency, the SPB should be defined tightly where plots adjoin a local or strategic gap. That approach has the additional advantage of keeping rear gardens generally open and thereby creating the impression of a greater extent of open land between the particular settlements that are separated by that gap. That applies here. The SPB should be defined about 25 m from the rear of the dwelling as shown in the Inset Map of the FDDP, and not as shown on SD2.032 (Map No SPB 25).

*

2.290 On g), the land west of Lovedean Lane, north of New Road and south of Day Lane is the subject of an objection on the grounds that it should be allocated for housing. I reject the

idea, as explained in Chapter 5.4 of my Report, and so I recommend no change to the SPB.

*

2.291 The land north of Randells Farm, h), is not part of the curtilage of this dwelling. It is an area of paddock that forms an attractive break in the frontage along this length of Catherington Lane and which contributes to the open character of this part of the settlement. The loss of these attributes would be unfortunate, to put it mildly. The land should be protected from development and hence no change to the SPB is justified. The extent of this land also enables it to complement the nearby Local Gap, and the Council should consider the merits of extending it westwards up to Catherington Lane.

*

2.292 On i), Dell Piece West is the subject of objections concerning housing, leisure and commerce, matters that I examine in Chapters 5.4, 6 and 7 of my Report. I conclude that the land, owing partly to its nature conservation value, should remain open. The SPB should not be modified.

*

2.293 On j), the land to the north of James Copse Road is subject to an objection on the grounds that it should be allocated for housing. I recommend that it should be held in reserve for that purpose in preference to land at Coldhill Copse. Nevertheless, Reserve Sites remain as part of the countryside until needed, and so no modification should be made here to the SPB.

*

2.294 For k), the Council allocates land east of Lovedean Lane and south of Coldhill Lane (Coldhill Copse) for housing as a Reserve Site. I recommend against it. The SPB should not be extended to include it.

*

2.295 Land to the west of Lovedean Lane and south of New Road is the subject of an objection that it be allocated for housing. I recommend in Chapter 5.4 of my Report against doing so. No modification to the SPB is warranted.

*

2.296 On m), the land at the rear of 115-123 Frogmore Road includes stables and is used for exercising horses, not unusual circumstances in the countryside. In terms of use, extent and prevailing openness, this land has a closer affinity with the countryside than with the built-up area. No modification to the SPB to include it is justified.

*

2.297 Parsonage Farm, n), is an overgrown site of about 0.8 ha with derelict buildings on it. Its neglected state is no reason for a more intensive form of development, or for including it within the SPB. This is yet another site that relates more to the countryside in both appearance and its former use than it does to the built-up area. The Council suggests

that there might be some scope for re-use of the buildings under the provisions of the now largely superseded PPG 7. That may be so, but it does not justify any modification to the SPB.

Recommendation

2.298 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by including the recreation and school grounds west of Five Heads Road in the SPB and designated as being subject to Policy R2 and by deleting Change No SD2.032 in respect of The Farmhouse Cottage, 240 Catherington Lane.

CLANFIELD & HORNDEAN

INSET MAP 37

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 6.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC004.2 (page 17).

Main Issues

Whether the SPB should be modified to:

- a) exclude the car park of The Farmer Inn and to exclude the nearby school playing field and paddock;
- b) include land at the rear of The Paddock;
- c) include land at the rear of 113-143 Drift Road;
- d) include land at the rear of properties in Downhouse Road (Nos.2-102) and 360-364 Catherington Lane;
- e) exclude the field west of Catherington Lane and south of Roads Hill (“The Dairy”);
- f) provide a uniform boundary at the rear Nos. 301-315 Catherington Lane;
- g) include the rear part of plots of 106 and 110 Drift Road;
- h) exclude land at the rear of dwellings in Little Hyden Lane;
- i) exclude land to the rear of dwellings in Glamorgan Road and White Dirt Lane;
- j) include the plots of 120 & 125 White Dirt Lane.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.299 The Farmer Inn car park is part of the curtilage of the public house. SD2.034 (Map No. SPB27) places the entire car park within the SPB. This is another example, however, of the need to define the SPB tightly at no more than at about 25 m from the back of a building. The extent and openness of the land relates it to the countryside, which immediately to the east is part of the Local Gap. The car park complements the Local Gap, and the Council should consider extending the Local Gap westwards up to 25 m or so from the back of the Inn.

2.300 Objection is also made to the current inclusion in the SPB of the school playing field and donkey paddock. These are sizeable open areas and have no part to play in the SPB. They should be excluded from it. The Council should consider putting them in the Local Gap.

*

2.301 On b), **Mr Dunning** objects because land at the rear of The Paddock, Catherington Lane is not included in the SPB. He says that it should be included because planning permission has been granted for the erection of a shop and store on it, work has started and can be completed. Starts such as the digging of trenches for, or laying of, foundations to keep a planning permission alive does not, in my view, justify a change to the SPB. It is the actual presence of buildings that determines the extent of the built-up

area. As I write, there is no building on the site. On that basis, no modification to the SPB should be made.

*

- 2.302 On c), land at the rear of Nos 113-143 Drift Road comprises parts of rear gardens, 2 dwellings and their curtilages and other mainly open land. Its is of about 1 ha and is in the Local Gap. SD2.037 (Map No.SPB29) includes the site within the SPB. Some Objectors say that this would result in an unwarranted incursion into the countryside. I agree. The frontage properties south of Drift Road, together with those along Downhouse Road (Nos.2-102), Glamorgan Road and White Dirt Lane are ribbons of, and sporadic, development in the countryside and poorly related to the main built-up areas.
- 2.303 The SPBs in this locality reasonably acknowledge what is there, and their tight definitions rightly discourage extensions to them and yet more incursion into the countryside. The openness and extent of long rear gardens complement the Local Gap to such a degree that they should be made part of it. In other words, they should be protected from development. The SPB should not be extended to include them, as SD2.037 intends. It should be defined as in the FDDP and the Change should not take place.
- 2.304 Most of the Nursery at No 117 Drift Road (Rumsey Garden) is unaffected by SD2.037. In openness, character, appearance and extent, this land relates more to the countryside than to the built-up area. Nurseries are identified in the Council's guidance (Document CD13/2, Appendix 2, criterion 8) as uses that should not be included in a SPB. I agree, and there is no cause to make an exception here.

*

- 2.305 On d), dwellings at Nos 2-102 Downhouse Road and 360-364 Catherington Lane have long rear gardens up to 80 m or so deep. SD2.038 includes their entire length in the SPB. This would create a significant area of backland with potential for redevelopment, particularly if part of a comprehensive scheme. For basically the same reasons as set out in respect of c), this Change should not take place. In particular, although these rear gardens are not in the Local Gap, their development would significantly reduce the physical and visual separation between the various parts of the settlement. Dwellings are somewhat irregularly sited, but the 25 m guideline should generally apply as in the FDDP.

*

- 2.306 Land south of Roads Hill ("The Dairy"), e), is occupied by a former agricultural building with planning permission, now implemented according to the Council, for use as a car repair and maintenance workshop. It is in the SPB. It is the least attractive site along Catherington Lane. It would certainly benefit from improvement whether or not the Council has any control through, perhaps, a temporary planning permission and the prospect of conditions upon renewal. The buildings are agricultural in appearance and utilitarian in style. According to the Council's criteria for defining a SPB, farm buildings at the edge of a settlement should not be included in it. That is a good guideline, and there is no cause for making an exception here. Although the site is unkempt and ramshackle in appearance, its prevailing openness and the appearance of the building gives it more the character of an agricultural use and, therefore, of the

countryside than that of a built up area. In this respect, it contrasts markedly with the more consolidated form of development on the northern, opposite side of Roads Hill which is rightly included in the SPB. The Dairy site should not be in the SPB.

*

2.307 I turn now to f). The rear gardens at Nos 313-315 Catherington Lane (SD2.033) are about 40 m deep. The other dwellings in the frontage (Nos. 301-311) vary in depth between 15 m and 30 m. If the rural setting to this attractive village is not to be eroded, backland development must be discouraged. That objective calls for a reasonably uniform and tightly defined SPB at the rear of these dwellings. That means 25 m or so from the back of Nos 307-315.

*

2.308 On g), Nos 106 and 110 Drift Road have rear gardens up to some 140 m deep. The objection site is made up of about a 100 m length of their rear gardens. An effective tall hedge/tree screen defines it on its northern and western boundaries where it adjoins the open countryside. It, and the open land beyond it, is in the Local Gap. To the east is a residential development at Farm View Avenue. Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the plots for 16 dwellings (14 net) to a depth of about 60 m, and the work has started. The approved layout includes the land to which the objection refers as gardens for 2 of these dwellings.

2.309 Although the land is previously-developed, a judgement must be made about the extent to which the curtilages should be redeveloped. Relevant planning circumstances must be taken into account. The Local Gap in this locality is of limited extent, being no more than 250 – 500 m wide from east to west, about 350 m wide at this point. Because it is narrow and vulnerable, it requires firm protection. The argument that the site is well screened from the public open space to the north is not sufficient reason to allow its development. The gap would be physically diminished by the development. Even with any future development limited to single storey housing, roofs would be visible when viewed from the open land to the north and west.

2.310 The best approach is to make a minor change to the SPB by making it uniform and continuing it eastwards across the objection site from the rear of Nos. 112-134 Drift Road. That is as much as the SPB should be modified.

*

2.311 On h) that refers to land at Little Hyden Lane, SD2.035 (Map No.28) extends the SPB to include the full length of rear gardens of 2 dwellings (Chapel Cottage & Westgate Lodge). They are relatively isolated dwellings in the countryside, and development in their curtilages should not be encouraged. A tight and preferably uniform SPB is required. The usual 25 m or so boundary from the back of the dwellings should be defined. It should accord with that at the rear of Chapel Farm House to the north.

*

2.312 On i), SD2.039 includes rear parts of gardens along Glamorgan Road (Nos 1-49) and White Dirt Road (Nos 142-152) in the SPB. The rear gardens vary between 20-70 m in length, and are not included in the Local Gap. But they adjoin it and some are deep enough to invite pressure for backland development. For reasons explained above in relation to Drift Road and Downhouse Road, this should be discouraged. It would

reduce both visually and physically the Local Gap between these 2 already close parts of the settlement. Accordingly, the SPB should be tightly defined behind these dwellings. I seem to recall 25 m or thereabouts.

*

- 2.313 On j), SD2.040 excludes No 120 and the front part of No 125 White Dirt Road from the SPB. Dwellings to the south of White Dirt Road stand in large plots and the SPB has rightly been defined tightly at the rear of the buildings. Although these 2 plots are larger than the majority in this residential enclave, they are physically and visually part of it. Accordingly, I endorse the Council's Latest Proposed Change (PIC004.2) that shows the SPB reverting to that shown on of the FDDP Inset Map 37 and these plots being returned to the SPB.
- 2.314 **Mr Saunders** requests that the rear, north eastern part of his land at No 120 White Dirt Road be included in the SPB. It has an interesting history, and he seeks to show that *it forms part of the historic built-up area of Catherington*. A replacement bungalow at No 120 was allowed on appeal, but the existing dwelling relies on the terms of a later planning permission. The Latest Proposed Change (PIC004.2) defines the SPB about 20 m beyond the dwelling, as did the FDDP. It does not follow any clearly recognisable feature, but its main advantage is that it distinguishes between the more immediate curtilage and that part of the plot that, owing to its extent, shape and general openness, relates more to the countryside than to the built-up area. This existing state of affairs at the site is of more relevance than its history.
- 2.315 Extension to the SPB as requested would invite a proposal for residential development that would have the effect of extending the built-up area into the countryside. Such an intrusion should be discouraged. The fact that the rear part of the plot is reasonably well screened makes no difference to that conclusion. Actual presence is a more important consideration than the extent to which a building could be shielded from view. Again, I endorse the SPB at this point as shown in the FDDP and PIC004.2.

-0-

- 2.316 On other matters, I deal with objections concerning The Farmhouse (No 240 Catherington Lane and land to the north of Randells Farm in the above section of this part of my Report concerning Horndean, Blendworth and Lovedean.
- 2.317 My recommendation below has implications for the extent of the Local Gaps in this part of the District. The Council should consider them, and make any necessary adjustments.

Recommendation

- 2.318 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by changes to the SPBs as follows:
- a) delete SD2.034 and so exclude the car park of the Farmer Inn and exclude the nearby school playing fields and paddock;
 - b) delete SD2.037 concerning land at the rear of 113-143 Drift Road and define the SPB about 25 m from the rear of the dwellings;

- c) delete SD2.038 concerning land at the rear of properties in Downhouse Road (Nos.2-102) and 360-364 Catherington Lane and define the SPB about 25 m from the rear of the dwellings;
- d) exclude from the SPB the land west of Catherington Lane and south of Roads Hill (“The Dairy”);
- e) provide a uniform SPB at the rear Nos. 301-315 Catherington Lane by re-defining it at the rear of Nos 307-315 at about 25 m from the rear of those dwellings;
- f) at the rear of Nos 106 and 110 Drift Road continue the SPB along the same line as that of plots to the west (Nos 112-134);
- g) at the rear of Chapel Cottage and Westgate Lodge, Little Hyden Lane continue the SPB along the same line as that along the rear of Chapel Farm House;
- h) at the rear of dwellings in Glamorgan Road (Nos 1-49) and north of White Dirt Lane (Nos 142-152) redefine the SPB about 25 m from the rear of the dwellings;
- i) delete SD2.040 and replace with PIC004.2 (Map No. PIC MAP 1) to include in the SPB the western part of No 120 and the frontage of No 125 White Dirt Lane.

ROWLANDS CASTLE

INSET MAP 38

Objections

First Deposit

1293/6864 George Wimpey (UK) Ltd
1885/8106 Fastnet Properties Ltd
1914/8182 Ref: Hooper
1904/8977 Mr Edney
1591/12127 Rowlands Castle Parish Council
3852/13462 Drum Housing Association

Second Deposit SD2.042

1666/11975 Councillor Mr D Clegg
4025/11998 A Thomson
4026/11999 Mrs Sheet
4027/12000 A Malden
3416/12001 Mrs M Cotton
4028/12002 E K W Skeet
1591/12126 Rowlands Castle Parish Council
4043/12219 Councillor Mr E M Byrom
1293/13618 George Wimpey (UK) Ltd
1278/14500 CPRE

Second Deposit SD2.043

1591/12125 Rowlands Castle Parish Council
4043/12220 Councillor Mr E M Byrom
1293/13623 George Wimpey (UK) Ltd

Second Deposit SD2.044

311/10940 L T & Mrs D M Trollope
4043/12221 Councillor Mr E M Byrom
1293/13625 George Wimpey (UK) Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set in Document CD11/12 at PIC005.2 (page 17).

Main Issue

Whether the SPB should be modified to:

- a) include land at Oaklands Farm;
- b) include Deerleap and its curtilage;

- c) include land north of Uplands and Wellsworth Lane;
- d) exclude ribbon development along Durrants Road;
- e) include the rear-most parts of plots of dwellings in Whichers Gate Road (Nos. 58-90) Changes SD2.042 and PIC005.2;
- f) include the rear of plots in Drift Road (SD2.044);
- g) include the parts of rear gardens of properties in Finchdean Road as proposed under change SD2.043 (Map No. SPB31);
- h) exclude the 2 housing allocations in Rowlands Castle.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.319 At Oaklands Farm also referred to as Oaklands House, 2 sites are the subject of Objections. I recommend in Chapter 5.4 of my Report that the larger one, promoted by **George Wimpey (UK) Ltd**, should not be allocated. I recommend that **Mr Hooper's** land be a Reserve Site. In neither case, but for different reasons, should the SPB be modified. As previously discussed, Reserve Sites remain as part of the countryside pending a decision on their future.

*

2.320 For b), the land at Deerleap, I recommend in Chapter 5.4 of my Report that the 2 sites subject of Objections should not be allocated. Again, the SPB should not be modified to include either of them.

*

2.321 The 2 sites north of Uplands Road and Wellsworth Lane, c), are the subject of objections that they should be allocated. Again, I disagree for reasons explained in Chapter 5.4 of my Report. And so, once more, the SPB should not be modified to include them.

*

2.322 For d), the SDDP shows ribbon development on both sides of Durrants Road within the SPB. This is a change from the adopted Local Plan. The development protrudes into the Strategic Gap that here is at its narrowest. It is no more than 150 m to the administrative boundary and about 300 m to the Staunton School buildings in Havant. Development in this locality would further reduce the effectiveness of the Gap. But planning permission has been granted, and implemented, for infilling on the low-density plots at 37 and 45 Durrants Road (Document CD12/24, page 27). The SPB confirms existing circumstances of a mainly built-up area and it should stay as it is.

*

2.323 For e), SD2.042 and PIC005.2 extend the SPB to include the whole of the curtilages of Nos 58-82 Whichers Gate Road. These properties back onto the open land that forms the Strategic Gap between Rowlands Castle and the built-up area of Leigh Park/West Leigh in Havant. The Strategic Gap is already narrow from north to south. It has been eroded, particularly along Durrants Road and is vulnerable to more development. Policies for its protection should be applied firmly here to keep both its visual and physical integrity. For the same reasons put forward for keeping rear gardens adjoining the Local Gap in Horndean and Clanfield free of development (see Inset Maps 37 and 37), the SPB should be drawn tightly, and uniformly, at the rear of these properties.

Again, a distance of 25 m or so from the rear of the buildings, in accordance with the Council's useful guidelines, comes to mind.

- 2.324 Landowners say that their gardens are distinguished from the open land of the gap by an effective hedge/tree boundary that defines the curtilages and gives them a different character. Certainly these boundaries are well marked, but the gardens are generally free of buildings and their openness prevails. Their openness and extent complements the open land of the gap to such an extent that much of this garden land should be treated as part of it. Thus the SPB on the Inset Map at the rear of Nos 58-82 Whichers Gate Road should be continued from along the rear of Nos 84-90, about 25 m back from the dwellings, to achieve a tight and reasonably uniform line. This would need consequential modification to the boundary of the Strategic Gap at the rear of these properties (see SD3.073 Map No. CH2) and PIC012.3 (PIC Map 9) in Chapter 3 below. Thus I do not endorse SD2.042 and PIC005.2.

*

- 2.325 On f), SD2.044 includes the rear of gardens of Nos 2-32 The Drift within the SPB. Much of the area affected contains dense tree cover that provides an attractive natural feature and edge to the settlement. This inclusion could result in pressure for the redevelopment of these long gardens, a prospect that should be discouraged since it could lead to the loss of the trees and significant harm to the generally open and rural character and appearance of the area. In any event, retention of the woodland would be unlikely to result in an area large enough to accommodate a satisfactory development.

- 2.326 The woods extend beyond the residential curtilages to the edge of a paddock that is part of the aforementioned grounds of Oaklands House that I recommend as a Reserve Site. If it is needed for housing, this woodland should be protected and integrated into the scheme. In the circumstances, I consider that the land to which SD2.044 relates should stay outside the SPB. This would discourage pressure to develop the backland and would safeguard the existing tree cover. The SPB of the FDDP is better.

*

- 2.327 Turning now to g), I note that SD2.043 puts parts of the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Finchdean Road in the SPB. This removes an anomalous situation where plots to the south, of similar depth, are in the SPB. The SPB, as changed, is more logical. The land is not part of the countryside nor in the Rowlands Castle/Havant Strategic Gap, sandwiched as it is between the railway and dwellings to the east and west. The **Rowlands Castle Parish Council** is concerned that the Change will encourage backland development, but any such proposal would be considered on its merits. It is unlikely to lead to what is feared because of risk of flooding and highway matters that, among other considerations, led to the Council's deletion of its proposed housing allocation at Finchdean Road. I deal with objections concerning that deletion in Chapter 5.4 of my Report.

*

- 2.328 On h), SD5.155 & SD5.275 delete the Council's previously proposed allocations at Finchdean Road and the former Brickworks respectively. The Council confirms that the SPB no longer includes greenfield sites that the FDDP allocated for housing. That should be the case with the land at the former Brickworks, located as it is at the edge of the built-up area. The land at Finchdean Road, however, is within the general confines

of the built-up area, and it should remain in the SPB in acknowledgement of that fact. To do otherwise would result in an awkwardly defined SPB around a scatter of buildings of various types and positions.

Recommendation

2.329 I recommend that the SDD P be modified as follows:

- a) by deleting SD2.042 and PIC005.2 in respect of land at Whichers Gate Road and by reverting to the SPB in the FDDP except in respect of Nos 84-90, and by continuing the SPB at the rear of Nos 58-82 across the rear gardens of Nos 84-90;
- b) by redefining the SPB to exclude the former Brickworks;
- c) by deleting SD2.044 (land at the rear of 2-32 The Drift) and reverting to the SPB in the FDDP.

LASHAM

INSET MAP 40

Objection

First Deposit

1875/13373 Swan Hill Homes

Main Issue

Whether a SPB should be defined for this village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.330 Lasham is a settlement of limited sustainability, so limited that I recommend against the encouragement of any significant residential development there. Essentially, it is a scattered group of dwellings and other buildings. Any development that is acceptable should be confined to such built up area as it has, taking account of its delightful character and appearance. The basis for consideration of any such proposal should also be national and local policies for the protection of the countryside for its own sake. No SPB is required.

Recommendation

2.331 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.