

ALL MATTERS

Objections

1622/8480	English Nature, Hampshire and Isle of Wight
1625/12906	The Countryside Agency
1692/9187	Alton Friends of the Earth
1692/9276	Alton Friends of the Earth

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Local Plan should set targets, especially for issues concerning biodiversity, pollution, transport and energy;
- 2) Whether the criteria used in the sustainability appraisal of the SDDP should include rural indicators.

Inspectors Reasoning and Conclusions

8.1 The setting of targets can be a useful means of testing performance. The Council says that its forthcoming Community Strategy will contain targets concerning the type of issues to which the **Alton Friends of the Earth** refers and that it will be updated annually. I agree that this is a more appropriate document for the monitoring of performance against particular targets than is the Local Plan.

*

8.2 On the second issue, I note that the existing criteria include those relating to rural areas and issues. Bearing in mind my examination of the objections concerning such matters as residential development in the countryside, I see no need for further elaboration. I agree with the Council that the criteria cover a suitable range of rural issues.

-0-

8.3 I agree that paragraph 8.3 should be changed to refer to the Environment Agency, as the SDDP proposes.

Recommendation

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

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Objection

First Deposit

1286/7462 Four Marks Parish Council

Main Issue

Whether supporting eco-system should be defined.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.5 The Glossary defines eco-system, and that should suffice.

Recommendation

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

APPENDIX B

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF POLICIES IN THE SECOND DEPOSIT

DRAFT OF THE EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN: SECOND REVIEW

Objections

First Deposit

1881/9595	Bryant Homes Technical Services Ltd
1622/8479	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1724/8585	Dr J Chatfield
1286/7460	Four Marks Parish Council
1881/9600	Bryant Homes Technical Services Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether *Transport Energy: Efficiency – Trips* should refer to the need to locate development *where it would offer the potential to minimise the length and number of trips by car*;
- 2) Whether the Sustainability Appraisal takes sufficient account of environmental impacts;
- 3) Whether Criterion 14 should refer to the safeguarding of buildings of local historic interest;
- 4) Whether Criterion 20 should be expanded to include a reference to training.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.7 There is no need to labour this point about private transport. It is a matter that I consider in my examination of Policy GS1 where in one recommended criterion I emphasise the minimisation of the need to travel, especially by car. Locating residential development as close as possible to a good range of services should, subject to other objectives, achieve that end.

*

8.8 On the second issue, **English Nature** is particularly concerned about the effect of certain proposed allocations that it considers contravene the overall strategy of sustainable development upon which the SDDP is based. There are more detailed objections to particular policies and proposals, and both the Council and I have taken them into account. We do not always come to the same conclusion, but I am satisfied that **English Nature's** reasonable concerns have been satisfactorily considered in the preparation of the Local Plan.

*

8.9 Thirdly, Criterion 14 appears to me to relate to features that enjoy various forms of statutory protection. Unless within a Conservation Area, a building of local historic interest is unlikely to enjoy such status. There is no need for the Criterion to include these buildings, but the Council would not be prevented from taking their character and appearance into account in its negotiations with a prospective developer and in its determination of a planning application. There is, however, a limit to what the Local Plan should contain.

*

8.10 On the fourth issue, I agree with **Bryant Homes Technical Services Ltd** that training the workforce to take advantage of the range of jobs available in the market is important. But I am not convinced that a Council, as local planning authority, is the best provider. As the SDDP rightly states, the Local Plan cannot alone provide a healthy economy. Training is mainly for others to ensure. Despite its undoubted importance, there is no need to refer to it.

-0-

8.11 On other matters, **Dr Chatfield** refers to the natural channel of the River Wey that needs to be maintained for visual attraction, local character and biodiversity. I agree, and can find nothing in the SDDP that is likely to thwart that worthy objective. The Council notes her helpful point.

Recommendation

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

APPENDIX C

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATING SITES OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION (SINCS)

Objections

First Deposit

572/6601	Worldham Parish Council
1293/8068	George Wimpey (UK) Ltd
1276/8202	David Wilson Estates
1622/8483	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1917/9069	Mr A Smith
1924/9154	Erringham Investements Ltd
1926/9174	Squires Bridge Homes Ltd
1933/9264	Highways Agency
1944/9417	Redrow Homes (SE) Limited
1897/9754	JGK Environmental Consultancy
1897/9757	JGK Environmental Consultancy
1496/9976	Mrs J Harwood
1537/10064	J F Vigay
1960/10272	Liss Village Design Group
1926/15152	Squires Bridge Homes Ltd
1872/12819	Hampshire County Council
1872/12820	Hampshire County Council
1872/12850	Hampshire County Council
68/14937	Environment Agency
1872/12817	Hampshire County Council
1287/14275	Councillor Mrs A Storey
1872/12806	Hampshire County Council
3802/11487	Mr C J Wyeth
1872/11523	Hampshire County Council
2014/12305	Hurlock Investments Ltd
3886/13718	Squires Bridge Homes Ltd / Wates Landmark
1872/12807	Hampshire County Council
1872/12808	Hampshire County Council
1303/12918	Borrow Dental Milk Foundation
1872/12809	Hampshire County Council
1666/13000	Councillor Mr D Clegg
1872/12810	Hampshire County Council
1872/12818	Hampshire County Council
1872/12811	Hampshire County Council
1931/14914	Secretary of State for Health
1872/12812	Hampshire County Council
1872/12813	Hampshire County Council
1872/12814	Hampshire County Council
1872/12815	Hampshire County Council

1113/10543 Sheet Village Association

Main Issue

Whether any modification should be made to this Appendix.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.13 There are numerous objections relating to terms such as *significant*, *sufficient* and *outstanding*, and the suggested need to define them. That would be impracticable and unhelpful. It must always be a matter of judgement on the facts of the case. The Council says that the *criteria were developed in 1994 by the Hampshire County Council, English Nature and the Hampshire Wildlife Trust using the collective experience and knowledge of officers working within the 3 organisations*. The County Council has *endeavoured to identify all SINC's in Hampshire, and is contributing major resources to a rolling programme of surveys with District Councils and other organisations to ensure that Plans are kept up to date*. This will result in the addition or deletion of SINC's as appropriate. The Council's response convinces me that potential and actual SINC's are assessed in a most comprehensive manner by well-experienced and dedicated staff. Apart from rectifying the factual errors set out by the **Hampshire County Council** and **Councillor Mrs Storey**, I see no need for any modification arising from these matters.
- 8.14 The Council will note the **Wordham Parish Council's** map showing Worldham Hanger and no doubt make any necessary change.
- 8.15 I deal with **George Wimpey (UK) Ltd's** objection concerning the SINC at Oaklands Farm/House in Chapters 3 and 5.4 of my Report. Other Objections refer to SINC's within or near allocated or Omission Sites. Again, I deal with them in the relevant Chapters, especially Chapter 5.
- 8.16 The **Highways Agency** points out that Inset Map 27 shows part of the A3 road at Greatham in a SINC. Presumably the carriageway should not be included.
- 8.17 The **Hampshire County Council** confirms that Dell Piece West qualifies as a SINC.
- 8.18 The **Sheet Village Association** refers to the Ashford Stream, the main tributary of the River Rother. I would ask the Council to see if it qualifies as a SINC, although I note that investigations are in hand and may by now be complete.
- 8.19 This is a detailed Appendix to the SDDP, and survey work continues on potential and actual SINC's. My recommendation is therefore broad rather than specific. I am in no doubt, however, that these Sites and their protection by way of mitigation of harm, are an important aspect of sustainability.

Recommendation

- 8.20 I recommend that the Appendix be modified as appropriate, in the context of the Council's discussions with the Hampshire County Council, English Nature, the Hampshire Wildlife Trust and any other interested parties, and in the light of ongoing surveys etc.

APPENDIX D

COUNCIL'S ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Objections

First Deposit

1874/10160 House Builders Federation
774/8304 Mr B W Evans
774/8307 Mr B W Evans
774/8311-12 Mr B W Evans
774/8314-16 Mr B W Evans

Main Issue

Whether this Appendix should be deleted or, if not, modified in any way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.21 The **House Builders Federation** considers that the Appendices do not form part of a statutory local plan, and **Mr Evans** points to the difficulties of trying to rewrite detailed and complex guidance in a few paragraphs. The Appendices do, however, provide useful information and should remain. The Council's procedures generally accord with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 18, and this national policy will continue to provide a more detailed foundation for its duties. There is little point in preparing development plans and administering the control of development if decision-makers lack the will to enforce control where it is expedient to do so. This Appendix convincingly demonstrates that the Council does have that will.
- 8.22 It is simply not possible to define *appropriate* and *proper* because they are likely to vary from one case to another. Judgement upon what is reasonable must underlie the Council's approach. Discretion and integrity are part of the planning system which would be a good deal poorer without it. Discretion cannot be edged out of the system as is suggested. I have no reason to doubt that the Council's officers and members act in a responsible and accountable manner. But a reference to PPG 18 would be appropriate, if I might be forgiven for using the word.
- 8.23 I do not consider that the Council is condoning or in any way encouraging delay in putting matters right. The Appendix refers to *negotiation if it is likely that a solution can be reached within a reasonable time scale*. That seems eminently reasonable to me. The phrase *as far as possible* should not be added at paragraph 3. Rightly, there is a clear indication that anyone can make a complaint without his or her identity being revealed.
- 8.24 The **House Builders Federation** says that more attention should be given to the Council's assumptions about housing supply. The Round Table Session on Housing Supply gave ample opportunity for all parties to address me on this matter, and I recommend in the light of the assistance provided.

Recommendation

- 8.25 I recommend that Appendix D be modified by an introductory paragraph along the following lines:

The following paragraphs are no more than a brief outline of the Council's Enforcement Procedures. These procedures are based upon national policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 18 – Enforcing Planning Control upon which the Council relies and to which those seeking further information are referred.