

INTRODUCTION

PARAGRAPH 7.1

Objections

First Deposit

1521/10000 Professor M J Withers

Main Issue

Whether the SDDP pays too much attention to community and recreation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.1 These are important matters, especially where significant additional residential development is expected. The attention given to them is about right.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 7.3

Objection

First Deposit

1379/9433 Holybourne Village Association

Main Issue

Whether proposals for Holybourne provide sufficient opportunity for community facilities.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.3 The main proposal for Holybourne is for the redevelopment of the Depot. The Council will seek to ensure that a mixed-use scheme includes an employment use and a reasonable amount of open space in the form of allotments. Any proposals elsewhere in the village for a shop or garage would have to come forward in the form of an application for planning permission. With no demonstrated pressure for either, it would be unrealistic to allocate a site for either of these particular purposes.

Recommendation

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

PROTECTION OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SERVICES POLICY HC1 AND PARAGRAPH 7.7

Objections

First Deposit

1704/7802 Greene King Plc
1704/10399 Greene King Plc
1292/8038 Bentley Parish Council

Second Deposit SD7.006

1905/12274 Eurotec International Plc

Second Deposit SD7.007

1905/12275 Eurotec International Plc

Main Issue

Whether the Policy adequately reflects changes affecting public houses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.5 **Green King Plc** outlines recent and expected changes affecting these establishments. In my opinion, the public house plays an important part in the life of the community, especially in the rural areas where opportunities for social gatherings are often limited. As the **Bentley Parish Council** says, however, a local planning authority cannot prevent cessation of trading at a public house that is not viable, however that might be measured. Where the establishment is demonstrably not viable, it would be reasonable for the Council to be assured that, in the interests of sustainability, other uses of benefit to the community have been considered.
- 7.6 The Policy, and especially its Criterion b, provides a useful background against which a planning application for a change of use could be determined. It could be made a little more certain, as I recommend. Perhaps the message for the local community is to use, or lose, your public house and other local facilities.

Recommendation

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

POLICY HC1 (b)

THE APPLICANT DEMONSTRATES THAT THE USE IS NOT VIABLE, THAT EVERY REASONABLE ATTEMPT HAS BEEN MADE TO RETAIN IT AND THAT OTHER USES OF BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED, BUT TO NO AVAIL.

PROVISION OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT POLICY HC2

Objections

First Deposit

1530/7342 Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society
1272/7690 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1874/10156 House Builders Federation

Main Issue

Whether suitable provision will be made for land for schools and other requirements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.8 The relevant Committee Report advises that further meetings will be held with the Hampshire County Council to explore the matter of land for schools in Liphook. That seems to be the best way forward. For the provision of other facilities, including monuments where considered suitable, the Council should attach conditions or seek to enter into agreements with developers. The guiding principle in both approaches must be reasonableness, in accordance with Policy GS4 and Circulars 11/95 and 1/97. For certainty, the Policy should indicate as much.

Recommendation

7.9 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY HC2

***PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED ONLY WHERE THE
DEVELOPER HAS ARRANGED FOR THE REASONABLE
IMPROVEMENT/PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES.....***

PUBLIC SERVICES, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL, LEISURE AND SPORTS FACILITIES

PARAGRAPH 7.17, SECOND DEPOSIT SD7.016, POLICY HC3 AND SD7.017

Objections

First Deposit

1375/6959 Lindford Parish Council

Second Deposit SD7.016

1279/12553 Liss Parish Council
1620/13630 Whitehill Town Council
1960/14041 Liss Village Design Group
1278/14776 CPRE

Second Deposit SD7.017

1279/12554 Liss Parish Council
1287/14272 Mrs A Storey

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph pays sufficient attention to the scale and type of provision of services and facilities and the degree of need for them.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.10 Again, the guiding principle is that of reasonableness. This covers matters of scale of provision and the need for it. In many cases, this would not be the only policy or material consideration brought to bear on a planning application. In particular, the importance of a local benefit derived from a proposal could be compared to any disadvantages that might arise from it. That would be a usual approach, and so there is no need to modify the Policy as the **Whitehill Town Council** suggests.
- 7.11 I agree with **Mrs Storey** that banks, building societies, cashpoints, cafes and restaurants are important amenities, especially in villages. They are more of a commercial than of a community character, however, and it is community facilities with which Chapter 7 of the SDDP is concerned. Even so, the list in Table HC1 is not exhaustive and the Council would not be prevented from applying the Policy to proposals for the type of services to which **Mrs Storey** refers.
- 7.12 The Council acknowledges the Lindford Parish Council's concern about public conveniences, and there is nothing that could be usefully added to SDDP paragraph 7.17. The Objection is conditionally withdrawn.

Recommendation

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

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

POLICY CF1

Objections

First Deposit

32/5044 Petersfield Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses
1908/8989 Kris Mitra Associates
1947/9446 Redrow (SE) Ltd & Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.7 (page 165).

Main Issue

Whether community facilities should be provided as part of particular Omission Sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.14 I recommend elsewhere that land at Passfield Common to which **Kris Mitra Associates** refers and at Four Marks to which **Redrow (SE) Ltd & Persimmon Homes (South Coast)** Ltd refers should not be allocated for the purposes suggested. The need for community facilities as part of their development does not, therefore, arise.
- 7.15 The **Petersfield Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses** asks that the Council gives some consideration to its needs. I have no doubt that the Council will assist in every reasonable way, but there is not enough evidence at present to justify the allocation of a particular site for a Kingdom Hall. Presumably all parties will first look at previously-developed land within a built-up area.

Recommendation

- 7.16 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC001.7).

COMMUNITY FACILITY ALLOCATIONS
CAUSEWAY FARM
POLICY CF1 (A)

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 137.

Main Issue

Whether Causeway Farm should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.17 These representations refer more to certain aspects of the principle of development at Causeway Farm, and to objections to them, than to whether any proposal for it should include community facilities. I deal with its suitability or otherwise as a Reserve Site in Chapter 5.3 of my Report, concluding that it should be reserved for residential and other development should it be required for the former purpose. If developed, it should include reasonable provision for community facilities which might include a church/community centre

Recommendation

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

DEPOT SITE, HOLYBOURNE

POLICY CF1 (B)

Objections

First Deposit

1764/8754 Mrs S J Bailey
1932/9254 Allison and Garwood Ltd
1379/9426 Mr J Bound
1505/9996 P Whitmarsh

Main Issue

Whether the redevelopment of this land should include provision for a village hall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.19 The Objectors say that a village hall is not needed in this part of the village. The Council accepts that this is so, hence the deletion by SD7.036 of paragraph 7.12 b. I have no reason to disagree.

Recommendation

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

GREEN LANE, CLANFIELD

POLICY CF1 (C)

Objections

First Deposit

296/5659	Katie Hovenden
297/5666	Mr J Barnbrook
133/5978	Mr P K Cox
368/6300	Hampshire Constabulary
907/6473	Mr B Jackson
1072/6739	A & E Parsons
1030/7240	Clanfield Parish Council
843/8333	Mr & Mrs G Martin
897/8516	The Ramblers' Association
1561/8705	Mrs J Clarke

Main Issue

Whether the development of this land should include provision for community facilities.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.21 Some Objectors query the need for this provision, others suggest that a community centre would be better located near the village centre. In these matters, I rely a good deal on the views of Parish Councils. They are in a good position to advise on them. The **Clanfield Parish Council** says that halls throughout the village are fully booked on every weekday. This suggests a need for more, as does the prospect of a significant amount of development at Green Lane, whose residents would be conveniently served by a community centre or similar on this land. The Council will note the advice of the **Hampshire Constabulary** about youth provision. Location nearer the village centre and its facilities would have its advantages, but the reserve site is within convenient walking distance of it and its development offers the better prospect of providing a community centre.
- 7.22 I therefore endorse the proposal for community facilities, but stress that the Development Brief should ensure the most suitable siting so as to avoid problems of undue noise and other disturbance to which **Mr Jackson** refers. New facilities here need not prevent improvements and/or extensions to others in the village.

Recommendation

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

LORD MAYOR TRELOAR HOSPITAL (LMTH)

POLICIES CF1 (D) AND PS2 (C)

Objections

First Deposit

1939/9347 LMTH Co & Maybourne Projects Ltd
1939/9348 LMTH Co & Maybourne Projects Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.7 and PIC002.7 (page 165).

Main Issue

Whether the redevelopment of this land should include a church/community building/community shop and doctors' surgery.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.24 The Objectors do not discount a mix of suitable uses on this land, and I generally agree with the Council that *the precise mix of uses will evolve through planning applications*. The importance of a Development Brief, however, should not be forgotten. The Latest Proposed Change usefully deletes the reference to particular community facilities. The best way forward is for the Council, the developer and any other relevant parties to ascertain reasonable community requirements in terms of their scale and type. They will bear in mind that PIC021.5 notes that particular facilities are to be provided on neighbouring land.

Recommendation

7.25 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC001.7 and PIC002.7).

LAND AT THE REAR OF CHASEFIELDS, FARRINGDON POLICY CF1 (E)

Objection

First Deposit

1277/6992 Beazer Strategic Land

Main Issue

Whether community facilities should be provided on this land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.26 The Council has deleted the allocation of this land for residential development, a community building and recreation facilities. It no longer appears in the SDDP. As I discuss in Chapter 5.3 of my Report, I support this decision.

Recommendation

7.27 I recommend that no modification be made of the SDDP.

NEW AND REPLACEMENT COMMUNITY FACILITIES POLICY CF2

Objections

First Deposit

876/8373 Horndean Parish Council

Main Issue

Whether the Council should encourage the fullest use of existing community facilities at Horndean Community School and at Merchistoun Hall.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.28 This is more a matter of management than of land use planning. Perhaps the Parish, District and County Councils could see if greater use could be made of these buildings.

Recommendation

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

PUBLIC SERVICE ALLOCATIONS

POLICY PS2

SD7.047, SD7.048, SD7.056

R E LINES BARRACKS, WHITEHILL/BORDON

POLICY PS2 (D)

Objections

First Deposit

350/5448	Churher's College
497/5611	Dr J R Sedgwick
403/5673	Sarah Roper
996/6748	Mr & Mrs E Darter
1310/7886	Portsmouth & SE Hampshire Health Authority
2026/8918	Hampshire County Council
1607/9246	Councillor Mrs S Halstead
1947/9447	Redrow (SE) Ltd & Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd
1611/9493	Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
1893/9721	Mr A Drinkwater
1499/9986	Mr J F Walters
1864/13456	Defence Estates
1620/13638	Whitehill Town Council
3842/13176	Sunley Estates Plc
368/5833	Hampshire Constabulary
1272/7694	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1745/13876	Mrs S Flint
1864/10299	Defence Estates

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC004.7 (page 167)

Main Issue

Whether land should be allocated for the stated requirements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.30 These objections were lodged in 1999 and in some cases, as the Committee Report (Document CD12/17) indicates, they have been overtaken by events. For example, a proposal to relocate Churher's College Junior School at the Senior School site has been permitted, and so there is no need to allocate any land for this purpose. The County Council has acquired land at Horndean for St John's Primary School. The SDDP notes that a doctors' surgery could be suitably sited within the housing allocation at Havant Road, Horndean, a proposal that I endorse. Planning permission has been granted on appeal for residential development at the R E Lines Barracks, Bordon, so the matter of the conversion of St Lucia Lodge to an hotel does not arise.

- 7.31 The Council envisages the allocation of land at Cumbers, Liss for a doctors' surgery, but I recommend against the allocation of any land here for residential development. I also recommend against the allocation of a large area of land north of Alton Lane, Four Marks for residential and other uses, and so I do not support the provision of a site for a school as part of that suggested development.
- 7.32 The **Hampshire County Council** is the local education authority and although it and the District Council will take account of representations concerning the need for more land for schools, I consider that it is best placed to judge the need for such land and its most suitable location. In my experience, this is a continuous process and I have no doubt that it takes place with good effect in East Hampshire.
- 7.33 I am not persuaded that I should recommend the allocation of any additional land for the stated requirements.
- 7.34 The Latest Proposed Change makes the necessary deletions to the text, and I endorse it.

Recommendation

- 7.35 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC004.7).

HERNE FARM, PETERSFIELD

POLICY PS2 (A)

Objections

First Deposit

404/5960 Petersfield Town Council
622/8272 Cllr Mrs T M Jamieson

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC003.7 and PIC004.7 (page 167).

Main Issue

Whether land at Herne Farm, Petersfield should be allocated for a school.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.36 The County Education Officer advises that there is no longer any need to reserve this land, hence the Latest Proposed Change that deletes superseded text. I have no reason to disagree with that judgement, but the Council will note my recommendation under Policy PS2 (b) about the drafting of the Latest Proposed Change PIC004.7.

Recommendation

7.37 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC003.7).

CAUSEWAY FARM, PETERSFIELD

POLICY PS2 (B)

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 140.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC004.7 (page 167).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether land should be allocated for a primary school as part of a mixed scheme of residential and other development at Causeway Farm;
- 2) And if not, whether any alternative provision should be made.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.38 These representations relate mainly to the principle of development on this land, for a variety of reasons. I deal with the main points in my consideration of this Reserve Site in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. They do, however, raise questions about the provision of education should the development proceed.

7.39 The County Education Officer advises that there is no longer a need to reserve a site for a school as part of the development. The Council accepts this advice, as I do, hence the Latest Proposed Change that deletes the reference to it.

*

7.40 On the second issue, it would be prudent for the Local Plan to outline an alternative means to ensure that the educational needs of children could be met. The Latest Proposed Change rightly notes that the amount of development at Causeway Farm would increase pressure on local schools, and presumably not just primary schools. If a school was not needed at Causeway Farm at the time that any development took place there, it says, the developer would be expected to contribute financially to the improvement of existing schools in the town. In principle, this is entirely reasonable, although the paragraph should be drafted to accord better with Circular 1/97. I recommend accordingly.

Recommendation

7.41 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

PIC004.7 paragraph 7.21

The amount of development proposed at Causeway Farm will increase pressure on local schools and may necessitate the provision of a primary school on the site. If this is not required, however, the District and/or the County Council will seek to enter into an agreement with the developer for a financial contribution to fund the reasonable improvement/expansion of existing school(s) in the town.

BUILDINGS OR LAND SURPLUS TO PUBLIC SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

POLICY PS3

Objection

First Deposit

1278/7360 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether, in certain circumstances, the restoration of this type of surplus land should be mandatory.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.42 Restoration may be difficult to enforce where there is no valid planning condition or other requirement to ensure it. It may be appropriate to grant planning permission for a small scale of development as a means of restoring the rest of the land. I would, however, suggest that the Policy be brought more into line with the advice in the Good Practice Guide. I also suggest other changes to it. Land includes buildings.

Recommendation

7.43 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY PS3

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE RE-USE OR REDEVELOPMENT OF LAND OUTSIDE SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES THAT IS DECLARED SURPLUS TO PUBLIC SERVICE REQUIREMENTS PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD BE:

- A) LIMITED TO THE FOOTPRINT OF THE BUILDING(S) RECENTLY IN USE;***
- B) OF NO GREATER INTENSITY THAN THE PREVIOUS USE;***
- C) IN KEEPING WITH THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDINGS;***
- D) WELL-SERVED BY A CHOICE OF MEANS OF TRANSPORT; AND***
- E) CONSISTENT WITH THE OVERALL AIM OF SUSTAINABILITY.***

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPHS SD7.062 AND SD7.063 DEVELOPERS CONTRIBUTIONS

Objections

Second Deposit SD7.062

1899/12264 Bewley Homes Plc
1926/12415 Squires Bridge Homes Ltd
1874/12875 House Builders Federation
3886/13842 Squires Bridge Homes / Wates Landmark
3858/14488 Robert Shaw & Partners
3859/14529 Cove Construction Ltd
3860/14553 J Roberts

Pre Inquiry Change PIC005.7

10/14995 North Hampshire Primary Care Trust
3886/15269 Squires Bridge Homes / Wates Landmark

Second Deposit SD7.063

1926/12417 Squires Bridge Homes Ltd
1874/12876 House Builders Federation
3886/13843 Squires Bridge Homes / Wates Landmark

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC005.7 and PIC006.7 (page 168).

Main Issue

Whether the text accords with Circular 1/97.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.44 The Latest Proposed Change brings the text more into line with the Circular, although I doubt the need for *unacceptably* for the same reason for their being no need to qualify *harm*. Apart from the useful reference to the County Education Department and its “Developers Contributions towards Education Facilities”, I am not convinced that these paragraphs add anything of substance to Policy GS4 and its supporting text. As the Local Plan will have to be read and applied as a whole, they should be deleted. My recommendation concerning Policy GS4 accords it more with the Circular, which would remain a material consideration in any event.

Recommendation

7.45 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of paragraphs SD7.062/PIC005.7 and SD7.063/PIC006.7, apart from the last sentence.

SMALL SCALE LEISURE AND CULTURAL FACILITIES POLICY LC2

Objection

First Deposit

322/5862 Frogmore Lane North Residents' Association

Main Issue

Whether no more commercial leisure facilities should be developed.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.46 It would be rash to seek to preclude their provision throughout the Local Plan period. Provided they accorded with all relevant development plan policies there should be no objection to further facilities on land use planning grounds. Existing facilities and their capacity might be a material consideration.

Recommendation

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

LEISURE AND CULTURAL FACILITY ALLOCATIONS

POLICY LC3 AND LC3a. & b.

Objections

First Deposit

459/5567	Mrs S McFarlane
133/6100	Mr P K Cox
210/6180	S A J Runalls
1289/7970	Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1452/8194	Sir Geoffrey Dalton
1620/8328	Whitehill Town Council
1620/8330	Whitehill Town Council
876/8375	Horndean Parish Council
1710/8571	Mrs P Brodie
1537/10065	J F Vigay
798/10404	Mr & Mrs A Milford
368/5835	Hampshire Constabulary
699/6515	Mrs P Gardner
368/5834	Hampshire Constabulary
479/6062	Mr & Mrs H S G Martin
1622/8469	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight

Main Issue

Whether the Telephone Exchange/Guadeloupe House car park, Bordon and land at Dell Piece East, Horndean should be allocated for leisure and cultural activities.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.48 The **Whitehill Town Council** supports the Council's proposal for the Telephone Exchange/Guadeloupe House car park for this purpose, although I understand that the BT Group Plc has not declared it surplus to its requirements. The land is well-located within the main built-up area and there is no reason in principle why it should not proceed. The Town Council further suggests that land north west of the Fire Station Crossroads should be allocated for leisure and cultural uses, and that land east and west of the Phoenix Centre should be safeguarded for the future extension of the Arts Centre. These sites are similarly located, but as there are no firm proposals of which I am aware, it would be better for the Council to consider any proposal on the basis of development plan policies and any other material considerations.
- 7.49 The **Hampshire Constabulary** is concerned about demands on its resources as a result of the SDDP proposals. The County Council, however, confirms that the SDDP is in general conformity with the adopted Structure Plan, and any additional resources required is more a matter for the County Council and the Government than for the District Council as a local planning authority.

7.50 There are objections to the use of land south of the Woolmer Trading Estate for leisure and cultural uses. As the SDDP notes, however, outline planning permission has been granted for recreation/leisure facilities here. I deal with the allocation of land for industrial development at Dell Piece West and to the south of the Woolmer Trading Estate in Chapter 6 of my Report.

Recommendation

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

RESIDENTIAL EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS

POLICY RI1

Objection

First Deposit

1877/8051 The Treloar Trust

Main Issue

Whether the Policy and supporting text should accept that *if a genuine and proven need for this type of development is accepted that this can be permitted outside Settlement Policy Boundaries.*

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.52 The SDDP goes as far as it should in accepting that there may be circumstances where this type of development in the countryside can be justified. Prospective applicants should realise, however, that the countryside lies beyond SPBs, that development in it will not usually be permitted and that it will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and that includes its openness. In other words, they must have a very good case to outweigh those considerations.

7.53 The Objector refers to *the need to respond to emergencies, fire alarms etc* and says *that the ability to provide on-site staff accommodation is essential to the continued high level of care required at the school.* These are material considerations and I have no doubt that the Council would take them into account in its deliberation on any planning application. But it would be wrong for the Policy to attempt to anticipate those considerations that might justify the outweighing of the provisions of the development plan.

Recommendation

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

CREMATORIUM AND BURIAL SPACE

POLICY CR1 AND PARAGRAPH 7.38

Objections

First Deposit

93/5681 Councillor Mr J Crowhurst
1666/9905 Councillor Mr D Clegg
1666/9906 Councillor Mr D Clegg
1312/10374 Mrs M J Comley

Second Deposit SD7.080

1279/12557 Liss Parish Council
1278/14779 CPRE

Second Deposit SD7.081

1279/12559 Liss Parish Council
68/14193 Environment Agency
1278/14781 CPRE

Second Deposit SD7.082

1278/14782 CPRE

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC007.7 (page 171).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should be made more, or less, stringent.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.55 Several suggestions are made with a view to improving the Policy. I agree with **Councillor Mr D Clegg** that *overriding* should be deleted. If a need is overriding, it makes the rest of the Policy irrelevant. The word can, however, be retained in the supporting text. I agree with the **Liss Parish Council** and **CPRE** that *unacceptable* should be deleted, but in my opinion *undue* would be no better.
- 7.56 The Objectors put forward several sites for this type of use, although it is not clear whether they are, or will be, available. It is better to have a Policy that, with any other material considerations, will provide the basis for the deliberations upon particular proposals if and when they arise. One material consideration might be the possible effect on water resources. Green burials could best be considered in the context of policies for the protection of the countryside.

7.57 In general, the Policy should be drafted more in line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. As any proposals are likely to be for land beyond SPB, it should be negatively worded. I recommend accordingly. That part of the Policy that comes after the criteria should be relegated to supporting text. It explains how the Policy will be applied in particular circumstances.

Recommendation

7.58 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY CR1

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A CREMATORIUM OR BURIAL SPACE WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNLESS:

- A. THERE IS A NEED FOR IT;***
- B. IT WOULD NOT HARM THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEARBY RESIDENTS, THE QUALITY OF WATER RESOURCES AND/OR OF THE LANDSCAPE;***
- C. IT WOULD NOT LESSEN THE ENJOYMENT BY WALKERS AND OTHERS OF THE COUNTRYSIDE;***
- D. IT WOULD NOT RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE AND/OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY; AND***
- E. IT IS OF SUITABLE DESIGN, SCALE AND APPEARANCE.***

and that part of the Policy coming after the criteria relegated to supporting text.

ON AND OFF SITE SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY UI1 AND PARAGRAPHS 7.42 AND 7.43

Objection

First Deposit

1622/8470 English Nature
1874/10157 House Builders Federation
1835/13080 Medstead Parish Council

Second Deposit

1620/13645 Whitehill Town Council
68/14194 Environment Agency

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC008.7 (page 172).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.59 The **House Builders Federation** points out that it is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for water supply and sewerage under the Water Industries Act 1991. It therefore suggests that the Policy is superfluous and requests its deletion.
- 7.60 An adequate supply of water and satisfactory sewerage are some of the many aspects of essential infrastructure for a development. But I am not convinced that this Policy adds anything of substance to Policy GS4, modified as I recommend. This, together with relevant legislation, should be a sound enough basis for ensuring that reasonable additions and/or improvements are made to infrastructure to serve a given scheme. The Policy should be deleted but the supporting text provides useful information and should be retained.
- 7.61 Rightly, PIC008.7 urges applicants to *discuss their proposals with the Environment Agency and with the appropriate sewerage undertaker at the earliest opportunity*. Although it will normally be in applicants' interest to discuss a proposal with all relevant parties, they cannot be forced to do so. I do not agree, therefore, with the **Whitehill Town Council** that they *must* discuss.
- 7.62 The Council will note the point made by **English Nature** about the need to safeguard Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) should there be any proposal to construct a reservoir on land south of Havant Thicket.
- 7.63 The **Medstead Parish Council** refers to the lack of mains drainage in much of its area. I agree that this can have an effect on densities and may mean that those recommended in PPG 3 may not be achieved. I have already commented on this matter in my examination of Policy H4. I have, however, recommended against the allocation of land

in the Parish for residential estate development.

Recommendation

7.64 I recommend that the SDDP be modified the deletion of Policy UI1 and in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC008.7).

NEW UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE COUNTRYSIDE POLICY UI2

Objections

First Deposit

88/6663 Thames Water Property

Second Deposit SD7.091

1639/12981 East Hampshire AONB Office

Second Deposit SD7.092

1639/12982 East Hampshire AONB Office

Second Deposit SD7.093

88/11542 Thames Water Property
1639/12983 East Hampshire AONB Office

Main Issue

Whether a request *to enter into a legal agreement requiring the removal of plant and equipment and the restoration of the site should the utility become surplus to requirements* is reasonable.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.65 **Thames Water Property** refers to Circular 11/95 paragraph 109, but this advises on the principles applying to temporary permissions. Most planning permissions for utility infrastructure are likely to be of the permanent, rather than the temporary, type. But it would be entirely reasonable for the land to be restored to its former condition should the development become surplus to requirements. That applies to both temporary and permanent permissions.
- 7.66 The Secretary of State generally prefers conditions to planning obligations because the imposition of restrictions by means of the latter deprives the developer of the opportunity to seek to have the restriction varied or removed by an application or appeal. The Local Plan should acknowledge this advice.
- 7.67 On the objections by the **East Hampshire AONB Office**, I do not doubt the Council's awareness of its legal obligations concerning proposals in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In c., I suggest *MITIGATE* or *REDUCE* rather than *AMELIORATE*. I am not sure how an impact can be made better.
- 7.68 The text of the Policy after the criteria explains how it will be applied in certain circumstances. It would be better as supporting text.

Recommendation

7.69 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as I suggest in paragraph 7.66 and as follows:

Supporting text to POLICY UI2

.....where this is not possible, the Council will attach a condition, and/or seek to enter into a legal agreement, requiring the removal of plant and equipment and the restoration of the site should the development become surplus to requirements.

RESERVOIR

SECOND DEPOSIT SD7.094 AND SD7.095

Objections

Second Deposit SD7.094

1289/12684 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1872/12805 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD7.095

1622/12396 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight

Pre Inquiry Change PIC010.7

1622/14987 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
3810/14994 Portsmouth Water
1289/13794 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
3810/15408 Portsmouth Water

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC009.7 and PIC010.7 (page 173).

Main Issue

Whether land south of Havant Thicket should be allocated for a reservoir.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.70 There is no convincing evidence to show that this reservoir is not needed and, bearing in mind Structure Plan requirements for more residential and other development during the plan period, the inference is that it is needed. I have no reason to doubt the reasons why **Portsmouth Water** supports the allocation, the reservoir being *a key strategy in meeting future needs for water supplies and is incorporated in both the Company's and the Environment Agency's plans*. An additional advantage is the potential for various forms of recreation.
- 7.71 There could be some environmental damage, perhaps especially to the 2 SINC's to which the **Hampshire County Council** refers. Significantly, it does not object to the principle of the allocation and makes the fair point that the boundaries of the proposed reservoir will need to be carefully considered. On the evidence, including the Council's recognition of the ecological constraints, its commitment carefully to consider them and presumably to initiate reasonable measures of mitigation, I conclude that the need is sufficient to outweigh the harm.
- 7.72 There has been some confusion about the location of this proposal, hence PIC009.7 which refers to land *south of* the Thicket. To ensure certainty, the Proposals Map should show the allocated land, as SD7.096 Map No: Hlth & Comm 1 provides.

Recommendation

7.73 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC009.7 and PIC010.7).

BUILDINGS OR LAND SURPLUS TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF UTILITY AND SERVICE PROVIDERS

POLICY UI3

Objection

First Deposit

1882/9632 BT Group Plc

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is too restrictive.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.74 The **BT Group Plc** considers that a more intensive form of development may be acceptable *where access is available by a choice of means of transport provided that it would not cause harm by way of traffic generation and road safety*. The point is also made that not all sites will necessarily be on a public transport route but might still be suitable for re-use.
- 7.75 The aim of the Policy appears essentially to be to protect the countryside and to prevent a greater demand being made upon country roads ill-suited to cater for it. The chances are that a greater intensity would generate more traffic and/or have some visual effect upon the surroundings. I recall the Council's agreement to my suggestions with regard to Defence Estates land, and the thrust of this Policy should also be towards buildings and hard surfaces rather than land in general.
- 7.76 The Policy is suitable in principle, but should be drafted more in line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. As the land concerned would be previously-developed, a positively-drafted Policy is required. The last, explanatory, part of the Policy would be better as supporting text.

Recommendation

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

POLICY UI3

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE RE-USE OF BUILDINGS, PARKING AREAS AND OTHER HARD SURFACES IN THE COUNTRYSIDE WHICH ARE DECLARED SURPLUS TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF UTILITY COMPANIES AND OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSAL:

- A. IS LIMITED TO THE AREA COVERED BY THE PREVIOUSLY-USED BUILDINGS, PARKING AREAS, ACCESSES AND OTHER HARD SURFACES;***
- B. DOES NOT CONSTITUTE INTENSIFICATION OF USE;***

- C. IS IN KEEPING WITH THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDINGS;*
- D. IS, OR CAN BE, SUITABLY SERVED BY A CHOICE OF MEANS OF TRANSPORT.*

In some instances,.....

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

POLICY UI4

Objections

First Deposit

558/5765	Vodafone Limited
920/8505	Binsted Parish Council
910/8771	Headley Residents' Association
1847/9568	Sussex Downs Conservation Board

Second Deposit SD7.105

1639/12984	East Hampshire AONB Office
1278/14788	CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is sufficiently in line with the Good Practice Guide.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.78 There is no need to qualify impact, harm or any similar term. Harm must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission, and a judgement must be made in every case about whether its severity justifies the refusal of planning permission.
- 7.79 I agree with **Vodafone Ltd** that the Policy should not duplicate the requirements of Part 24 of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 or any other requirement. The Council can be relied upon to abide by them. Nevertheless, for those readers of the Local Plan not conversant with this Order, it would be useful to put the latter part of the Policy, modified as I recommend, in the supporting text.
- 7.80 The Government generally promotes telecommunications development because of its undoubted advantages to industry and individuals. The Council is therefore right to have a positively-worded Policy as a basis for the determination of planning applications. I do not, therefore, agree with the suggestion by the **Headley Residents' Association** that it should be of negative intent.
- 7.81 The **Binsted Parish Council** suggests that in sensitive environments like an AONB *any mast should be at a minimum of 250 yards from housing unless shielded by appropriate tree coverage*. It would be better, however, not to be so prescriptive. A mast might be satisfactorily sited within a shorter distance, but it might be necessary to insist on an even greater distance. A judgement should be made on the circumstances of the case, bearing in mind the requirement to take account of living conditions.
- 7.82 Special care is needed in the determination of planning applications for this type of development in environmentally sensitive areas. I agree with the **East Hampshire AONB Office** and **CPRE** who comment on this matter. It is reasonable to suppose that the need to safeguard these areas will in some circumstances outweigh the need for, and advantages of, telecommunications development. This should be part of the supporting text, explaining the application of the Policy, rather than being included in it.

- 7.83 Interference can be a material planning consideration, and the Policy should refer to it. There is no need for a statement about cumulative effect. I am confident that the Council would take account of the effect of any existing telecommunications equipment in a locality in assessing the degree of any additional harm to interests of acknowledged importance. *May in some circumstances* is too weak. **Will** is better. *In some circumstances* provides enough flexibility in the weighing of conflicting objectives.
- 7.84 The Council's Policy is basically sound and accords with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 8. My recommendation should bring the text even more into line with advice in the Good Practice Guide.

Recommendation

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

POLICY UI4

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS INSTALLATIONS AND EQUIPMENT PROVIDED THAT:

- A. THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT HARM THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA, THE APPEARANCE OF THE STRUCTURE OR BUILDING (IF APPLICABLE) OR LIVING CONDITIONS;***
- B. AS IN SDDP;***
- C. AS IN SDDP; AND***
- D. THERE IS NO CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT IRREMEDEABLE RADIO INTERFERENCE WILL ARISE, OR IS LIKELY TO ARISE, WITH OTHER ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT.***

The need to safeguard areas of particular environmental sensitivity will in some circumstances outweigh the benefits of development. A condition will be attached to any planning permission requiring the restoration of the land to its condition before the development took place, or to any other agreed condition, should the equipment be removed and the land become surplus to requirements.

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD7.107 & PARAGRAPH 7.52

Objections

First Deposit

558/10403 Vodafone Limited

Second Deposit SD7.107

1639/12985 East Hampshire AONB Office
1882/13573 BT Group Plc

Pre Inquiry Change PIC011.7

4200/14988 Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd.
1882/15125 BT Group Plc

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC011.7 (page 175).

Main Issue

Whether the text could better reflect national advice on telecommunications.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.86 The **East Hampshire AONB Office** makes the valid point that where operators rely on surrounding vegetation for screening, they should have control over it. That is more a matter, however, for the Council's exercise of its development control powers with individual proposals rather than for a policy or other text in the Local Plan.
- 7.87 I agree with **BT Group Plc** that *it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards*, but PPG 8 confirms that *health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations*. Parties involved in applications for planning permission or prior approval will be aware of PPG 8 and all its contents, and there is no point in repeating much or all of this national advice in the Local Plan. Whilst applicants probably cannot be forced to provide relevant information, including confirmation that a proposal meets the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines, it is in everybody's interest that they do so. In my experience, they do.
- 7.88 The text could give rise to some misunderstanding, as **Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd** points out, about the stage at which applicants should submit relevant information in support of their schemes. Applications should be accompanied, as PIC011.7 states, by relevant information, but this does not sit comfortably with the last sentence of the paragraph. I recommend accordingly.

- 7.89 The Council may contact operators should it decide to seek approval of an Article 4 Direction. As it says, however, there is no statutory requirement to do so and I see no reason why it should commit itself in this regard.
- 7.90 **Vodafone Limited** comments on Article 4 Directions. Paragraph SD7.108 deletes reference to this procedure and the Objector does not pursue the point. I see no need now for any modification.
- 7.91 Generally, the text suitably reflects Government guidance on Local Plan policies for telecommunications, and other local policies are likely to be apposite.

Recommendation

- 7.92 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC011.7) but with its last sentence replaced with:
-Such information is needed to assist in the Council's determination of the application.*

OUTDOOR SPORT AND RECREATION

POLICY R1

SECOND DEPOSIT SD7.115 AND SD7.118

Objections

1279/12561	Liss Parish Council
1620/13654	Whitehill Town Council
1620/13657	Whitehill Town Council
1791/13861	Buriton Village Association
1960/14044	Liss Village Design Group
68/14195	Environment Agency
938/14447	Buriton Parish Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC012.7 (page 177).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should take account of traffic generation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.93 The short answer to this is: yes. The **Liss Parish Council**, the **Liss Village Design Group** and the **Buriton Village Association** helpfully refer to the need to take account of traffic generation, and presumably their members welcome the Latest Proposed Change. I much agree with the comments of the **Buriton Parish Council** about sunken lanes. They are a vital part of the beauty of the East Hampshire countryside and merit protection.
- 7.94 I would resist the suggestion that **Whitehill Town Council** makes about overriding local benefits. They should be taken into account in the determination of a planning application, and might outweigh the provisions of the development plan. The unqualified reference to disturbance is satisfactory. Again, usual development control procedures allow for the attachment of conditions to a permission to ensure sufficient mitigation of disturbance and thereby making the development acceptable.
- 7.95 There is no need to mention the matters to which the **Environment Agency** refers. There are adequate national and local policies dealing with the effect on the countryside, the AONB that the Policy already acknowledges and other interests of acknowledged importance. And the Local Plan will have to be read as a whole.
- 7.96 The Policy could, however, be brought more into line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. Its last 3 paragraphs appear to me to be information as to how the Policy will be applied. That would be better as supporting text.

Recommendation

- 7.97 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC012.7) and as follows:

POLICY R1

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE PROVISION FOR OUTDOOR SPORT AND RECREATION IN THE COUNTRYSIDE PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD NOT:

- A. HARM ITS CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE, ESPECIALLY IN THE AONB;***
- B. RESULT IN ACTIVITY DAMAGING TO IT OWING TO THE SCALE, DESIGN AND NATURE OF THE PROPOSAL;***
- C. HARM THE NEARBY USE OF LAND, INCLUDING LIVING CONDITIONS AND THE ENJOYMENT BY ALL OF ITS ATTRACTIONS;***
- D. RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY, OR HARM THE SPECIAL QUALITY OF, FOR EXAMPLE, SUNKEN LANES;***
- E. REQUIRE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HIGHWAY THAT WOULD BE DAMAGING TO ITS CHARACTER AND SURROUNDINGS;***
- F. RESULT IN UNSUSTAINABLE TRAVEL PATTERNS.***

If buildings ancillary to an outdoor recreational use.....

PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACE

POLICY R2

Objections

First Deposit

25/5025 Alton Allotments Association
1308/8930 Sport England

Main Issue

Whether the Policy sufficiently emphasises the importance of providing alternative open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.98 I appreciate that the location of alternative provision might be less convenient for some individuals, but the Council would not be denied taking their particular and present circumstances into account. Furthermore, a local planning authority should take a longer-term view that is in the interests of the local community as a whole. That is the gist of the Policy and I support it. Management of allotments, though important to the holders, is more a matter for owners and others with an interest in the land than for a land-use policy.
- 7.99 To ensure greater certainty, the sites to which this Policy applies should be identified on the Proposals Map. I realise that this will be a time-consuming task, but these open spaces are important in terms of function and amenity and the Local Plan will be better as a result of a clear cross-reference between the Policy and the land to which it relates and protects.
- 7.100 The Policy could be brought more into line with the Good Practice Guide. There is no need for *wherever they are located*, because this is a District-wide policy. Again, the explanatory material after the criteria would be better as supporting text.

Recommendation

- 7.101 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by identifying on the Proposals Map the sites to which this Policy applies, and as follows:

POLICY R2

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD RESULT IN THE LOSS OF EDUCATIONAL OR RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE, PLAYING FIELDS, PARKS OR ALLOTMENTS, WHETHER IN PUBLIC OR PRIVATE OWNERSHIP, UNLESS:.....

and with the explanatory material after the criteria appearing as supporting text.

PARAGRAPH 7.59

Objections

First Deposit

1890/9708 Coors Brewers Ltd

Second Deposit SD7.128

3882/14285 Sport England

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC013.7 (page 178).

Main Issue

Whether the provision of alternative open space should be of better quality than that which is lost.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.102 Ideally, it should be but it would be unreasonable to insist upon it in every case. **Sport England** makes the good point that a playing field can be used as a local play area and so should be located close to the communities that they serve. This should also reduce travelling by car. The Latest Proposed Change satisfies these points.

Recommendation

7.103 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC013.7).

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS

POLICY R3

PRE-INQUIRY CHANGE PARAGRAPH PIC014.7

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 143.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC57 and PIC015.7 (page 179) and at PIC014.7 (page 179 and 180).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is practicable and suitably reflects national and Structure Plan policies.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.104 The SDDP now provides for those circumstances where off-site provision would be more appropriate. The Policy anticipates proposals for new development, rather than directly seeking to rectify any existing deficiencies in Headley or elsewhere. There is nothing to stop the Council, however, from seeking to enter into agreements with a developer to make good any local shortage. The Latest Proposed Change usefully clarifies the point.
- 7.105 **George Wimpey (UK) Limited** points out that 3.0 ha of open space per 1000 people is above National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) and Structure Plan requirements of 2.4 and 2.8 ha respectively. The Council's response on this point is, however, convincing. The Structure Plan, it says, suggests that the Local Plan policy for the provision of open space should be based upon NPFA minimum standards for playing fields and children's play space. Being *based upon* implies flexibility, not rigidity.
- 7.106 The SDDP standards are somewhat above NPFA standards because they include 0.8 ha of informal open space which are areas for general, informal recreation. They include village greens and parks. The Council notes that the Structure Plan no longer refers to a 2.8 ha standard, and the SDDP states that the total amount of open space in the various categories does not exceed 3 ha per 1000 population. These various figures do not greatly differ, none is excessive, and the Council is in a good position to continue to survey and assess local requirements. There is no convincing reason not to accept its conclusions on the matter.
- 7.107 Where there is sufficient and suitably located open space of suitable quality and of all types to meet existing and expected requirements, there would be less reason to expect developers to provide it as part of, or in association, with their schemes. No doubt that would be a consideration that the Council would take into account in its deliberations. As **Coors Brewers Ltd** states, there is no point in providing *open space which is neither needed nor desired in specific locations*.

- 7.108 Areas of wildlife interest may or may not be appropriately included in the provision of open space. It depends upon circumstances, including compatibility of uses. Developers may be willing to enter into agreements for the management of these areas, and in my experience they often do so. All obligations concerning open space and any other infrastructure must, however, be in line with Policy GS4 as recommended to be modified, and with national policy in Circular 1/97 with which it accords. As always, the key test is reasonableness.
- 7.109 A distinction should be made between those parts of the text that are the Policy and that from SD7.132 onwards which is more by way of explanation. The supporting text should also be brought more in line with Circular 1/97, as several Objectors request. **The Whitehall Town Council** requests the deletion at SDDP paragraph SD7.142 of the reference to Town or Parish Councils. I do, however, see a role for these democratic bodies, and see no reason for their omission from the text.

Recommendation

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

POLICY R3

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR SCHEMES OF ONE OR MORE DWELLINGS PROVIDED THAT THEY INCLUDE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE TO THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM STANDARDS (IN HECTARES PER 1,000 PEOPLE):

AS IN SDDP

The Council will seek to enter into agreements with the developer for the suitable provision, laying out and maintenance in perpetuity of open space. Where there is a deficiency, the Council will seek to enter into an agreement to secure a higher provision so as to offset that deficiency.

Where development sites include or adjoin areas of wildlife interest, the Council may seek to enter into an agreement with the developer for their management in perpetuity to maintain and/or enhance their wildlife potential.....

And then as in SDDP but with the last sentence replaced as follows:

On small schemes where it would not be practicable to include open space, the Council will seek to enter into an agreement with the developer to secure suitable provision in the vicinity, or to make an appropriate commuted payment to it in lieu of its inclusion on site and thereby make a reasonable contribution to any identified local need.

PARAGRAPH 7.64

Objection

First Deposit

1287/7633 Mrs A Storey

Main Issue

Whether developers should normally be required to determine, within 3 months of the grant of planning permission, how they wish to deal with the future management of open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.111 I do find this requirement difficult to understand, and I am grateful to **Mrs Storey** for raising the matter. Presumably any planning permission would be granted with a condition attached to it or, more likely, subject to an agreement concerning future management. In being aware of the condition or in acceding to the agreement, the developer would be aware from the date of the permission at the latest of what is required.

7.112 In other words, the management of the open space should be resolved at the planning application stage, with the prospect of refusal of permission if satisfactory arrangements cannot be agreed. Alternatively, a condition could be attached to ensure that the development could not be occupied until those arrangements had been agreed.

7.113 Perhaps the last sentence should be *Developers will normally be required to determine how they wish to deal with the future management of such areas before planning permission is granted*. I would ask the Council to look again at this paragraph and clarify it.

Recommendation

7.114 I recommend that the SDDP be modified with any clarification that the Council thinks appropriate.

SECOND DEPOSIT SD7.138

Objection

1308/8929 Sport England
1620/13662 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether any studies or surveys should be *agreed by the local community*.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.115 I have no doubt that the Council would consult, and attach a good deal of importance to the comments of, the local community. That would include Town and Parish Councils. But the Council remains the local planning authority and its decisions should not be fettered in the way suggested. **Sport England** say that it would be appropriate to refer to an assessment of playing fields carried out by the Council. SD7.138 adequately covers this valid point, and I endorse it.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 7.66

Objection

First Deposit

1874/10159 House Builders Federation

Main Issue

Whether the guidance in this paragraph is appropriate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.117 There is nothing wrong in principle with the Council seeking to enter into agreements with developers for commuted payments to provide open space. The acid test, yet again, is reasonableness as explained in Circular 1/97. Where there is a requirement for *commuted sums to be spent collectively on unspecified projects at some time in the future*, as the Objector asserts to be the case, it may be difficult to demonstrate reasonableness. There is no great need to modify this paragraph, apart from replacing such phrases as *the developer will be requested/required* with the more suitable basis for negotiation of *the Council will seek to enter into an agreement with the developer*.

7.118 The main point, however, is that obligations are governed by national policy in the Circular and by SDDP Policy GS4 which should be modified to bring it more into line with the Circular. Each case should be considered on an individual basis, taking account of its particular facts, so as to make any negotiated agreement in conformity with national and local policies. That approach should avoid reliance upon, for example, a blanket formulation, resolution of existing deficiencies or unfair and unreasonably related contributions. In that context, the paragraph is not unduly prescriptive and is, in the main, appropriate.

Recommendation

7.119 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by replacing such phrases as *the developer will be requested/required* with *the Council will seek to enter into an agreement with the developer*.

OPEN SPACE ALLOCATIONS

POLICY R4

Objections

First Deposit

114/5120	M Hoare
806/6262	C Butler
979/6595	Mr & Mrs J Bailey
1008/6644	Mr B Seager
1113/7181	Sheet Village Association
1283/7296	Four Marks Village Design Group
1620/8361	Whitehill Town Council
1992/8624	Mr & Mrs Thornton
1906/8985	The Brows Farm Partnership
1908/8990	Kris Mitra Associates
1921/9096	Rydon Homes Ltd
1942/9390	The Bell Cornwell Partnership
1947/9448	Redrow (SE) Ltd & Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd
1893/9722	Mr A Drinkwater
1644/10240	Alton Town Council
1960/10284	Liss Village Design Group

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC016.7 and PIC017.7 (pages 181 and 182).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Sunderton Lane Conservation Field and adjoining fields at Clanfield, as well as various playing fields, allotments, recreation grounds on Map 32b (Petersfield and Sheet) should be allocated for open space;
- 2) Whether land west of Fenwood Bowen and to the east of the Barratt estate at Four Marks should be allocated for this use;
- 3) Whether there should be public access to the castle mound and adjacent earthworks at Rowlands Castle and to the nearby showhouse with its exhibits of products of the former brickworks.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.120 I agree with the Council's comments about Sunderton Lane Conservation Field and neighbouring fields. It is not appropriate for existing open spaces to be allocated in the Local Plan. They will be protected by Policy R2. The same applies to other land to which this issue refers. The identification of those areas on the Proposals and Inset Maps will serve to confirm the protection of existing open spaces.

*

7.121 Land to the west of Fenwood Bowen is now rightly allocated for residential development as part of the baseline site south of Winchester Road. I support this allocation for the

reasons I set out in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. I agree with the Council that land east of the Barratt estate is suitable for residential development and should be regarded as a windfall.

*

7.122 The third issue raises an interesting point, but it appears to me to be more a matter of land ownership than for inclusion in a Local Plan as a suitable policy or proposal.

-0-

7.123 On another matter, the SDDP now includes the Lemon Grove for children's playspace and informal open space. Several Objectors refer to its wildlife interest, and the Council will note the **Whitehill Town Council's** request that an ecological survey be carried out. This should certainly be undertaken before any *possible limited residential development* is contemplated.

7.124 Allotments are to be part of the redevelopment scheme for the Depot at Holybourne. Hopefully this will meet the **Alton Town Council's** concerns about the present distribution of allotments in the town. Similarly, I hope that my recommendations concerning Liss that are founded upon its rural setting and character will meet the reasonable aspirations of the **Liss Village Design Group**.

7.125 I deal with the **Brows Farm Partnership's** proposed mixed-use development at Liss and **Kris Mitra Associates** proposals for Passfield Common in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. Residential, employment and other development is not always justified by the provision of land for open space as part of a scheme and any other claimed advantages. That is the case with these examples. The same applies to land at Blackberry Lane and Alton Lane, Four Marks, and at Cumbers, Liss.

7.126 I recommend against the allocation of land, proposed by either the Council or Objectors, at Medstead.

Recommendation

7.127 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC016.7 and PIC017.7).

GREEN LANE, CLANFIELD

POLICY R4

LAND ADJACENT TO VILLAGE HALL, EAST MEON

POLICY R4 (bi)

Objections

First Deposit

297/5669	Mr J Barnbrook
1030/7226	Clanfield Parish Council
897/8515	The Ramblers' Association
2018/8888	Mr M Chaudhry
1831/10405	Mr R S Cullimore
1832/10407	Mrs J Cullimore
192/5206	Lt Cmdr & Mrs R J West
897/8511	The Ramblers' Association
68/10501	Environment Agency

Main Issue

Whether the proposed residential scheme at Clanfield should include open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.128 In short, yes, it should. This will be a residential development of substantial size and it is entirely reasonable that it should include a kickabout area, children's playspace and informal open space, all suitably sited and related to the dwellings and of a size commensurate with the demands likely to be made upon it. I agree with the supporters of the scheme that these facilities would serve to reinforce existing facilities elsewhere in the village.
- 7.129 The assertion that some open spaces are not fully used and should be improved should not deny prospective residents the conveniently sited open space that the scheme should include. Nor should the fear, reasonable or otherwise, about vandalism.
- 7.130 The Design Brief for the residential scheme should take account of the **Ramblers' Association** point about a cycle route between Petersfield and Horndean. It should also include any traffic calming measures that might be needed.
- 7.131 There is a good deal of support for the open space proposal at East Meon, and the relevant planning permission has been granted.

Recommendation

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

WINCHESTER ROAD, FOUR MARKS

POLICY R4 (ci)

PARAGRAPH 7.72(C)

Objections

First Deposit

1276/8188 David Wilson Estates
1289/7974 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1622/8474 English Nature

Main Issue

Whether nature conservation interests on the Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) should thwart development on the baseline site south of Winchester Road.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.133 These are holding objections. There is always the risk of disturbance when residential development takes place close to land with this important interest. Bearing in mind the management of the SINC that should take place, the acute need for housing in the District, the appreciable degree of sustainability of Four Marks and the suitability in principle of the baseline allocation for housing, these interests should not thwart the residential proposal.
- 7.134 The deletion of the open space from this land and its replacement near the tennis courts and bowling green as a result of SD7.146 will serve to retain the nature conservation interests. I accept the point made by **David Wilson Estates** that a SINC is a local, not national, designation, but that is no reason to excise it from the SDDP or to give little attention to its protection.

Recommendation

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

SOUTH OF WINCHESTER ROAD, FOUR MARKS

POLICY R4 (cii)

Objections

First Deposit

1289/7975 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1956/8125 Messrs Tew Preston & Cheesley
1276/8189 David Wilson Estates
1720/8574 J King
1706/8961 Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd

Second Deposit SD7.145

1286/14239 Four Marks Parish Council
1287/14268 Mrs A Storey

Second Deposit SD7.146

3792/11472 Mr D & Mrs K M Preston
1956/11650 Messrs Tew, Preston & Cheesley
3800/14229 L F & R K Millar
68/14936 Environment Agency

Pre-Inquiry Change PIC016.7

3886/15271 Squires Bridge Homes / Wates Landmark

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC57 (page 179) and PIC016.7 (page 181).

Main Issue

Whether the amount of open space to which the Latest Proposed Change refers is reasonable.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.136 The Latest Proposed Change corrects the amount of open space from 1.1 to 1.6 ha. There is no convincing evidence to suggest that it is an unreasonable amount. And, in view of the closeness of this land to existing and proposed residential development, its convenient shape, sense of enclosure and the fact that it could form part of a complex of recreational facilities in this part of the village, I support this latest change. Any contribution by developers to its provision would need to be based upon the principle of reasonableness, a matter discussed exhaustively. The Council usefully explains *that within areas of open space deficiency, the Council will negotiate with developers to seek a higher provision of open space to offset the deficiencies*. That sets the record straight,

and **Squires Bridge Homes / Wates Landmark** has conditionally withdrawn its objection to Policy R3. I also bear in mind that the local deficiency could be somewhat offset should planning permission be granted for more than the currently envisaged 150 dwellings on the baseline site south of Winchester Road.

7.137 I deal with the objection lodged by **Messrs Tew, Preston & Cheesley** in Chapter 2 of my Report, recommending that their gardens be included in the SPB. I also consider there other aspects of the SPB for Four Marks.

Recommendation

7.138 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC016.7).

LAND AT THE REAR OF CHASEFIELDS, FARRINGDON POLICY R4 (di)

Objections

First Deposit

487/6103	S & P Cory
1059/6723	Mr & Mrs D Drew
713/6803	Ms A Shewan
1277/6980	Beazer Strategic Land
1278/7335	CPRE
678/8335	Mrs L Cavendish
679/8340	The Hon J Cavendish
1579/8890	Mr & Mrs D J Gilchrist
1013/9829	Commander L J Pearson
1671/9911	Mr A J King
1079/9991	Mrs S Ranger

Second Deposit SD7.147

3822/12735 Mr J Harris & Mrs M Ball

Main Issue

Whether open space here is needed.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.139 The majority of these representations display a marked lack of enthusiasm for this proposal, and Change No: SD7.157 deletes it, together with the allocation for residential development of which it would have formed part. It is not now, therefore, included in the SDDP. The prospect of this open space does not justify a significant increase of residential development in this small settlement where services and facilities are so lacking. Any required open space to serve existing residents should be provided independently of a residential scheme.

Recommendation

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

DELL PIECE WEST, HORNDEAN

POLICY R4 (fi)

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 145.

Main Issue

Whether this land should be retained for informal open space (wildlife area) as the SDDP proposes and/or designated as a SINC.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.141 **The Borrow Foundation** requests that this 4.25 ha site be included in the SPB and allocated for one or more of the following 3 uses; commercial leisure, residential or industrial/business. Conversely, it says, it should not be designated as informal open space or as a SINC. I agree that it is well located to the good range of local services and facilities, and that frequent buses to Portsmouth and convenient access to the A3(M) road make it well located for public and private transport to a range of larger centres. It is much closer to the Safeway supermarket and a large employment area (Hazleton Industrial Estate) than is, for example, the land south of Keydell Nursery. In terms of location, this land at first sight has much to commend it for the types of development envisaged.
- 7.142 In particular, a commercial/leisure development would be conveniently placed for a wide residential catchment area. A leisure use has been contemplated in the past, including in the Council's Development Brief in 1988. The Council refers to Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 6 concerning Town Centres, which has since been published, and rightly notes that the siting of new commercial leisure facilities should follow the sequential approach. There is little evidence to suggest that such an examination has been thoroughly undertaken, and in any event the Havant Borough Local Plan already includes an allocation for recreation facilities in the town centre at Waterlooville. These considerations tell against this particular use at Dell Piece West.
- 7.143 There is a good deal of support for the SDDP proposal that the land should be for informal open space (wildlife area). This is despite the securing of about 17 ha of land for public open space to the south of Dell Piece West as a result, the **Borrow Foundation** points out, of a legal agreement arising from the Safeway retail proposals, and provision elsewhere in the locality. Dell Piece West was also granted to the Council as open space through a legal agreement. It is clear from the representations that many local people appreciate and enjoy its openness and wildlife interest. Open areas like this often provide a pleasant contrast and relief to the built-up areas within which they are located, and that is the case here. When they are of wildlife interest, they are especially valuable. Thus it is not just quantity of open space, but its quality and location that are of importance.
- 7.144 The **Hampshire County Council** provides convincing evidence of the substantial nature conservation interests of this land. Mr Edwards is a well-qualified and experienced ecologist, and I rely a good deal on what he tells me. His evidence is set out in his proof,

and there is no need to repeat it here. It confirms that local people are right to point out that the land should not qualify as a SINC solely on the presence of rare dragonfly, and the supporting text should acknowledge the fact. I ask the Council to consult Mr Edwards again so as to make this point clear, although I recommend as far as I am able to do so.

- 7.145 Built development would not only deny members of the public access to some or all of this land, but would cause serious harm to its nature conservation interest. Its biodiversity should be enhanced, not eroded. This consideration, together with the sufficient amount of land that the modified SDDP should make available for residential, commercial and industrial uses, outweighs any need for built development on this land.
- 7.146 The extent of the land, its openness and location close to other open land at this edge of the settlement relates it more to the countryside than to the built-up area. It is common ground between the Council, **Mr Palmer** and others that Horndean needs more leisure facilities, and I would urge the Council to continue to use its best endeavours to promote them in a suitable location. But the SPB should not be altered to include an allocation at Dell Piece West.

Recommendation

- 7.147 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the inclusion of the following in paragraph 7.72 f.:

The County Council has indicated that the site is very important for nature conservation, due to such features as ancient semi-natural woodland, agriculturally unimproved grassland, a pond and the wildlife that they support. This includes rare dragonfly and various amphibians and reptiles.

**CATHERINGTON LANE, HORNDEAN
POLICY R4 (fii)**

Objection

First Deposit

1934/9345 Mr S Prescott

Main Issue

Whether this land should be retained as designated open space, or would be more suitably allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.148 This land is at the edge of the settlement generally further away from services and facilities than are those sites that I recommend should be allocated for residential development and thereby better contribute towards the Districts housing requirements. There is no need for this additional land to be allocated for this purpose, and its location close to existing residential development, as well as its extent, makes it more suitable for the use that the Council intends for it. A Section 106 Agreement required the provision of the playing fields in association with the residential development to the south.

Recommendation

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

LONDON ROAD, HORNDEAN
SECOND DEPOSIT ALLOCATION SD7.148

Objection

Second Deposit SD7.148

3837/14798 S R Wittcombe

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC018.7 (page 183).

Main Issue

Whether this land is suitably located and satisfactory in all other respects for informal open space, children's play area, access and interpretation area for Catherington Lith.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.150 I outline the planning history of this land in my examination of Objections to Policy IB1 (10), and conclude that the SDDP should be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change. The land should provide for a limited amount of development in the form of either industrial/business use or for mobile homes, thereby securing some open space on it.

Recommendation

7.151 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC018.7).

LAND REAR OF CAMOY MEAD, LASHAM
POLICY R4 (gi)

Objection

First Deposit

1875/10163 Swan Hill Homes

Main Issue

Whether this land should remain allocated for open space or should be included within a residential development scheme.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.152 There is considerable support for the retention of this allocation and for the use of the land for open space, and for good reasons. It is located near the centre of the village where it can be conveniently used by local people. As I explain in Chapter 5. 5 of my Report, there are few services and facilities in this village, and this limited sustainability makes it unsuitable for significant residential development. That conclusion is not outweighed by such benefits as affordable housing and a management scheme for the village pond. The allocation should remain as the SDDP intends.

Recommendation

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

LINDFORD

POLICY R4 (h)

Objections

First Deposit

439/5546 Mr & Mrs D C Comber

Main Issue

Whether the Riverside Walk should be designated a bridleway.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.154 The Draft Development Brief for the Chase Road development, adopted by the Council's North East Area Committee on 3rd November 1998, noted that consideration should be given to enhancing the use of this path by designating it a bridleway. I agree that, if compatible with other reasonable requirements, such a designation could be of benefit to local horse riders. No doubt the Council will be considering the provision of a bridleway in any proposed development of this allocated land which has been carried forward from the First Review of the Local Plan.

Recommendation

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

LAND OFF NORTH ROAD, PETERSFIELD

POLICY R4 (ji)

Objections

First Deposit

195/5209 Mr R L Bennetts
1948/9461 Beechcroft Developments Ltd

Main Issue

Whether any of this land should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.156 The SDDP accepts the possibility of a small amount of housing on this site to enable the public open space to come forward. As I discuss in Chapter 5.3 of my Report concerning Petersfield, this is an acceptable proposition.

-0-

7.157 On another matter, I agree that Mr **Bennetts'** land at the southern end of this allocation should be deleted from it. That is achieved by Change No: SD7.151, and rightly so for the reasons that he gives. It is part of his garden.

Recommendation

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

CAUSEWAY FARM, PETERSFIELD

POLICY R4 (jiii)

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 147.

Main Issue

Whether this land should be allocated for open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.159 These Objections are essentially to the principle of residential development at Causeway Farm, a matter that I examine in some detail in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. I conclude there that this land should be retained as a Reserve Site and developed should circumstances warrant it. If it is developed, a reasonable requirement will be sufficient open space and in the most suitable part of the residential scheme.

7.160 The parties concerned will note **Mrs Alkin**'s comment about the very boggy nature of the R4 allocation and in her view its unsuitability for any kind of recreational facilities. Even so, its placing towards the east of the site on each side of the stream appears to me to be the most satisfactory arrangement. Its precise extent and shape will no doubt be considered during the preparation of any Development Brief.

Recommendation

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

HOLLYWATER ROAD, WHITEHILL/BORDON

POLICY R4 (mi)

Objections

First Deposit

1620/8365 Whitehill Town Council

Second Deposit SD7.154

3878/11767 Peak Quality Homes Ltd
4024/11997 Joan Martin
1620/13665 Whitehill Town Council
1620/13675 Whitehill Town Council
3747/13827 Councillor Mr A S Carew

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC020.7 (page 184).

Main Issue

Whether land at Lemon Grove should be allocated for children's playspace, informal open space and possible limited residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.162 Paragraph SD7.154 introduces a proposal for Lemon Grove rather than a change to the Council's proposal for informal open space at Hollywater Road. **Peak Quality Homes Ltd** says that the land is unsuitable for children's playspace, for reasons that include that *it is not securely overlooked or visible from surrounding roads*. It is, however, surrounded by residential and other development and is close to a good range of facilities. The Objector complains that the SDDP gives no indication of the extent of that part of the land that would be suitable for possible limited residential development or the extent of the wildlife area. It would be better, it says, to judge any application for residential development in the light of development plan policies.
- 7.163 It is true that the SDDP gives no indication of the extent of the various possible components of a scheme for the land, and there is no reason why a planning application could not be determined in the way suggested. There is, however, evidence from the representations of some wildlife interest, and the Council will note in particular **Councillor Mr Carew's** comments about badgers. And I agree with the **Whitehill Town Council** that its openness provides a green lung in this very densely developed part of the Parish. Surveys indicate a shortage of children's play space in Whitehill. I am attracted to the suggestion that the land should be retained solely as a wildlife area, but I am not convinced from such evidence as there is that that interest is sufficiently noteworthy to justify it. Further, more detailed surveys of badger setts and foraging areas would be useful in establishing the value of the land for nature conservation.

- 7.164 On the evidence of the competing claims for the future of this land, the District Council has got the balance about right. The emphasis should be on keeping all or most of the land open and enhancing its wildlife interest if that can be justified and shown to be compatible with playspace. I would not rule out a playspace, although supervision of children would no doubt be prudent. I would not resist some very limited development of a few dwellings or so, provided that this could be achieved without undermining proposals for nature conservation and/or children's play space. If too much is expected of this small site, the various possibilities suggested for it could negate each other. The text should stay substantially as it is, but should be less definite and as I recommend.
- 7.165 This is as much help as I can give. The best way to progress from here is for the Council to discuss things further with the Objector and other interested parties with a view to submitting an application for planning permission. The matter of possible contamination of the land must be assessed.

-0-

- 7.166 The **Whitehill Town Council** asks that land adjacent to the Forest Community Centre be allocated and landscaped as an informal open space for a variety of uses including open air markets and community events. The landscaping of an existing open space should not, however, qualify as a policy or land use allocation in a Local Plan. The District Council owns the land. It states that Whitehill has a surplus of some 15 ha of informal open space and, accordingly, there is no need to allocate for more. The District Council confirms that there is no reason to presume that in future the land will be used differently from its current informal community purpose. Any proposed changes to that arrangement would need to be considered against the provisions of the development plan and the requirements of the community. In these circumstances, I see no need for an open space allocation under this Policy.

Recommendation

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

SD7.162/PIC020.7

.....the Council considers that a very limited amount of development on part of this site *may* be appropriate. Any development will.....

WHITEHILL/BORDON POLICY R4 (m)

Objections

First Deposit

1620/8363 Whitehill Town Council

Second Deposit SD7.162

3878/13346 Peak Quality Homes Ltd

Pre-Inquiry Change PIC020.7

3878/14980 Peak Quality Homes Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC020.7 (page 184).

Main Issue

Whether the text should refer to a significant shortfall of playing fields at Whitehill/Bordon, and the means of making it good.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.168 There is a limit to what the Local Plan should say, and the number of times that it should say it. I am in no doubt that the Council will take account of existing and required infrastructure in its determination of planning applications for residential and other development, and seek to enter into agreements with developers where it is reasonable to do so. It will be guided by Policy GS4, Circular 1/97 and any other material considerations. Those agreements may specify particular and actual provision or improvement, or introduce commuted payments. Reasonable conditions might also be attached to planning permissions. It is also a matter that should be examined in the preparation of the Masterplan for Whitehill/Bordon. This should take account of land within and without Defence Estates ownership, recreational and otherwise.

7.169 The Town Council agreed at the Inquiry that the shortfall in playing fields at Whitehill/Bordon is of the order of 4.8 ha. The District Council agrees to incorporate a revised wording at SDDP paragraph 7.72(m). This would acknowledge the need to improve accessibility to playing fields and the deficit in children's play areas and kick-about areas. I endorse the agreed wording.

-0-

7.170 On another matter, the **Whitehill Town Council** requests that the text includes a note that *land adjacent to the Forest Community Centre will be retained and landscaped as an open space for a variety of uses including open air markets and community events*. I agree with the Council's response. The land is in the District Centre, and it may be in the landowner's interest to provide certain facilities near the Centre during the Local Plan

period. Those opportunities might be lost if the land were allocated for uses that precluded acceptable redevelopment.

7.171 It is not for the Local Plan to address the matter of improved drainage to the Community School playing pitches on the east side of Hollywater Road.

7.172 There is nothing that I can add to my conclusions above about Lemon Grove.

Recommendation

7.173 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC020.7), subject to my recommendation at paragraph 7.167 and replace the second sub-paragraph of SDDP 7.72(m) with the following:

The designation of Mill Chase School as a community school has brought forward additional pitch facilities for the Parish, however these are poorly drained and this often results in the pitches being unplayable. The 2003 Open Space Survey identifies a shortfall in playing pitch provision of 4.8 ha, and there is still an urgent need to improve accessibility to playing fields throughout the area. Whitehill also has a deficit of children's play areas and kick-about areas, and the provision of facilities to meet all of these shortfalls will be sought.

COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION POLICY R5 AND PARAGRAPH 7.76

Objections

First Deposit

897/6453 The Ramblers' Association
1278/7366 CPRE
1278/10437 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the SDDP should be modified in any way.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.174 This Policy and paragraph are deleted in the SDDP by way of Changes SD7.163 and SD7.166. There are no objections to these deletions. The **Ramblers' Association** refers to problems arising from the parking of vehicles in various villages. The Council will note the request for meetings, although they have no doubt already taken place.

Recommendation

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

RECREATION FACILITIES REQUIRING EXTENSIVE AREAS OF LAND

POLICY R6 AND PARAGRAPH 7.81

NOISY SPORTS

POLICY R7

Objections

First Deposit

910/8775	Headley Residents' Association
1578/8884	The Petersfield Society
1578/8886	The Petersfield Society
1521/10342	Professor M J Withers
622/10343	Councillor Mrs T M Jamieson
622/8276	Councillor Mrs T M Jamieson

Second Deposit SD7.193

3882/14290 Sport England

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC021.7 (page 187).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Policy R6 gives sufficient attention to proposals for golf courses;
- 2) Whether the Policies should refer to wildlife habitats, nature conservation and protection from noise.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.176 Policy R6 identifies golf courses as facilities that require extensive areas of land and, although it should be strengthened in its drafting, there is no need to labour the point any further. I agree, however, that golf courses can have a damaging effect upon the countryside, the manicured greens and ancillary buildings giving it a more urban and less rural character.

*

7.177 On the second issue, these interests are important, and the Policies should acknowledge them. Nature conservation does, however, include significant wildlife areas. The text, amplified by the Latest Proposed Change, refers to various matters likely to be of importance in the Council's deliberations. These include nature conservation, but I would prefer to see it included in the Policy. I recommend accordingly. Some material considerations are common to both policies, and a combined Policy would avoid duplication. I draft one in line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. Owing to the

importance that I attach to the beauty of the East Hampshire countryside and to national policy for protecting it for the sake of its intrinsic character, this combined Policy should be negatively worded.

- 7.178 Existing golf courses would be taken into account in the establishment of any need for an additional one. As previously discussed, there is no need to qualify harm or similar terms.

Recommendation

- 7.179 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC021.7) and as follows:

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR

1) A RECREATION FACILITY LIKE A GOLF COURSE OR DRIVING RANGE THAT REQUIRES AN EXTENSIVE AREA OF LAND, OR

2) A PROPOSAL FOR NOISY SPORTS,

WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNLESS IT:

A. MEETS AN IDENTIFIED NEED;

B. IS CONVENIENTLY ACCESSIBLE BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT;

C. SAFEGUARDS THE QUALITY OF THE LANDSCAPE (ESPECIALLY OF THE AONB) AND CONSERVES AREAS OF IMPORTANT TREES AND WOODLAND, HEATHLAND OR CHALK GRASSLAND, AS WELL AS NATURE CONSERVATION INTERESTS;

D. IS OF A TYPE THAT DOES NOT RESULT IN MORE TRAFFIC CAUSING INCONVENIENCE OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY OR REQUIRING IMPROVEMENTS TO IT THAT WOULD HARM ITS CHARACTER AND THAT OF ITS SURROUNDINGS;

E. WOULD NOT HARM LIVING CONDITIONS OR THE ENJOYMENT OF THOSE WHO ENJOY THE COUNTRYSIDE, INCLUDING ITS RIGHTS OF WAY, AS A RESULT OF NOISE OR ANY OTHER DISTURBANCE.

F. IN THE CASE OF 1) WOULD BE CLOSE TO THE MAIN AREAS OF DEMAND, PREFERABLY AT THE EDGE OF A SETTLEMENT;

The Council will expect the proposal to include any relevant measures for the retention and management of important landscape features.