

INTRODUCTION

PARAGRAPH 4.2

Objection

First Deposit

1578/8862 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether policies for car restraint should be brought into the Local Plan rather than being deferred to the Local Transport Plan, and whether the Local Plan is sufficiently explicit in the matter.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.1 Paragraph 4.3 explains how the transport policies of the Local Plan are to be developed in line with national guidance and the County Council's integrated transport strategies, which promote national and regional transport objectives. The strategies are to reduce the heavy reliance on the car by a reduction in demand for car travel and by encouraging a range of realistic alternatives. Two particular strategies apply to East Hampshire. They are the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy (CHARTS) and the South East Hampshire Transport Strategy (SEHTS). They will be implemented through the Local Transport Plan process. The latter is not subject to statutory procedures.
- 4.2 Since one of the objectives of Local Transport Plans is to place greater emphasis on targets, performance indicators and monitoring, it is not unreasonable to expect the Local Plan to contain some complementary means whereby the success, or otherwise, of car restraint policies are measured/monitored. The Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 requires the County Council as the Highways Authority to publish a report containing an assessment of road traffic levels and set targets for reducing them, or to set out the rate of growth of traffic. The Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006 (Document CD7/3) contains the strategies applying across the County. The headline targets for CHARTS and SEHTS (Tables 6.4.1 and 6.9.1, CD7/3) is to reduce traffic growth by two-thirds by 2020.
- 4.3 Given the importance of traffic reduction within the strategies, it would be helpful for the Local Plan to confirm the target and period for traffic reduction in the District. It should also confirm that the target applies to the District as a whole, and not just to particular settlement(s). Information about the responsibility for monitoring the data and its availability should be included.
- 4.4 Where a Local Transport Plan proposal involves the development or use of land, it should appear as a proposal or policy in the development plan. That would accord with the advice in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 Annex B about the integration of transport and land use policies. The Objector does not, however, identify any such Local Transport Plan proposal. The Petersfield Area Transport Strategy to which SDDP paragraph 4.6 refers, is in some detail. Presumably, any strategy developed for the larger

settlements would be prepared in a similar way and would be incorporated in any review of the Local Plan.

- 4.5 Briefly, therefore, my conclusion is that the Local Plan should include District-wide targets for traffic restraint, and the period that applies. So far as I can judge, transport policies and proposals with land use implications are suitably included in the SDDP.

Recommendation

- 4.6 I recommend that the SDDP be modified to confirm the target for the District-wide restraint of traffic, the period that applies, the authority responsible for monitoring progress and the availability of relevant information.

PARAGRAPHS 4.3 & 4.5

Objections

First Deposit

1620/8161 Whitehill Town Council
1622/8427 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight

Second Deposit SD4.005

1620/13234 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether businesses should be encouraged to use means other than road haulage to carry goods and whether too much is being expected of the private motorist;
- 2) Whether schemes promoting the integration of transport and land use should avoid damage to nature conservation interests.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.7 SD4.005 is a very brief summary of Government policy. It is not subject to objection through the local plan process. Policy T14 of the SDDP deals with the movement of freight. It holds out the prospect of transfer of freight from road to rail, but with relatively few industrial areas in East Hampshire close to railways and marshalling yards, there is limited opportunity for doing so. I have no doubt that the Council will, however, promote this transfer as far as it is able to do so.

4.8 The objective of reducing the heavy reliance on car travel stems from Government policy. The County Council's strategy, embodied in the SDDP, is to provide a range of realistic alternatives to the car. It will be more difficult to achieve in a predominantly rural area such as East Hampshire, but it is still a laudable objective. It is an important consideration that I take into account in my recommendations concerning the Council's proposed allocations for residential and industrial development and the Omission Sites. Essentially, the objective should be to locate main residential and employment areas close together, so as at least to increase the opportunity of people to use modes of transport other than the car.

*

4.9 On the second issue, the schemes concerned might have an adverse effect on nature conservation interests. It is not unusual for a judgement to be made on the basis of the weighing of competing objectives. Much will depend upon the circumstances of the case. It would be wrong, however, for the Council to commit itself to rejecting a transport proposal in principle because of its adverse effect upon nature conservation or any other interest. Appropriate weight would have to be given to SDDP Policies C3-C5 and any other material consideration. I accept, however, that in some parts of East Hampshire, nature conservation interests are likely to be of vital importance.

Recommendation

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

MOVEMENT AND ACCESS STUDIES

PARAGRAPH 4.7

Objections

First Deposit

1578/8863 The Petersfield Society
1895/9733 English Heritage

Main Issue

- 1) Whether the 20 mph speed restriction of the Petersfield Area Transport Strategy (PATS, formerly PAMS) for the town's historic core will be as beneficial as claimed;
- 2) Whether an increase in traffic using Sheep Street will result in a greater threat to its Listed Buildings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.11 This paragraph is redrafted by way of SD4.014 following the completion of PATS, although the recommendations are similar. The Strategy has been prepared, made the subject of consultation and adopted as part of the Local Transport Plan (LTP). The 20 mph restriction was the Option (3) that received the greatest support during the consultation exercise. I refer above to the complementary nature of transport and land use proposals, but this restriction is a highway management scheme and not a change in the use of land. As a general point, however, I consider that slow moving traffic in town centres enhances the environment to the benefit of pedestrians. No doubt the scheme will be monitored and refinements made as appropriate.

*

4.12 On the second issue, the protection of Listed Buildings and their settings is of vital interest. This means that changes may have to be made to the detailed design of Proposal 13 of the Strategy (securing improvements to the historic core of the town) in so far as it affects Sheep Street. I have no doubt that the Strategy will be kept under review once implemented and that remedial action will be taken if valid objectives are not met.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.8

Objection

First Deposit

1732/7761 G M Dobson

Main Issue

Whether the proposal to revert Tor Way to 2 way working (Proposal 14, CD7/5), and the proposed traffic lights at the junction of London Road/Pulens Lane (Proposal 5, CD7/5), will inhibit the flow of traffic.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.14 This paragraph is deleted following the completion of PATS. Its substance is in SD4.014. My general conclusions above about the complementary relationship between transport and land use proposals, and in particular between the Local Transport Plan, PATS and the Local Plan, apply. The slowing of traffic and reducing the dominance of vehicle traffic goes hand in hand with improving safety and the environment in the town centre and its approaches. These traffic management measures were adopted following public consultation and are now incorporated in the SDDP. In both cases they were introduced to improve safety and convenience, especially for pedestrians crossing the road.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.014

Objections

Second Deposit SD4.014

1673/13060 Alton Society
1620/13236 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the County Council's Access and Movement Study for Alton should be brought into the Local Plan;
- 2) Whether it is necessary to include PATS within the Local Plan or to provide it as supporting documentation when the strategies for Alton and Whitehill become available.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.16 The Council confirms that the main findings of the Alton transport strategy will be published when they are available. It would not be appropriate to bring it into the Local Plan before the public has been consulted on it as part of the Hampshire Local Transport Plan and before its adoption by the District Council.

*

4.17 As mentioned before, transport proposals should be included in a Local Plan where they have development/land use implications. The Council is rightly keen to include PATS proposals in the Local Plan to inform all concerned, even though some may be implemented before its adoption.

Recommendation

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

LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

PARAGRAPH 4.10

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7228 CPRE
1929/9218 Danbuild Southern Ltd

Second Deposit SD4.016

3888/13875 Gammans and Claxon
3889/14142 Marechaux Ltd

Second Deposit SD4.018

1960/13977 Liss Village Design Group
1278/14613 CPRE

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the objectives in this paragraph suitably acknowledge that too great a demand on local services, like a primary school, can lead to longer journeys; that the scale of new development, as well as its location, can have an effect on the need to travel; and the importance of access to a range of transport modes;
- 2) Whether *high level of service* applies to any station in East Hampshire by virtue of the poor performance of the rail operator.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.19 The matters raised in the first issue are valid points. SD4.016, SD4.017, SD4.018, SD4.019 and SD4.020 meet the thrust of the objections and I endorse them.

*

4.20 SD4.018 reflects national policy to locate major new development where there is, or will be, a choice in the means of transport. Any reported poor rail service does not alter the fact that settlements served by rail provide a wider choice to residents than those that lack it. There is also the prospect of a better service to meet increased demand. In my conclusions, I take account of the better service at Petersfield than, say, at Bentley Station. I hope that train services throughout both District and country will improve during the Local Plan period and beyond it.

-0-

4.21 On another matter, Objectors promote sites in Sussex Road and elsewhere in Petersfield. I deal with these representations in Chapter 5.3 of my Report.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.12

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7230 CPRE

Second Deposit SD4.027, SD4.028 and SD4.029

1306/12743 Government Office for the South East

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.4 (pages 57 & 58).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether provision should be brought into the Local Plan for the monitoring and review of travel plans to gauge their effectiveness;
- 2) Whether SD4.027, SD4.028 and SD4.029 would be better expressed as policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.23 The Council accepts that some form of monitoring and review is necessary and that the text should say so, hence SD4.030. This change meets the objection.

*

4.24 The Council accepts that the need for transport assessments and travel plans would be better expressed as policy, hence PIC001.4. I disagree. This is an important matter, sometimes vital, but it is not a land use policy or proposal. It is guidance concerning the Council's reasonable expectations about a document that should be submitted alongside planning applications for particular types of development. I endorse the Latest Proposed Change, but as supporting text instead of as policy.

Recommendation

4.25 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as set out in the Latest Proposed Change (PIC001.4) as supporting text.

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS AND TRAVEL PLANS

PARAGRAPH 4.13

Objections

First Deposit

1521/10007 Professor M J Withers

Main Issue

Whether the text should state that public transport cannot provide a viable alternative to the car in rural areas.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.26 This paragraph is concerned with major development proposals and the need for transport assessments. It is not the place to discuss the viability of public transport versus the car in rural areas. I do, however, accept that the infrequency of buses in rural areas does not encourage their use. That is one reason why I recommend that land should not be allocated for residential development in settlements poorly served by public transport, and with little chance of substantial and enduring improvement.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.030

Objection

Second Deposit SD4.030

3820/14316 Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issue

Whether the first sentence of the paragraph should be made a local plan policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.28 This first sentence rightly confirms that unacceptable development will not be permitted solely because of the existence of a travel plan for it. This reflects national policy in PPG 13 paragraph 89. It explains an aspect of the planning system rather than being a land use policy or proposal. It should stay as supporting text.

Recommendation

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

GENERAL POLICY: LAND USE AND TRANSPORT

POLICY T1

Objections

First Deposit

567/5774	Network Rail
567/6341	Network Rail
567/6353	Network Rail
1278/7222	CPRE
1272/7306	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1622/8406	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1921/9084	Rydon Homes

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should promote a sustainable relationship between development and transport;
- 2) Whether it should refer to the advantages of moving freight by rail;
- 3) Whether Network Rail should be consulted on development proposals on sites at or near railway land;
- 4) Whether the Policy should address the traffic problems that new development creates;
- 5) Whether it clearly relates to other parts of the SDDP;
- 6) Whether the Policies are sufficiently committed to achieving targets, monitoring and delivery;
- 7) Whether the Policy pays sufficient attention to nature conservation interests;
- 8) Whether it purports to give the Council more controls than it has.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.30 Paragraph 4.10 deals with the location of development. SD4.018 confirms that development should be well located in relation to public transport, such as near railway stations with a high level of service. Policy T2 requires uses that generate a significant amount of traffic to be located where they are well served by public transport. The Local Plan will have to be read as a whole, and the Objector's point is well covered.

*

4.31 Secondly, Structure Plan Policy T3 supports proposals that encourage the movement of freight by rail and sea. The Hampshire Local Transport Plan does the same in its freight strategy. As far as I can see, however, neither CHARTS nor SEHTS does so. SDDP Policy T14 seeks the transfer where appropriate of goods from road to rail through planning conditions or agreements. Policy T1 seeks to encourage the development of an integrated transport network, but does not refer to the movement of freight by rail. The Local Plan should acknowledge this important matter, preferably at Policy T14.

*

4.32 The Council confirms that it consults Network Rail when need be. This is an aspect of the consideration of planning applications, not a land use matter. A policy is unnecessary. None is required here.

*

4.33 On the fourth issue, development proposals will be considered against Policies T11 and GS3. Policy T11 ensures that development involving a new or improved access will be permitted only where it not prejudice the safety, function and character of the highway or harm the wider environment. Policy GS3 ii) would similarly resist development that, owing to the type and volume of traffic generated, would harm the countryside. These policies are sufficient for the purpose. The Council could introduce traffic management measures on nearby roads, at the expense of the developer and in accordance with Circular 1/97, to make a scheme acceptable in highway terms.

*

4.34 On the fifth issue, the SDDP must be read as a whole, and too much cross-referencing would be cumbersome.

*

4.35 Sixthly, Chapter 8 sets out the Council’s monitoring proposals. In some cases, such as housing allocations where targets have been set, this should be more straightforward than in others. Some aspects of the Local Plan will be assessed against a set of sustainability indicators. These provisions go as far as it is reasonable to expect in monitoring the effectiveness of land use policies and proposals and the achievement of the 5 key aims set out in SDDP paragraph 2.15.

*

4.36 I can add little to my conclusions at paragraph 4.9 above on the seventh issue. Policies C3-C5 ensure that the nature conservation issues of any scheme would be taken into account.

*

4.37 On the last issue, SD4.033 and SD4.034 meet the Objector’s concerns. It must be appreciated, however, that the Council is but one of the parties promoting an integrated transport and land use system. Others include the County Council and bus and railway companies. The Policy is clear, however, that it is concerned with the Council solely as a local planning authority.

-0-

4.38 The Policy could, I believe, be somewhat better drafted. There is no need to refer to other SDDP policies. That is taken as read.

Recommendation

4.39 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY T1

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT PROMOTES THE INTEGRATION OF THE MEANS OF TRANSPORT, CHOICE OF MODE AND AN EFFICIENT PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT POLICY T2

Objections

First Deposit

1280/8352	George Wimpey (UK) Limited
1304/8732	Country Landowners Association
910/8733	Headley Residents' Association
1921/9085	Rydon Homes
1692/9216	Alton Friends of the Earth
1403/9687	Mrs E Constable
1625/9785	The Countryside Agency

Second Deposit SD4.035

1620/13238	Whitehill Town Council
3820/14317	Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issues

- 1) Whether *public transport* should be qualified by *good quality*;
- 2) Whether the Policy is unnecessarily more restrictive than PPG 13 and whether sub-paragraph a) should require development to be located near public transport centres or corridors;
- 3) Whether it recognises the difficulties faced in rural areas;
- 4) Whether it should require new development to be located near frequent public transport and not in villages where it is infrequent or non-existent;
- 5) Whether it can ensure that new development will be well served by public transport when there is no requirement to improve it;
- 6) Whether it should provide for door to door school transport to reduce congestion;
- 7) Whether SD4.035 should include a safeguard for land to provide rail links between Whitehill/Bordon to Bentley and Whitehill/Bordon to Liss;
- 8) Whether development is unduly precluded in such smaller settlements as Bordon.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.40 *Public transport* should be qualified. Paragraph 4.15 of the supporting text acknowledges that, while *high quality* public transport is desirable, it is mostly outside the scope of a land use plan. I share that view. SD4.035 does, however, qualify *public transport* with *well served by, or is likely to be well-served by, public transport*. That is a reasonable response to the objection by **George Wimpey (UK) Ltd**.

*

4.41 On the second issue, PPG 13 requires local planning authorities in preparing their development plans to manage the pattern of urban growth to make the fullest use of public transport and to steer major traffic generators to places well served by public transport, such as city, town and district centres. SD4.035 ensures that development is located where it would (or could) be well served by public transport, and that accords with national policy.

*

4.42 Thirdly, the Policy deals with development that is likely to generate significant levels of travel demand. Because of the heavy reliance on the car in rural areas, such development should not be located in them where realistic alternatives to the car seldom exist. Indeed, PPG 13 paragraph 5 acknowledges that the car will remain the only real option for travel in rural areas. Low density of population with correspondingly low fare revenue makes the provision of good public transport difficult in rural areas. The SDDP cannot reasonably go beyond the last sentence of paragraph 4.18.

*

4.43 Fourthly, paragraph 4.10 sets out the strategy for the location of new development. This confirms that the transport strategies of central (CHARTS) and south-east (SEHTS) Hampshire emphasise that new development should be in places where the need to travel is reduced and which are served by a choice in the means of transport. SD4.035 rightly requires significant traffic generators of all types to be located only in settlements well served by public transport. I take this into account in my recommendations concerning land for residential development.

*

4.44 On the fifth issue, a land use plan has only limited scope to secure improvements to public transport in terms of frequency, cleanliness, punctuality and affordability. These are usually matters for the rail and bus operators. The Local Plan can assist only where the use of land is involved. Policies GS4 and T13 provide for developers to contribute to infrastructure where the development reasonably requires it. The suggested policy to secure funding from a developer to improve the quality of public transport would depend on the merits of the particular proposal. It would need to pass the tests set out in Circular 1/97 paragraph 7. Similarly, if the Council wished to be involved in the charging regime for car parking at a development it would be better achieved as part of negotiations on an application for planning permission rather than as a policy in the Local Plan. The general thrust of the provisions of the development plan would, however, set the context.

*

4.45 Sixthly, the provision of school transport at the public's, or any other party's, expense is not an appropriate matter for the Local Plan.

*

4.46 On the seventh issue, the Council is doubtful about the feasibility of re-opening these rail links. In the absence of support for it from the County Council, the Strategic Rail Authority or one of the train operating companies, it would not be appropriate to safeguard land in the Local Plan. At present, therefore, it does not appear to be a realistic option. In any event, no such land is identified. It is for the Whitehill Town Council to seek to persuade the relevant party or parties that a feasibility study is justified. Presumably it is a matter to be considered in the preparation of the Masterplan.

*

4.47 Lastly, the Policy deals with development that would give rise to significant levels of traffic. As discussed, it would not normally be appropriate to steer significant traffic generators to settlements not already well served by public transport or capable of being made so. I consider Whitehill/Bordon in more detail in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. In principle, however, I consider that it is capable of accommodating some further growth.

-0-

4.48 I suggest a minor re-draft of the Policy to emphasise the importance of good public transport.

Recommendation

4.49 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY T2

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO GENERATE A SIGNIFICANT LEVEL OF TRAVEL DEMAND UNLESS:

- A) IT IS, OR ARRANGEMENTS ARE MADE FOR IT TO BE, WELL-SERVED BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT; AND***
- B) ITS LAYOUT IS DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT EXISTING AND/OR FUTURE BUS ROUTES LIE WITHIN EASY WALKING DISTANCE OF THE ENTIRE SCHEME WITH CONVENIENTLY SITED BUS STOPS WITH SHELTERS.***

PARAGRAPH 4.18

Objection

First Deposit

1578/8864 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether there should be a policy to ensure the provision of public transport before the use of the car is restrained.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.50 Policies to bring about restraint in the use of the car will be effective only when public transport, walking and cycling become acceptable alternatives. Policy GS4 enables the Council to seek contributions from developers, where reasonable, to improve public transport. That should assist in providing choice in the means of transport. The Policy does not, and cannot, lead to a general subsidy to the wider population. The policies of the SDDP go as far as they can in promoting improvements to public transport.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.19

Objections

First Deposit

567/6345 Network Rail
1620/8163 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether land should be safeguarded for rail links between Whitehill/Bordon and Bentley and between Whitehill/Bentley and Liss.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.52 I discuss this matter in my above conclusions, although here it gives me another opportunity to stress the importance of the Masterplan. The reference to British Rail is deleted as part of the updating of the SDDP.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.20

Objections

First Deposit

1286/7458 Four Marks Parish Council
920/8503 Binsted Parish Council
1692/9219 Alton Friends of the Earth
1856/9607 Mr J Deverill
1673/9942 The Alton Society

Second Deposit SD4.039

1287/14258 Mrs A Storey

Pre Inquiry Change PIC003.4

1706/15008 Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC003.4 (page 59).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the paragraph is necessary;
- 2) Whether the Council should investigate the feasibility of making the Watercress Line more than a purely tourist attraction, including a link between Farnham and Alresford;
- 3) Whether inadequate parking at Alton and Bentley stations should be acknowledged.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.54 Suitable corrections are made in the SDDP. The paragraph now better describes a noteworthy land use feature in the District, albeit a railway providing a tourist service. It should stay.

*

4.55 On the second issue, the Council confirms that the owners of the Line have considered meeting any potential use by commuters, but have identified only a limited demand for such a service in the Four Marks, Ropley and Alresford areas. Regrettably, therefore, at present it appears that it will continue to be no more than a tourist attraction. I would urge all concerned, however, to keep the matter under review, especially with the envisaged growth at Four Marks.

4.56 Any proposal to include the Line in a Farnham-Alresford rail link would need to be considered in the context of the County Council's area transport strategies. If, however, there is insufficient demand now to support a commuter service between Four Marks and

Alresford, there is unlikely to be any significantly greater demand for a commuter line to Farnham, especially with the present rail link Alton and Farnham. CHARTS identifies a potential role for the line, but with no firm land use proposal it would not be appropriate to raise false hopes in the Local Plan. Again, the matter should be kept under review.

*

- 4.57 On the third issue, any lack of car parking at these stations would best be considered under Policy T17 and its supporting text. The text explains that need for it will be kept under review. Any future provision will need to be in line with the appropriate Area Transport Strategy.

Recommendation

- 4.58 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as set out in the Latest Proposed Change (PIC003.4).

PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS

POLICY T3

Objections

First Deposit

112/5118	Chichester District Council
125/5132	East Hampshire Cyclists Forum
1278/7237	CPRE
1578/8867	The Petersfield Society
733/8910	Liss Forest Residents Association
1924/9159	Erringham Investments Ltd
1639/10085	East Hampshire AONB Office

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the proposed cycle network should be shown on Inset Maps;
- 2) Whether the Policy should encourage developer funding for cycling facilities;
- 3) Whether it should anticipate the need to provide safe access to cycle routes where high volumes of fast moving traffic is a danger to cyclists;
- 4) Whether it should address matters of safety, convenience and pollution and in particular for the Petersfield town centre;
- 5) Whether it should recognise the need for a continuous footpath along Forest Road, Liss Forest;
- 6) Whether *development proposals which are likely to generate significant levels of travel demand will be permitted only where the development can be served effectively by walking and cycling* is realistic;
- 7) Whether the text should mention that new industrial development should include secure storage, shower and changing facilities for cyclists.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.59 One of the main aims of the transport strategy is to encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport in order to reduce reliance on the private car. If encouragement is to be given to cycling, land use proposals for it should be given due prominence on the Proposal Map and its Insets. The Council's Cycle Plan may be reviewed in parts, but that is no reason not to identify the cycle network, the majority of which is unlikely to be changed in any material way. Where a cycle route requires a change in the use of land, it should be shown on the Proposals Map and/or relevant Inset Map.

*

4.60 On the second issue, SD4.042 meets the Objector's useful point. It, Policy GS4 and Circular 1/97 should be a suitable basis upon which to proceed with all reasonableness.

*

4.61 Thirdly, safety on and access to cycle routes are matters of detailed design that would be tackled at that stage of a scheme. There is no need for the Policy to spell out these matters. Safety is fundamental to the success of any network of cycle ways if a material shift to this form of transport is to be achieved. The Council confirms that wherever possible new cycle routes will be provided away from roads and that they would serve areas of high population density. The extent to which modal shift is secured will no doubt be monitored.

*

4.62 On the fourth issue, SDDP paragraph 4.33 confirms that the District and County Councils will promote traffic management measures to improve road safety and the environment mainly through procedures other than under the land use planning regime. The key elements of Petersfield Area Transport Study, including proposals for the town centre, are set out at SD4.014. In this land use document, the SDDP, there is no need for more detail.

*

4.63 Fifthly, it would not be appropriate to include a “wish list” for the provision of footpaths (or any other facility) in the Local Plan without a firm commitment to a change in the use of land within the plan period from the Highways Authority (or any other provider). The Council confirms that when development proposals are being considered in Liss Forest, an assessment will be made as to how pedestrian access could be achieved or enhanced. I do, however, recommend against significant residential development in this part of the District.

*

4.64 Sixthly, the drive to ensure that significant travel generators are served by good means for walking and cycling is a primary aim of promoting such development in sustainable places. This serves to reduce dependency on the private car, as urged in national policy in PPG 13, and with which the Policy accords. The statement is realistic and there is no need to modify it.

*

4.65 On the seventh issue, paragraph 4.54 confirms that the Council will seek the provision of secure storage, shower and changing facilities for cyclists at places of employment. This meets the Objector’s concerns.

Recommendation

4.66 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

- A) by showing, where there is a proposed change in the use of land, the Council’s cycle network on the Proposals Map and/or on relevant Inset Maps;
- B) POLICY T3

...AND THE DISTRICT-WIDE CYCLE NETWORK. WHERE APPROPRIATE, CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE SOUGHT FOR THE PROVISION OF NEW, AND/OR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING, PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ROUTES. IN NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT,....

POLICY T4

Objections

First Deposit

455/6737 Mr L Axel-Berg
1692/9241 Alton Friends of the Earth
1847/9557 Sussex Downs Conservation Board

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should refer to the safety of horses;
- 2) Whether it should protect disused railway tracks, seek funds for their use for future transport and upgrade the footpath from Southfield Farm to and beyond Lower Farringdon Farm;
- 3) Whether it should encourage the provision of cycling and cyclists' facilities in new employment schemes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.67 The Policy seeks to protect the amenity of users of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways. Horses and their riders use bridleways, and so their protection is a material consideration. There is no need to labour the point.

*

4.68 On the second issue, SD4.049 requires that when redundant railway land is made available the local authority should be approached so that it can consider its potential use for transport facilities. This meets the Objector's valid concern. It would, however, be prudent for the Council to go a little further in its protective capacity. The Local Plan should confirm that the Council will ensure, where appropriate, that disused railway land will not be developed in a way that would compromise its potential for transport or leisure use.

4.69 The seeking of funds to bring about the repair and re-use of disused railway lines is not a suitable topic for inclusion in a Local Plan. Similarly, the feasibility of upgrading of any particular route is a detailed matter that would need to be considered by the responsible highway authority outside the local plan process.

*

4.70 Lastly, paragraph 4.54 suitably deals with the matter of facilities for cyclists in places of employment.

Recommendation

4.71 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by adding to Paragraph SD4.049:

Pending such consideration, the Council will seek to ensure that the tracks of disused railway lines are not developed in a way that would compromise their use for any transport or leisure purpose.

POLICY T5

Objections

First Deposit

897/8488 The Ramblers' Association
1578/8869 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether the Proposals Map should include existing Rights of Way and, in particular, the footpath link between St Peter's Road and Hylton Road, Petersfield.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.72 The Council argues that because Rights of Way are subject to change over time it would not be appropriate to show them on the Proposal Map. I agree. This is, however, a matter of legitimate public interest and the supporting text should refer to the Definitive Map that shows them.
- 4.73 The Council confirms that the improvement of the footpath between St Peter's Road and Hylton Road is a requirement of a planning permission for the Tesco Superstore. No change of use is involved, and so it would not be appropriate to show the route on the Proposals Map.

Recommendation

- 4.74 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by adding to Paragraph 4.25:

A copy of the Definitive Map of existing Rights of Way in the District is held in the District Council offices and is available for public inspection.

CYCLING

PARAGRAPH 4.21

Objections

First Deposit

1108/7144	Ms J M Burrell
1110/7155	Mr G J Lampton
1111/7163	Mr A Parkes
1289/7958	Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1622/8428	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1031/9885	G May

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the provision of the cycle route between Four Marks and Holybourne should be pursued;
- 2) Whether the construction of cycle tracks would be the subject of other provisions of the Local Plan including Policy T8 (Road Schemes) and nature conservation protection policies;
- 3) Whether representations should be made to South West Trains to enable more than 2 personal cycles to be carried on their trains.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.75 The SDDP makes no mention of a cycle route between Holybourne and Four Marks. The objection is in relation to a proposed cycle route that is identified in the East Hampshire Cycle Plan that was adopted in 1999. This paragraph and those that follow emphasise the part that cycling could play in providing a flexible, cheap, environmentally benign form of transport with important health benefits. Accordingly this aspect of the SDDP is wholly in accordance with national guidance at, for example, PPG 13 paragraphs 78-80. The proposed cycle route would make an important contribution to the strategy to reduce reliance on the private car by providing an alternative and sustainable means of transport between these settlements. In principle, therefore, it should be pursued.

4.76 The Council confirms that parts of the Holybourne to Four Marks route have been funded through the Local Transport Plan and CHARTS, although neither identifies routes to which priority will be given. Where a proposed cycle route directly involves the development or use of land it should appear as a policy and/or proposal in the Local Plan. This would follow similar national advice that land use transport proposals should be included in the development plan. It applies in this case.

*

4.77 On the second issue, the Council confirms that the construction of new cycle routes would be the subject of planning permission and would be subject to the policies of the Local Plan, including Policies C3-C5 dealing with nature conservation issues. The Objectors' concerns are already suitably safeguarded.

*

4.78 On the third issue, the content and application of regulations for the carrying of cycles on trains is not a matter for the Local Plan. It should be pursued through the consultation process in drawing up the Local Transport Plan and Local Area Transport Strategies. Hopefully the train operators will be receptive. It is a small, though important, part of an integrated transport strategy.

Recommendation

4.79 I recommend that, provided a change in the use of land is involved, the SDDP be modified by showing the proposed cycle route between Holybourne and Four Marks on the appropriate Inset Maps.

PARAGRAPH 4.23

Objections

First Deposit

1692/9223 Alton Friends of the Earth
1031/9896 G May

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the text should be changed speedily to remedy any shortcomings identified in the use of cycleways;
- 2) Whether the Local Plan should pursue the provision of a cycle path along the entire length of the A325.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.80 The Objector's valid point is that where an existing cycle route fails to provide a safe and convenient link between homes, shops and schools a mechanism should exist, within the Local Plan, to bring about an improvement. I am not entirely satisfied that the monitoring provisions of the SDDP includes an effective means of achieving it. Section 2 of Appendix B sets out "The Basis of the Sustainability Appraisal". This sets the scene in a general way for achieving the monitoring of matters such as safety and convenience in the use of cycle paths. But items 2 (Transport, Energy: Efficiency – Modes) and 18 (Safety) do not cover this point. It may be that the matter would be monitored through the Hampshire Local Transport Plan/Strategies (Document CD7/3). Even so, it would be sensible to mention it in the Local Plan Appendix B.

*

4.81 The Council confirms that its Cycle Plan includes provision for a cycle route along most of the A325. It would be a matter for the Council, in reviewing it, to consider the feasibility of continuing the cycle route along the entire length of the A325, a distance of some 13 km. Presumably the route would be within the highway boundary, so there would be no change in the use of land.

Recommendation

4.82 I recommend that the SDDP be modified at Appendix B to confirm that safety and convenience of cycle paths will be monitored.

WALKING/HORSERIDING

PARAGRAPH 4.25

Objections

First Deposit

897/8517 The Ramblers' Association
1622/8429 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the paragraph should include suggestions for “safe links” between different stretches of the rights of way system, require speed limits on country lanes and give non-car traffic priority within the AONB;
- 2) Whether it should ensure that proposals for new cycle-tracks, footpaths and bridleways would not harm nature conservation interests.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.83 Detailed suggestions are made for improving Rights of Way. This is too detailed a matter for the Local Plan but it has been passed to Council staff that deal with it. The making of lanes safer for non-motorised traffic is a traffic management matter. I would expect initial consideration by the Highways Authority in conjunction with the Council, possibly in the context of consultations for a future review of the Local Transport Plan and the strategies developed within it.

*

4.84 On the second issue, any such proposal for which planning permission was required would be assessed against SDDP Policies C3-C5 and any other material consideration. There is no need to repeat them here.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.26

Objections

First Deposit

758/8366 Miss J Kemp
1309/8945 British Horse Society
1503/9995 Mrs F Axel-Berg

Main Issue

Whether the safety of horse riders needs to be mentioned.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.86 This paragraph emphasises the need to promote those forms of travel that will reduce dependence on the private car for short journeys, especially walking and cycling. That seldom applies to horse riding, a mainly recreational pursuit. There is no need to modify.

Recommendation

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

NEW RECREATIONAL FOOTPATHS POLICY T6

Objections

First Deposit

368/5819	Hampshire Constabulary
1278/7245	CPRE
1309/8944	British Horse Society
1960/10274	Liss Village Design Group
1829/9141	No name supplied
1639/10090	East Hampshire AONB Office
1620/8166	Whitehill Town Council

Second Deposit SD4.047

3046/10570	Rotherlands Conservation Group
------------	--------------------------------

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should require that new footpaths are wide enough for emergency vehicles and appropriately lit in urban areas; and whether it should encourage the use of footpath signs, particularly in wood;
- 2) Whether the protection of disused railway lines as recreational footpaths and cycleways should also include their use as bridleways;
- 3) Whether the Policy should refer to the Riverside Railway Walk and its associated feeder paths from Liss Forest and West Liss;
- 4) Whether the proposed route along the Tilmore Brook, Petersfield of Footpath No 48 and the text at SD4.047 pay sufficient regard to local nature conservation assets and physical conditions;
- 5) Whether the Policy should promote a link between Alexandra Park and Lindford, whether the link between Headley Mill and FP4 is required; and whether this part of the River Wey should be designated a SINC with no formal access to it.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.88 The new recreational footpaths that the Policy identifies pass mainly through the countryside and along water courses/rivers. In these cases it would not normally be desirable or practicable to design footpaths wide enough to take emergency vehicles. The paths could pass through rough terrain, including woodlands where artificial lighting would too often be intrusive in the rural scene. Generally, footpaths should be well lit in urban areas. Footpath signs and their design is not a land use matter and so inappropriate for inclusion in the Local Plan.

*

4.89 Secondly, SD4.048 rightly refers to bridleways.

*

4.90 Thirdly, the Policy's objective is to protect the course of proposed footpaths. Policy T4 seeks to protect existing Rights of Way. These include those to which the issue refers.

*

4.91 Fourthly, the Council states that the footpaths shown on the Inset Maps are indicative. That is the case with the footpath along the River Rother to the north of its connection with Tilmore Brook. The Council confirms that, before the route is determined, the likely environmental impact will be carefully assessed. Its course should avoid the otter enclosure/SINC. At present, the footpath which is a statutory right of way, runs through the SINC and will need to be diverted under the usual statutory procedures. The preferred route will be shown on the Inset Map in accordance with Map No TEP2 (Document CD15/4/T6). I support this clarification.

*

4.92 Lastly, the Council confirms that the proposed footpaths will link Bordon/Whitehill and Lindford with the River Wey. The link to the footpath along the River Wey from the River Deadwater is seen as a vital part of the proposed network. It will also connect Alexandra Park with the River Wey path. This path from near Washford Lane to Headley Mill is also seen as a key part of the public right of way network in the area.

4.93 I agree that these footpaths will provide an extensive and valuable system through an attractive wooded, riverside landscape along the Rivers Wey and Deadwater. They will also provide a useful pedestrian link between these settlements and make a valuable contribution to local recreation facilities.

4.94 The Council confirms that the area suggested for a SINC by the **Whitehill Town Council** does not meet its criteria for this status. With no evidence to the contrary, I see no basis for upholding the objection.

Recommendation

4.95 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by indicating on Inset Map 32b that section of Footpath No 48 that is intended to be diverted to avoid the otter enclosure/SINC as shown on Map No TEP2 (Document CD15/4/T6).

ACCESS FOR PEOPLE WITH IMPAIRED MOBILITY POLICY T7

Objections

First Deposit

1660/9810 Voluntary Action for East Hampshire

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should ensure that all planning and design takes place to ensure full access for people with disabilities, with reference to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and whether Listed Buildings should be exempt from this legislation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.96 The Policy states that development to which the public will reasonably be expected to have access, will be permitted only if provision is made for safe and convenient access by people with impaired mobility. It is amplified by SPG “Access for People with Disabilities”, with its advice and information on the design of buildings. It explains the Act and deals with matters concerning Listed Buildings and access to them. This is sufficient. The **Voluntary Action for East Hampshire** does not suggest an improved draft of the Policy, and I am not persuaded of any need for modification.

Recommendation

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

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY SCHEMES

PARAGRAPH 4.33

Objections

First Deposit

1578/8868 The Petersfield Society
996/8909 Mr & Mrs E Darter
1379/9432 Holybourne Village Association
1666/9877 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD4.052

1960/10276 Liss Village Design Group

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the paragraph should pay regard to the environmental quality of the locality in the implementation of traffic calming measures;
- 2) Whether Tower Road, Liphook should be returned to 2 way traffic, and whether traffic speed and volume in Holybourne should be the subject of a traffic management scheme;
- 3) Whether traffic calming measures should be considered for any new development and whether existing problems should be remedied;
- 4) Whether a new policy is needed for traffic calming and lorry bans to prevent “rat running” through villages.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.98 The Council has made extensive changes to the text. SD4.057 is concerned with environmental quality, road sign clutter and lighting in rural areas associated with traffic management schemes. These changes meet the concerns of the **Petersfield Society**.

*

4.99 This part of the SDDP is a general approach to highway improvements and traffic management schemes. Detailed suggestions for them would normally be considered by the County Council as Highways Authority, and by the District, town and parish councils outside the Local Plan process. They would not be suitably included in the Local Plan until they are firmly proposed and require a change in the use of land. That applies in the instances of the second issue.

*

4.100 Not all development proposals will justify traffic management measures. But where they do, owing to the amount of traffic generated, Policy T13 provides for contributions to be sought from the developer to fund on or off-site work. Circular 1/97 reasonableness will apply. It cannot normally reasonably be sought to put right existing problems.

*

4.101 Lastly, SD4.058 recognises that “rat running” can cause significant environmental and safety hazards within settlements. The text confirms that, where solutions are available, the Council will work with the Highways Authority to introduce appropriate traffic management measures. There is no need for further elaboration.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.058

Objections

First Deposit

1835/13074 Medstead Parish Council
760/14376 Mrs C Burns
910/14398 Headley Residents Association

Main Issues

- 1) Whether delays and other causes of rat-running, as at Butts Bridge and White Lane, Alton, should be remedied instead of relying on traffic management measures; whether the Local Plan should include proposals to deal with these causes, as at Medstead and with regard to heavy lorries and coaches on the B3004 road between Headley and Passfield;
- 2) Whether the Plan should provide for rural lanes to be restricted to “access only” as happens in Surrey.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.103 There is little that I can add to previous conclusions. Individual traffic management measures are not highlighted in the Local Plan, presumably because they will take place within the highway boundary and so involve no change in the use of land. The Council confirms, however, that there are at present no proposals for significant highway improvements to Butts Bridge and White Lane, Alton. The exception to this would be if development of the former Lord Mayor Treloar Hospital site resulted in the need for improvements to roads around Butts Bridge which should reasonably be funded by the developer.

4.104 Traffic management measures would usually be considered under the provisions of the Hampshire Local Transport Plan (Document CD7/3) and the local transport strategies that it introduces. Particular problems outside the main settlements would normally be considered by the town/parish council in consultation with the District and County Councils. Schemes must gain Highways Authority support and then vie for a place in the relevant funding programme. Again, this process takes place outside that of the Local Plan unless there are land use implications.

*

4.105 The management and control of traffic using rural lanes is another matter for the Highways Authority. It would decide on any change to the types of traffic allowed on rural lanes, following consultation with interested parties. Any change in the use of land would be reflected in the Local Plan.

Recommendation

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

ROAD SCHEMES POLICY T8

Objections

First Deposit

322/5867 Frogmore Lane Residents Association
690/8654 Mrs A Davis
1611/9495 Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Local Plan should include particular highway improvements;
- 2) Whether more development will generate additional heavy goods vehicles and lead to pressure for wider roads.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.107 Various suggestions are made. They include a southern access to the Motorway at Clanfield, the identification of land at Whitehill/Bordon for a south-western relief road from the Station Road area to the Longmoor Road area to link potential new school sites and divert traffic from The Square, and a long term relief road at Bramshott/Liphook to divert through traffic that uses Headley and Haslemere Roads away from The Square. For reasons outlined, the Local Plan process is not the appropriate means to seek road improvements. They first need Highways Authority approval and inclusion in a funding programme before being included in a Local Plan, and then only if a change in the use of land is involved.

*

4.108 Secondly, Paragraph 4.34 confirms that it is not desirable on feasibility and environmental grounds to try to meet future levels of demand for road space by building new roads and, by implication, widening existing ones. New development will inevitably result in additional traffic that could put greater strain on roads. Whether that would lead to more heavy goods vehicles and pressure for road widening would depend upon the circumstances of the case. It would be wrong to prohibit all road schemes without knowing them. It is better to consider development proposals against such criteria as those in PPG 3 paragraph 31, upon which the strategy of the Local Plan should be based.

4.109 I suggest a minor re-draft of the Policy.

Recommendation

4.110 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY T8

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR A ROAD PROPOSAL ONLY WHERE IT WOULD MITIGATE OR OVERCOME ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, IMPROVE SAFETY AND/OR CONVENIENCE ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY OR PROVIDE ACCESS TO A NEW DEVELOPMENT.

PARAGRAPH 4.34

Objection

First Deposit

68/6332 Environment Agency

Main Issue

Whether the text should acknowledge the impact of road schemes on nature conservation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.111 There is no need. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and Policies C3-C5 provide the protection sought.

Recommendation

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

A325 ROUTE STRATEGY (GREATHAM TO HOLT POUND) POLICY T10

Objections

First Deposit

652/8283 Mr D C Platford
1622/8440 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight

Second Deposit SD4.060

1620/13267 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether, given the predictions that traffic will continue to increase, the Council should carefully consider the impact of any development proposals on the A325 road;
- 2) Whether the nature conservation interests are likely to be harmed by the proposed improvements to the Whitehill Crossroads junction;
- 3) Whether an addition to the Policy is needed to safeguard land required for any improvement promoted within the plan period.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.113 Proposals would be considered under Policy T11 (Highway Issues – New Development). Development involving a new or improved access would be permitted only if it did not prejudice the safety, free flow, function and character of the road and would be acceptable in environmental terms. These safeguards meet the Objector's concerns.

*

4.114 On the second issue, the Council confirms that improvement is underway. There is therefore no need to protect the land required for it and the Policy is rightly deleted.

*

4.115 Thirdly, the Council is not aware at present of any need for land for improvements beyond the highway boundary. Should land beyond it be required for this purpose, it is likely to be acquired when the timing of the proposal is known. This is a reasonable approach. There is no need for a policy to cover the prospect of additional land being required at some time in the future.

Recommendation

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

HIGHWAY ISSUES – NEW DEVELOPMENT

POLICY T11

Objections

First Deposit

1921/9087 Rydon Homes
1666/9879 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD4.063

1278/14626 CPRE

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy is too restrictive and prevents beneficial change and whether it fails to balance environmental implications against the need for a new or improved access;
- 2) Whether the replacement of *adverse* with *unacceptable* weakens environmental protection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.117 The usual key consideration is that planning permission should be granted provided that it would not cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. That is the thrust of the Policy and it is therefore well-founded. It is unlikely to be the only policy in the development plan brought to bear on a proposal, and so the Council would not be prevented from taking others into account and thereby weighing often competing objectives in coming to a decision. Those objectives might well include the character of a settlement, a consideration of especial importance where there is a Conservation Area.

*

4.118 I deal elsewhere with qualifications of harm and similar terms, including in my letter to the Council's Chief Executive. The Policy should be re-drafted accordingly, and to make it more explicit. I am also concerned about the reference in the Policy to the Highway Authority's adopted standards. They may well change, and it would be better to regard them as Supplementary Planning Guidance instead of elevating them to part of an adopted Local Plan policy. The supporting text should refer to them.

Recommendation

4.119 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY T11

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT REQUIRING A NEW OR IMPROVED ACCESS WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD NOT:

- A) CAUSE DANGER OR INCONVENIENCE ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY; OR***
- B) HARM THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDINGS***

OR CAUSE ANY OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE.

The Council will expect the design of the access, and especially its junction with the public highway, to accord with the Highway Authority's latest adopted standards.

POLICY T12

Objections

First Deposit

1933/8242 Highways Agency
1666/10366 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD4.066

1933/11538 Highways Agency

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC004.4 (page 65).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the text should refer to the Highway Agency's policy concerning proposed developments adjacent to All-Purpose Trunk Roads and to advice in PPG 13 about Traffic Impact Assessments;
- 2) Whether the Policy would protect the character of a settlement.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.120 SD4.066 refers to the key parts of national guidance that explain the approach to be taken in respect of proposed development adjacent to All-purpose Trunk Roads. It meets the **Highway Agency's** point. The Latest Proposed Change refers to the most recent guidance (DTLR Circular 4/2001). SDDP paragraph 4.13 and PIC002.4 outline the circumstances where a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan is likely to be required. No further elaboration is needed.

*

4.121 There is nothing that I can add to my conclusions of Policy T11 about the protection of the character of settlements.

Recommendation

4.122 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC004.4).

OFF-SITE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY T13

Objections

First Deposit

1578/8870 The Petersfield Society

Second Deposit SD4.067

3820/14318 Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy will ensure that development will take place on a site allocated for it where land for substantial access works is required;
- 2) Whether SD4.067 places too onerous a duty on a prospective developer.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.123 The Policy deals with those situations where a development would be likely to place additional burdens on roads and outlines the means whereby developers will be expected to provide for that extra demand. Such provision could cover a range of matters, including additional land for a new or improved highway. Arrangements would have to meet the tests of reasonableness laid down in Circulars 11/95 (Planning Conditions) and 1/97 (Planning Obligations). The Policy meets the Objectors' concerns, although I doubt that it adds anything of substance to Policy GS4. That ensures that planning permission will not be granted for a development unless arrangements are made for the provision of any infrastructure reasonably required by that development. There is no need for repetition.

*

4.124 On the second issue, it is clear from the drafting of the Policy that a developer would be expected to fund improvements to infrastructure arising from the increased demands of the development itself. The Policy meets the tests of Circular 1/97 and so is not too onerous. Again, however, Policy GS4 covers the point about reasonableness.

Recommendation

4.125 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of Policy T13.

FREIGHT MOVEMENTS

POLICY T14

Objections

First Deposit

1692/9258 Alton Friends of the Earth

Second Deposit SD4.073

567/11531 Network Rail

1306/12742 Government Office for the South East (GOSE)

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should identify the transport of goods by rail as a preferred option in order to minimise pollution, and to accord with national and Structure Plan policies;
- 2) Whether the Policy should highlight the responsibility of developers to show that they have given adequate consideration to the feasibility of transport to and from their premises by rail.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.126 SD4.073 provides that the transfer of goods from road to rail will be required, where appropriate, through planning conditions or agreements. The Policy should, however, place more emphasis on the use of railways for the carriage of freight to reflect national, regional and county objectives. I appreciate that there may be only limited opportunities to do so for reasons that include the District's lack of inter-modal freight facilities. But a more positive stance would strengthen the Council's hand if there was an opportunity to further this worthwhile aim. I also suggest that SD4.073 should be accompanied by a short explanation describing the circumstances where the transfer of goods from road to rail is likely to be achieved. It would be sensible to link any explanation to national and Structure Plan policies.

*

4.127 On the second issue, my comments above deal with some of the points made by **Network Rail** and **GOSE**. Given the limited scope for bringing about the transfer, I consider that my recommended modification would be better than the Policy's placing a responsibility on developers to consider the feasibility of transport of goods by rail. Similarly, I see no need to require the location of freight-generating industries to be located near inter-modal freight facilities. My recommended modification would accommodate any change in circumstances.

4.128 I am not convinced that the first part of the Policy adds anything of substance to, for example, Policies GS4, T11 and T12. The emphasis should be more on supporting text.

Recommendation

4.129 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of Policy T14 and by adding the following paragraph to the supporting text:

The Council will need to be satisfied that development likely to generate heavy goods vehicles includes suitable safety measures, both on and off-site. Where appropriate, it will seek to enter into an agreement with the developer, or attach a condition, to ensure the carriage of freight by rail. It will encourage measures to increase the proportion of freight moved by rail and those that will facilitate the transfer of the carriage of goods from road to rail. Where possible, existing or former rail facilities that would assist in furthering this aim will be safeguarded.

ROAD USER FACILITIES

POLICY T15

Objections

First Deposit

1622/8441 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1892/9719 Service Stations (Southern)

Main Issues

Whether the Policy should be re-worded to refer to the need to protect features of wildlife value and to the planning permission for a Motorist Service Area near Buckmore Farm.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.130 SDDP Policies C3-C5 provide protection to features of wildlife value. There is no need for repetition.
- 4.131 The Motorist Service Area is built, it operates and is there for all to see. It would be misleading for the Local Plan to imply that it is a proposal.

Recommendation

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

PARKING STANDARDS

POLICY T16

Objections

First Deposit

357/5744	Mr B R Winter
567/6342	Network Rail
1293/8074	George Wimpey (UK) Ltd
1620/8172	Whitehill Town Council
1306/8540	Government Office for the South East (GOSE)
1933/9259	Highways Agency
1870/10111	Tesco Stores Limited

Second Deposit SD4.077

125/12116	East Hampshire Cyclists Forum
-----------	-------------------------------

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC005.4 (page 66).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether provision of off-street car parking would be justified where it would result in the removal of on-street parking and the freer flow of traffic, and whether the relaxation of standards should be allowed where it would lead to more on-street parking;
- 2) Whether a separate policy is required to deal with car parking at railway stations and whether the train operating companies should be given encouragement and flexibility to provide car parking to serve their customers;
- 3) Whether car parking standards should be more flexible and relate to specific requirements; whether *only* should be deleted and whether, in its advice on new standards, PPG 13 provides scope for setting more stringent requirements;
- 4) Whether the parking standards should be included as part of the Local Plan; whether the text should continue to refer to commuted payments and whether the text should refer to maximum or minimum standards.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.133 The Council's strategy and policy is based on the approach to parking standards set out in PPG 13 (March 2001). This adopts a more restrictive approach than did previous national advice, requiring local planning authorities to adopt maximum parking standards in their local plans. The Latest Proposed Change explains that the Council adopts the County Council's standards in its Supplementary Planning Guidance "Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards - Summer 2002" (Document CD7/4) for the purposes of Policy

T16 and development control. This incorporates the most recent national guidance on parking standards, which will be applied throughout Hampshire. I think that it would be useful for SDDP paragraph 4.48, as proposed to be changed by PIC005.4, came immediately after the Policy.

4.134 If on-street parking is causing an obstruction or creating a hazard to safety in Alton or anywhere else, I would expect the matter to be remedied with local traffic management measures or through local transport plans. The Council might reasonably insist on adequate off-street parking to ensure that any existing on-street parking problems are not made worse. There may be occasions where standards for off-street parking might reasonably be relaxed, even if that would result in more on-street parking. A balance would need to be struck between the reasons for relaxation and the problems that might be created or aggravated on the public highway. The SDDP contains policies for the objectives likely to be relevant in particular cases, and it is difficult to see how the Local Plan as a land use document could be of further assistance.

4.135 The application of maximum parking standards is part of the SDDP's transport strategy that seeks to reduce the dependency on car use. If the latest standards lead to congestion and obstruction as a result of on-street parking, I would expect the matter to be considered as part of the monitoring of the Policy or remedied with a local traffic management scheme or as part of the review of the local transport plan.

*

4.136 On the second issue, I see no reason why parking at railway stations deserves a separate policy. Proposals to provide additional parking could be considered on their merits, if necessary, as an exception to the policy. Similarly, I see no reason why train operating companies should not be able to initiate schemes to provide car parking for their customers. I would expect any such initiative to be undertaken in consultation with the County and District Councils and in the context of the local transport plan. There is no need for modification on this count.

*

4.137 Thirdly, the parking standards are to be applied throughout the County. They are part of an integrated and balanced transport strategy that will be kept under review (Document CD7/4, paragraph 6.3). They are intended to be robust, but flexible, in their application. They will be applied more stringently in locations where accessibility by public transport and other non-car modes is good (Document CD7/4, page 8, Proposal 3a and Appendix 1, Section 2). There is thus already sufficient flexibility in their application to particular circumstances. *Only*, or similar, should stay; it sets the right tone. In view of the importance of a parking regime, the Policy should be negatively worded to ensure that the correct standard is applied.

*

4.138 On the fourth issue, the County Council has developed its parking standards in partnership with the constituent authorities. They have been subject to *consultations with those who have an interest in parking as part of a sustainable economy and environment for Hampshire*. This involved 167 organisations including developers, District Councils, adjoining councils, transport operators, Government agencies and other interested parties (HCC Committee Report-Hampshire Parking Strategy & Standards 17/9/2001). This extensive consultation demands that much weight be given to the agreed standards. But as they will be subject to review from time to time, and probably more frequently than the Local Plan, they should have the status of SPG. The Latest Proposed Change makes that clear, and I endorse it.

4.139 Commuted payments in lieu of parking space and minimum parking standards are deleted from the SDDP, and rightly so.

Recommendation

4.140 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC005.4) and as follows:

POLICY T16

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR A PROPOSAL UNLESS IT INCLUDES SPACE FOR THE PARKING OF VEHICLES, INCLUDING CYCLES,

and with SDDP Paragraph 4.48 coming immediately after the Policy.

PARAGRAPH 4.48

Objections

First Deposit

1591/9104 Rowlands Castle Parish Council
1666/9880 Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD4.079

1666/13036 Cllr Mr D Clegg
1620/13268 Whitehill Town Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC005.4 (page 66).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should require parking space for visitors as well as residents to avoid increasing on-street parking and to protect the character of settlements;
- 2) Whether minimum standards should be cited to prevent on-street parking.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.141 The County Council's parking standards take into consideration the parking needs of visitors (see CD7/4, Table 1, Note 1, 4th bullet point).

*

4.142 Secondly, tighter controls on parking and growing car ownership will inevitably lead to situations where demand for space exceeds supply. Transport policies seek to persuade people to use means other than the car. For larger developments, this would be achieved through transport assessments to optimise the use of alternative modes of transport. Where it causes a problem, on-street car parking whether associated with commercial or residential use may need to be controlled through traffic management schemes and/or parking controls. Tensions that may arise as a result of a more restrictive parking policy do not justify the relaxation of standards to the point where car use is uncontrolled and the transport strategy undermined. That could result with the setting of minimum standards.

4.143 National policy at PPG13 paragraph 53 requires that all parking standards, with the exception of those for people with disabilities, be set as maxima in local plans. Local circumstances do not outweigh it.

Recommendation

4.144 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC005.4).

PARAGRAPH 4.49

Objection

First Deposit

1306/8541 Government Office for the South East (GOSE)

Main Issue

Whether the removal of minimum parking standards obviates the need for commuted payments in lieu of parking space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.145 References to commuted payments are deleted under SD4.081, SD4.082, SD4.083, SD4.084 and SD4.085. This meets **GOSE**'s point.

Recommendation

4.146 I recommend that no change be made to the SDDP.

PARAGRAPH 4.50

Objection

Second Deposit SD4.084

125/13936 East Hampshire Cyclists Forum

Main Issue

Whether deletion of references to commuted payments will remove a vital source of finance for improvements in conditions for cyclists.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.147 The removal of commuted payments could indeed mean that a source of funding for the provision or improvement of cyclists' facilities would no longer be available. This, however, does not justify the retention of commuted payments, which are no longer supportable with the abandonment of minimum parking standards. However, Policy T3 does allow for contributions to the improvement of cyclists' facilities to be sought in those cases where it would be appropriate.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.53

Objection

First Deposit

368/5820 Hampshire Constabulary

Main Issues

Whether the text should be expanded to ensure that car parks incorporate standards set down by the Secured Car Parks Scheme.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.149 The Council accepts that new car parks should meet standards laid down in this Scheme. It suggests, however, that it would be best noted at the end of paragraph 4.56, which deals with the provision of new car parks as part of the Area Transport Strategies. I agree.

Recommendation

4.150 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the following addition to paragraph 4.56:

The Council will expect new car parks to incorporate standards set down in the Secured Car Parks Scheme.

CAR PARK ALLOCATIONS

POLICY T17

Objections

First Deposit

161/5172	E R J Finneron
404/5689	Petersfield Town Council
9/6526	Stroud Parish Council
1306/8542	Government Office for the South East (GOSE)
1591/9105	Rowlands Castle Parish Council
1611/9499	Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
1499/9985	Mr J F Walters
1521/10006	Professor M J Withers
1530/10049	Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society
1530/10050	Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society
1611/9496	Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
1348/9005	Mrs A McNamara
1886/9700	Ushers of Trowbridge Plc

Main Issues

- 1) Whether car parks are being proposed without due regard to the local transport strategy;
- 2) Whether the Policy should provide for secure off-street parking for properties in Alton that lack it, take account of the needs of rural dwellers who need cars for work and shopping, provide for more spaces in Petersfield town centre and Rowlands Castle for, for example, residents of new housing schemes;
- 3) Whether there are enough parking spaces for the number of people wishing to use them;
- 4) Whether car parks should be located close to approaches to town and village centres to reduce travel through the built-up areas, and whether on-street parking should be discouraged where roads are sufficiently wide to accommodate it;
- 5) Whether the car park proposed at Liphook should be for employees, rail users and shoppers and whether the Local Plan should allocate land for an off-street car park in the library/scout hut area to serve Bramshott & Liphook.
- 6) Whether an additional car park is required in Liss and whether it should be proposed on privately owned land to prevent its development for an alternative town centre use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.151 The Council accepts that the provision of additional car parking at the 4 places identified should stem from the local transport strategy. The first sentence to the Policy is now supporting text and suitably relates the provision of car parks to the local transport and parking strategies. I therefore endorse SD4.089 which meets **GOSE's** objection.

*

4.152 On the second issue, the emphasis of the Area Transport Strategies (Documents CD7/1 & CD7/2 - CHARTS & SEHTS) is to locate development where the need to travel is reduced and which are served by a choice of transport modes. The car parks to which the Policy refers would serve town and village centres, mainly for short stay users, to support their economic well-being. Even if land were available, the provision of off-street parking space to accommodate increased car ownership in the areas to which the issue refers is unlikely to accord with the Local Plan's parking strategy. This strategy seeks to reduce reliance on the private car.

4.153 The Council confirms, and I accept, that it is neither practicable nor appropriate to identify all the areas with particular parking needs. Rightly, it says, more parking space would not be provided without first carrying out a local transport assessment. This applies to Petersfield town centre and Rowlands Castle. There is no cause for changing the Policy prior to any transport assessment that might, or might not, confirm need and assess the best means of meeting it. The provision of any extra space required would depend on land being available.

*

4.154 On the third issue, with rising car ownership and use it is increasingly unlikely that there will be enough parking spaces to meet demand at peak periods. That applies especially in parts of South East England like East Hampshire where there is already mounting pressure on road and parking space. This is a key factor why the Government seeks to reduce reliance on the private car, especially in urban areas where there is usually some choice in the means of transport. It would therefore be unreasonable and undermining of national policy for the Local Plan to provide enough parking space to meet unrestricted demand. Better to provide extra spaces only where justified by a transport assessment. That is the Council's approach, and I support it.

*

4.155 Fourthly, the location of a proposed car park is dictated to a large extent by the availability of land close to town/district centres. Ideally, they should be at the approaches to a centre to discourage through traffic through the built up area, yet within convenient walking distance of the main concentration of shops and other facilities. Unfortunately, that is not always possible. The provision of on-street car parking space needs to be considered against a number of factors as explained in SDDP paragraph 4.58. Where these factors, particularly safety, amenity and access are prejudiced, on-street parking restrictions are a legitimate means of control. The width of the road is not likely to be the only consideration. Its function, the nature of the traffic passing through it and the parking regime in the locality are also legitimate matters, as the paragraph implies. There is no need to modify the text.

*

4.156 On the fifth issue, the Council confirms that the proposed car park at the Ordnance Supply Unit at Liphook will be as close as possible to the railway station. This will augment existing spaces for people travelling by train, and hence make public transport more attractive. Land allocated for employment will include a car park.

4.157 The scout hut site has been landscaped and is part of the open space close to the library. The library car park is intended to serve it alone, its limited size making it unsuitable for more general use. The envisaged car park at The Square is not site specific, but is intended to be at the rear of properties fronting The Square, London Road and Haslemere

Road. It is hoped that a proposal that includes rear servicing will come forward as part of a small scale development proposal within a comprehensive development scheme (SDDP paragraph 4.60 and Inset Map 23). This approach is reasonable.

*

4.158 Sixthly, most public parking space in Liss is at Hill Brow. The Council considers that this is too far from the railway station and community centre (250 m) and from the shops in the village centre (150 m), resulting in unauthorised car parking closer to these facilities. The Council fears that private parking areas that the public uses may not always be generally available. Presumably this applies to car parks attached to public houses and other establishments. If the safeguarded land at Rake Road is attached to the public house, the text should say so and give a brief explanation about implementation.

-0-

4.159 I applaud the intention to provide more spaces where there is demand for it and where it accords with the Local Plan's sustainability credentials. It is not sufficient, however, for the Policy to safeguard land without identifying it on the Proposals Map. Either an intention should be explained in the supporting text, or the Policy should allocate land that can be shown on the Proposals Map. The Council should proceed on that basis.

Recommendation

4.160 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows;

POLICY T17

LAND IS ALLOCATED FOR VEHICLE PARKING AT...and the sites concerned shown on the Proposals Map;

and the supporting text to explain any less definite intentions, including identification of the Rake Road, Liss site and a brief explanation of implementation.

PARAGRAPH 4.56

Objection

First Deposit

1278/7251 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the provision of car parking at Hawkley and High Cross is appropriate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.161 SD4.092 deletes reference to this provision. The Change meets the Objection, and I see no reason to disagree.

Recommendation

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

SERVICING POLICY T18

Objection

First Deposit

1895/9734 English Heritage

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should encourage rear servicing and parking in historic towns.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.163 The Policy refers to Policies HE4-HE12 that deal with the protection of conservation areas and Listed Buildings. These other Policies should ensure that the character and appearance of the historic cores of the District's towns and villages would be protected from insensitive proposals to incorporate rear servicing and car parking within them. There are also, of course, statutory requirements concerning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.
- 4.164 There is no need for the Policy to cross-refer to other Policies, because the Local Plan should be read as a whole. Drafting could also better accord with advice in the Good Practice Guide.

Recommendation

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

POLICY T18

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR RETAIL OR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OR RE-DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS IN TOWN, VILLAGE AND LOCAL CENTRES UNLESS ADEQUATE SERVICING IS PROVIDED THAT RESPECTS THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDINGS.

PARAGRAPH 4.59

Objection

First Deposit

1578/8871 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should restrict the hours available for front servicing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.166 The effect of front servicing on the free flow of traffic and pedestrian safety and convenience needs to be assessed on a case by case basis. If it is thought necessary to restrict the hours during which servicing should take place, this could be dealt with as part of a traffic management scheme. There is no need to modify the Policy or supporting text on this count.

Recommendation

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

CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

POLICY E1

Objection

First Deposit

1895/9737 English Heritage

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should refer to a presumption in favour of re-using existing buildings as a more efficient, but often more expensive, practice.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.168 This is a laudable aim, but the Council's control of the re-use or redevelopment of existing buildings is limited. It can prevent the demolition of Listed Buildings and buildings in a Conservation Area in accordance with Policies H8 and H9 and statutory requirements. As **English Heritage** acknowledges, modern buildings are usually more amenable to energy saving techniques.

4.169 I am doubtful about *where appropriate* in the Policy. That appears to me unduly to weaken it. It would be better to delete it and to apply the Policy where it is reasonable to do so.

Recommendation

4.170 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion from Policy E1 of ***WHERE APPROPRIATE***.

PARAGRAPH 4.63

Objections

First Deposit

1692/9261 Alton Friends of the Earth

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should encourage more use of renewable energy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.171 The paragraph gives encouragement to renewable sources of energy while seeking to ensure that external equipment is integrated within the design of the building. The example of solar panels is cited, with the suggestion that they should be provided within the roof profile of the building, particularly where proposed on the front elevation. It is reasonable to seek to balance the provision of renewable energy sources with aspects of design, particularly in East Hampshire with much of it being an AONB and containing many Conservation Areas. The text achieves that balance.

Recommendation

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

RENEWABLE ENERGY

POLICY E2

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7257	CPRE
1292/8026	Bentley Parish Council
1884/8084	FES (for the DTI)
1306/8543	Government Office for the South East (GOSE)
690/8655	Mrs A Davis
1578/8876	The Petersfield Society
1692/9263	Alton Friends of the Earth
1692/9278	Alton Friends of the Earth
1692/9281/2	Alton Friends of the Earth
1847/9558	Sussex Downs Conservation Board
1884/9693	FES (for the DTI)

Second Deposit SD4.107

1625/12888	The Countryside Agency
1639/12963	East Hampshire AONB Office

Second Deposit SD4.108

1279/12491	Liss Parish Council
------------	---------------------

Second Deposit SD4.110

1278/14629	CPRE
------------	------

Second Deposit SD4.111

1278/14631	CPRE
------------	------

Pre Inquiry Change PIC007.4

1279/15090	Liss Parish Council
1960/15227	Liss Village Design Group

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC007.4 and FPC12 (page 70).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy is too protective of the landscape and provides enough encouragement for the generation of electricity from renewable sources;
- 2) Whether its reference to national interest sufficiently accords with PPG 7 paragraph 4.8.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.173 The Policy is changed in several ways to seek to balance the need to encourage new sources of renewable energy with the protection of the AONB and the openness of strategic and local gaps. It also seeks to protect residential amenities from the harmful effects of wind turbines. Inevitably the Policy implies tensions, a not unusual state of affairs.
- 4.174 Renewable energy has undoubted advantages, and it would be wrong for the Council to impose a blanket prohibition on, for example, wind turbines throughout the rural areas of the District. They have the potential to cause material harm, especially in an exposed position in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Policy is criteria-based, which I consider to be the right approach. It outlines the likely material considerations in the determination of an application for planning permission. It is neither too protective of the landscape, within and without an AONB nor of the views towards and from it. Nor is it too cavalier in its approach to these important interests. The Latest Proposed Change assists in this objective.
- 4.175 SD4.116 introduces the subject of energy generation from biomass, prudently cautioning that generation plants and transmission lines could harm the landscape. I agree with the Council that it is not practicable for it to identify sites for the generation of electricity from this, or indeed any other renewable source. That stems especially from the sensitivity of the extensive and often exposed swathes of landscape that contribute so much to the character of East Hampshire. It would be better for a prospective developer to identify a site or sites and discuss them with the Council. The criteria of the Policy, and other relevant provisions of the development plan, would provide the context.

*

- 4.176 On the second issue, the caveat previously included within criterion b) which provided that development could be permitted in the AONB where justified in the national interest, has been relocated to criterion a) as SD4.107. It reflects PPS 7 paragraph 22 that supersedes the equivalent guidance in PPG 7. As SD4.107 follows national policy it is not too restrictive and, given the exception to development that might be warranted in the national interest, its inclusion in the Policy needs no further justification. The Policy complements Policies GS3 and C2 which set stringent tests for proposals in the rural areas, and those parts of it within the AONBs

-0-

- 4.177 There are other matters. *Harm* is shorter and thus better than *have an adverse effect on*. There is no need to qualify it, as I believe that I have mentioned before now. Other policies refer to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SINC’s and other aspects of heritage. There is no need for cross-reference or repetition.
- 4.178 Subject to my recommendation, the Policy strikes a balance between the laudable and frequently conflicting objectives of encouraging development for the generation of energy from renewable resources and the protection of the landscape. A distinction

should be drawn, however, between the Policy and the way in which it will be implemented and perhaps outweighed.

Recommendation

4.179 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY E2

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR THE GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY FROM RENEWABLE RESOURCES PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD NOT:

- A) HARM THE SPECIAL LANDSCAPE QUALITY OF THE AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) OR VIEWS INTO OR OUT OF IT;***
- B) HARM THE ATTRACTIVE LANDSCAPE OF AREAS OUTSIDE THE AONB;***
- C) RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY;***
- D) PREJUDICE THE OBJECTIVES OF A STRATEGIC OR LOCAL GAP;***
- E) AS IN SDDP;***
- F) AS IN SDDP;***
- G) AS h. IN SDDP.***

Supporting text immediately after the Policy:

The Council accepts that this Policy, like others, is capable of being outweighed by material considerations. These include the amount of electricity likely to be generated, the national need for clean renewable energy, and the inability to generate it elsewhere or in some other way. In all cases, provision should be made for the removal of wind turbines and restoration of the site if the turbines become redundant or stop generating electricity for a period of 12 months or more.

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.114

Objections

Second Deposit SD4.114

3820/14319 Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph wrongly imposes on developers an obligation to address renewable energy production within design proposals.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.180 The Government is committed to the production of 10% of electricity from renewable sources by 2010. If that target is to be met, every reasonable opportunity must be taken to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. The update to the Annex to PPG 22 (2002) stresses that a positive, strategic approach to planning for renewable energy is essential to help meet the target. Thus, RPG 9 (2001) recognises the importance of giving priority to energy conservation and it requires development plans to include proposals for renewable energy resources and to promote energy efficient measures as part of the design and form of development. Local planning authorities are urged to use their development control duties and the Building Regulations to influence the design of new development to incorporate the use of appropriate renewable energy heating or power systems (RPG 9, page 80, Policy INF4, b, iii).
- 4.181 Given the importance and priority that national and regional policies attribute to fostering the production of energy from renewable sources, this aspect of land use planning deserves the strongest support. This paragraph is entirely appropriate in seeking to ensure that significant consideration is given to secure those objectives at the design stage. The recently published PPS 22 (August 2004)) does not materially depart from this national and regional advice in that it advocates a criterion-based policy which should not rule out renewable energy technologies without sufficient reasoned justification to do otherwise. SDDP Policy E2 provides that approach. Local planning authorities are authorised to require a percentage of energy in new developments to come from on-site renewable sources, provided that it is not unduly burdensome and is viable in the context of the proposed scheme.
- 4.182 It is well known that planning for energy conservation/production as early as possible in the design stage can secure significant economies and improved efficiency in such matters as district heating, insulation and photovoltaics (solar panelling). I warmly support this paragraph and trust that the Council's officers and members will be encouraged to carry through the message when negotiating with prospective developers.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.65

Objections

First Deposit

1692/9279 Alton Friends of the Earth

Main Issue

Whether there should be more emphasis on the environmental benefits of wind energy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.184 The SDDP now rightly includes greater encouragement for this source of energy.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.116

Objections

Second Deposit SD4.116

1306/12745 Government Office for the South East (GOSE)
3820/14321 Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issues

- 1) Whether SD4.116 conforms with PPG 22 paragraph 25.
- 2) Whether the last sentence of the paragraph, dealing with visual impact, should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.186 PPS 22 replaces PPG 22. Its paragraph 6 states that local planning authorities should allocate sites for the generation of renewable energy only when a developer has indicated an interest in it, has confirmed that the development is viable and that it will be brought forward during the plan period. The Policy and supporting text conforms with this national policy. The subject will need to be monitored in the light of regional guidance on renewable energy (RPG 9), being reviewed at the time of writing.

*

4.187 On the second issue, Policy E2 includes suitable criteria against which the visual impact of a proposal would be assessed. This goes as far as necessary in this respect in providing the basis for the selection of sites.

-0-

4.188 In conclusion, the paragraph usefully amplifies the Policy. The text as a whole sets out the proper context for the weighing of issues and decisions in the selection of sites for the generation of biomass energy.

Recommendation

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

POLLUTION

SAFEGUARDING GENERAL AMENITY

POLICY P1

Objections

First Deposit

1306/8545 Government Office for the South East
1304/8739 Country Landowners Association
1578/8877 The Petersfield Society

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is too restrictive and/or superfluous, and whether the location of new development needs to be considered in relation to existing “bad neighbour” uses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.190 The Policy is deleted as a result of SD4.118. It would add little of substance to local and national policies, including SDDP Policies P2-P6 and those for the protection of living conditions. The SDDP is better without it.

Recommendation

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

UNPLEASANT EMISSIONS

POLICY P2

Objection

Pre Inquiry Change PIC008.4

3820/15297 Dalton Warner Davis

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC008.4 (page 71).

Main Issue

Whether the Latest Proposed Change is too prescriptive and fails to recognise that some deterioration in air quality may be acceptable.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.192 The Latest Proposed Change adds *a deterioration in air quality* to the list of hazards that would be resisted if they put at risk the health, safety or amenity of the users of land or the quality and enjoyment of the environment. These matters are so vital to the quality of life that they demand protection. Most of the pollutants mentioned can be measured, and it would be reasonable for the developer to show that the health and safety aspects of his proposal were acceptable and/or for the Council to show that demonstrable harm would be caused. Suitable planning conditions, or controls available in other regimes, might make a development acceptable in this respect.
- 4.193 There is no advantage in qualifying the degree of deterioration in air quality that would be acceptable with *significant*, as **Dalton Warner Davis** suggests. As with harm, the deterioration would have to be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission. That should go without saying, and so the Policy is not too prescriptive in seeking to highlight the importance of the need for new development to respect living and working conditions.
- 4.194 I would ask the Council to consider whether it should be a) *and* b) or a) *or* b). I think that the latter would be better, in that planning permission should be refused even if the proposal failed just one of the tests. Although perhaps they amount to more or less the same thing.

Recommendation

- 4.195 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC008.4).

PARAGRAPH 4.69

Objection

First Deposit

1306/8551 Government Office for the South East (GOSE)

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph duplicates the effect of other legislation and attempts to undermine consultation with other pollution control agencies.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.196 SD4.120 deletes this paragraph, and rightly so. I would expect the occasions when the Council went against the professional advice of these agencies to be so rare that there is no need to draw attention to them in the Local Plan.

Recommendation

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

NOISE POLLUTION

POLICY P3

Objection

First Deposit

1924/9161 Erringham Investements Ltd

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should acknowledge that the layout and design of a scheme can often minimise the impact upon living conditions.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.198 The Council accepts the point made by the Objector, but considers that acknowledgement of it is better in the supporting text than in the Policy. I agree. Paragraph 4.72, as amended by SD4.123, is fine.

Recommendation

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

POLICY P4

Objection

First Deposit

1847/9561 Sussex Downs Conservation Board

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should refer to areas of tranquillity or *undisturbed quietness* as important characteristics of the AONB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.200 The Council agrees that *tranquillity* in SDDP paragraph 4.71 should relate to the AONB as an area valued for its tranquillity. SD4.122 well meets the point.

Recommendation

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

LIGHT POLLUTION

POLICY P5

Objections

First Deposit

368/5821	Hampshire Constabulary
1278/7262	CPRE
1933/9260	Highways Agency
1847/9563	Sussex Downs Conservation Board
1639/10095	East Hampshire AONB Office

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC013.4 (page 73).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should be qualified with *commensurate with the need to deter criminals and reduce the fear of crime* and whether there should be a balance between aesthetic and security lighting to avoid light pollution;
- 2) Whether it should refer to the prevention of light spillage and glare from proposed development that would affect trunk roads;
- 3) Whether it should refer to the damaging effect of light pollution on the AONB/countryside and wildlife.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.202 SDDP paragraph 4.71 makes it clear that lighting should be restricted to the minimum required for security and working purposes. It goes on to require that the potential light spillage and glow from any source to be minimised. This strikes a balance between the various purposes of artificial lighting. The text adequately meets the Objector's point.

*

4.203 On the second issue, the last sentence of the Policy confirms that lighting schemes will be examined for their effect on vehicle users. That should apply to all types of road, and there is no need to distinguish any particular one.

*

4.204 Thirdly, I agree with the Council that the supporting text would be improved with a reference to the potentially damaging effect of light pollution on the countryside; hence SD4.125. The AONB is countryside, and further distinction is unnecessary. The Latest Proposed Change rightly mentions the detrimental effect upon wildlife, especially nocturnal animals and nesting birds. I would suggest *visibility and appreciation* of the night sky.

Recommendation

4.205 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC013.4) and that the last line of the Policy includes:

....PEDESTRIANS AND THE VISIBILITY AND APPRECIATION OF THE NIGHT SKY.

CONTAMINATED LAND

POLICY P7

Objections

First Deposit

1921/9090 Rydon Homes Ltd
1933/9262 Highways Agency

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should state that, in some cases, a desk-top study is sufficient to embark on the planning stage of a scheme, and whether its last sentence is too inflexible since remedial measures involving the removal of all or part of the contamination may not be the first step in every case;
- 2) Whether it should ensure that development affecting contaminated land adjacent to trunk roads should be required to safeguard the structural stability of the road and include measures to ventilate contaminated material should it remain in place.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.206 I presume that **Rydon Homes Ltd** means the planning application stage when referring to *the planning stage*. The Policy and its supporting text do not preclude a desk-top study at an early stage. Its suitability, however, would depend on the circumstances of the case and a more thorough assessment might be needed with an application for planning permission. It would be for the developer to convince the Council that an “appropriate report of investigation” could replace a “site assessment”. There is no need to refer to desk-top studies, since those cases where they would be sufficient are likely to be rare.

4.207 The Policy is neither unreasonable nor inflexible in requiring remedial measures to be completed as a first step in carrying out development. These measures would normally be the subject of a condition and/or a legal agreement linked to a detailed schedule of the works required to deal with any contamination. It would be normal to require the remedial work as a pre-cursor to development taking place. Those rare cases where this would not be so do not justify reference to them in any part of the text.

*

4.208 Secondly, I see no justification for the Policy to specify the arrangements for dealing with contaminated sites next to trunk or any other roads. Any developer seeking to develop a contaminated site would need to satisfy the Council about the stability of the site and adjoining land. Similarly, he or she would have to satisfy the Council that the contamination would pose no unacceptable risk to the public. The Policy deals with these matters, and there is no need for further detail about the ventilation of contaminated material. The Policy should seek to protect the stability of land as well as buildings. That would meet the **Highway Agency**'s valid point about the stability of trunk roads.

Recommendation

4.209 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY P7

- B) THREATEN THE STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY OF ANY EXISTING OR PROPOSED BUILDING OR THE STABILITY OF OTHER LAND AT OR NEAR THE SITE.**

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.128

Objections

Second Deposit SD4.128

68/14188 Environment Agency
68/14189 Environment Agency

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should refer to the need to protect controlled waters and state that a site shall be proven “fit for purpose” prior to the commencement of development on it, using regulatory assessment models and criteria.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.210 The Council has produced guidance and a methodology for dealing with contaminated land in its Contaminated Land Strategy – June 2001. The text refers to it and explains that a full risk assessment should be undertaken using the methodology set out in the Strategy which has been prepared in accordance with the Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2000 (SI 2000 No 227). The Strategy takes full account of the **Environment Agency**'s points, and there is no need for further change.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT NEW PARAGRAPH SD4.129

Objection

Second Deposit SD4.129

68/14190 Environment Agency

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should be modified to refer to structures and controlled waters.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.212 Although *environment* is all embracing in planning terms, the impact of contaminants on watercourses, water bodies and aquifers requires particular care. Policy P7 c) refers to this in the various ways of dealing with contamination. The protection of water justifies special reference in the supporting text. I presume that *structures* in the **Environment Agency's** suggested alternative wording is in geological terms. The reference to controlled waters, however, is sufficient since maintaining the purity and integrity of water sources depends upon protecting the water bearing sub-strata. The text should be expanded slightly to ensure that the risks referred to are not only reduced, but reduced to acceptable limits.

Recommendation

4.213 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

...the extent and nature of the contamination and the remedial measures whereby risks to health, controlled waters and other aspects of the environment can be reduced to an acceptable level.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

PARAGRAPH 4.75

Objections

First Deposit

1287/7653 Mrs A Storey
1289/7960 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
690/8657 Mrs A Davis
1872/10120 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD4.130

68/14191 Environment Agency

Second Deposit SD4.131

68/14192 Environment Agency

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the paragraph should mention the prospect of community composting, the opportunities at mineral sites for wildlife habitats and the potential damage to them as a result of waste management undertakings;
- 2) Whether the text should recognise the consequences for the environment of increases in waste;
- 3) Whether the use of *regulation* in the second sentence of paragraph 4.75 is confusing, and whether this sentence is redundant;
- 4) Whether SD4.130 should refer to “waste disposal facilities” rather than “tipping”; whether the reference to the County Council being responsible for the disposal of household waste disposal should be reinstated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.214 Proposals for community composting would be considered under the adopted Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Document CD9/2). Although I support all types of composting, private and community, it is not an appropriate topic for the Local Plan unless there are land use implications. There are none here.

4.215 Structure Plan Policies E10-E13 seek to protect wildlife habitats in connection with mineral workings. Policy E13, in particular, urges local planning authorities to consider the opportunity to create or improve habitats and features of conservation interest. Structure Plan paragraph 378 stresses that minerals and waste development, particularly mineral extraction and landfilling, can provide opportunities for environmental enhancement and public benefits including the establishment of new habitats to off-set the impact of a scheme. It would not be appropriate, however, for the Local Plan to

intrude into land use matters that are the responsibility of the County Council. Nevertheless, SDDP paragraph 4.76 confirms that the Council, when responding to consultations on proposals for which the County Council is the local planning authority, will consider the implications for wildlife. This is sufficient.

*

4.216 On the second issue, considerations for the environment and waste disposal/management are matters to be dealt with at the strategic level through the Structure Plan and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

*

4.217 Thirdly, the Council accepts that the second sentence is repetitive and thus redundant. I endorse SD4.131 that deletes it.

*

4.218 Fourthly, the deletions that result from SD4.131 and SD4.132 are at the request of the **Hampshire County Council**, the statutory waste management authority. The deleted text is repetitive and redundant, and the Local Plan will be the better without it.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 4.76

Objections

First Deposit

1872/10121 Hampshire County Council

Main Issue

Whether the reference in a) to the waste for which any waste disposal site is licensed, should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.220 The Council accepts that the reference to control over the type of waste is a matter for the Environment Agency and is not a land use planning matter. I agree, and endorse SD4.132 that deletes it.

Recommendation

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