

INTRODUCTION

PARAGRAPH 6.1

Objections

First Deposit

1272/7675 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1660/9814 Voluntary Action for East Hampshire

Main Issue

Whether the employment strategy is sufficiently flexible and whether sufficient land is allocated to provide a selection of sites of marketable quality.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.1 The Council's employment strategy is in SDDP Chapter 6 paragraphs 6.6-6.9. Background to it is in its Industrial and Business Land Topic Paper (Document CD17/3). The strategy seeks to keep the local economy buoyant and to ensure a range of economic activities without creating undue pressure for new housing and with attendant traffic problems and detriment to the environment. The Council accepts that the provision of land for industry and business is crucially important, but it also realises that the Local Plan cannot meet all the economic aspirations and solve every problem by allocating land on demand. I agree. East Hampshire is a primarily rural area with substantial constraints imposed by its high quality environment. The SDDP seeks to balance competing demands and objectives, and in the main I consider that it does so. There is no undue emphasis on social, environmental or any other relevant considerations.
- 6.2 The Council's consultant (Hughes Ellard) identifies a dearth of Grade A industrial space (newly completed/refurbished/top specification). But I accept that in a predominantly rural District, where demand for building land of all types exceeds supply, a balance is needed. In other words, the Local Plan should not provide for unrestricted, market-led demand. The effectiveness or otherwise of the strategy will be reviewed through monitoring (see SDDP Chapter 8 and Document CD17/3 paragraphs 3.8, 4.20 & 4.21). A summary of the technical and statistical background to the strategy is set out in some detail in the Industrial and Business Land Topic Paper, its flexibility being outlined in paragraphs 5.23-5.24. I acknowledge the reasonable limitations on the flexibility, but consider that the strategy provides a suitable range of provision.
- 6.3 I deal later with the supply of land in greater detail in respect to objections to SDDP paragraphs 6.7-6.9. The marketability of allocated land can be tested only through the marketing process. Whilst inevitably some sites will be more attractive for economic investment than others, there is no evidence to suggest that the Council's strategy fails on the matter of marketable quality of the allocated lands.

Recommendation

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

PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS LAND

PARAGRAPH 6.7

Objections

First Deposit

1039/9930 P Cullen

Second Deposit SD6.004

3812/11551 B&Q Plc
1943/12595 Hartley Park Farms Ltd
1906/13553 The Brows Farm Partnership
3820/14329 Dalton Warner Davis

Main Issues

- 1) Whether there is a need for new businesses to locate within the District, given the existing population and economic activity;
- 2) Whether the strategy is right when it states that the District is unable realistically to accommodate all requirements of industrial and business provision because of environmental and other constraints;
- 3) Whether any expansion of Omega Park, Alton and an allocation at Brows Farm, Liss should contribute towards the provision;
- 4) Whether there should be equal provision of Class B1, B2 and B8 Uses;
- 5) Whether the strategy is unduly restrictive and should permit other Uses like retail where employment uses do not come forward and whether the type of industry/business appropriate for outworn sites should be defined.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.5 The strategy seeks to provide a variety of sites to meet the needs of existing businesses and for new ones to locate in the District to match the skills of the local labour force. SD6.004 includes an important caveat with its acknowledgement that the District cannot realistically accommodate all requirements for industrial and business provision, due to environmental and other constraints. Priority will be given to the provision of Class B1 Uses to reduce commuting and the provision of small business units and managed workspace to encourage starter companies. To achieve these worthy objectives, some new employment opportunities must be created in the District irrespective of other circumstances in South East England. The SDDP provides reasonable opportunity for them.

*

6.6 On the second issue, the strategy is right to state that environmental and other proven constraints impose a limit on the amount of new development that can suitably take place in the District. It would be unreasonable to state or imply otherwise. This is a rural District with small market towns and villages. Some 40% of its area lies in an AONB and the prospect is of more land being designated as a National Park. These factors demand significant restraint on development. Again, I consider that the Council has achieved a balance. As for housing supply, the dearth of suitably located previously-developed land inevitably and regrettably requires a majority of the employment allocations to be on greenfield sites.

*

6.7 Thirdly, the SDDP proposes the allocation of about 11.74 ha of land at Alton for employment purposes. That amounts to about one third of the total allocation for the District. Allocation of the Omega Park Omission Site would involve the loss of a greenfield site and would result in the built up area of the settlement expanding up to the A31 trunk road. The loss of this open land between town and road would be severely damaging. It is a valuable part of the rural setting of Alton at one of its main approaches.

6.8 Brows Farm is beyond the main built-up parts of Liss and outside its Settlement Policy Boundary. It is in the AONB. The farm buildings are accessed off Farnham Road and B1 and B8 uses already exist on the site. The attractive countryside around Liss should not be expected to accommodate a substantial increase in employment development.

6.9 These are 2 good examples where, despite the undoubted demand for development, strong environmental matters should prevail.

*

6.10 On the fourth issue, the reason for according priority to Class B1 use is set out at SD6.004. In short, it is to provide local employment opportunities for the resident workforce, reduce commuting and the need to travel. At present some 40% of the local work force commutes to places beyond the District to work (Document CD17/3 paragraph 2.26). The majority is employed in Class B1 enterprises (SD6.004), and that justifies priority being accorded in the District to those Uses. The proposed allocations (Table 1B1) include B2 and/or B8 uses in addition to B1 Uses in 9 of the 16 sites identified. This suggests an appropriate balance in the type of employment sought.

*

6.11 Fifthly, Policy IB4 includes a vital aspect of the employment strategy. This seeks to retain existing industrial and business space where it accords with its surroundings. That is a sensible approach given the need to retain a balance between local employment opportunities, the need for more housing and the high proportion of residents that work outside the District. It is particularly important to retain this space where the value of housing land is well above that for employment uses, otherwise the local employment base could too easily be eroded.

6.12 Policy IB4 sets out those situations where development for alternative uses would be considered. It deserves firm support. Employment brought about by retail development would be a welcome addition to the local economy, but it is not a consideration that would normally be given much weight when applying Policy IB4.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 6.8

Objections

First Deposit

1287/7612 Mrs A Storey

Second Deposit SD6.008

3820/14330 Dalton Warner Davis
1278/14737 CPRE
1278/14762 CPRE
3814/14970 Dairy Crest Groups Plc
3816/14975 Tates

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the *Four Marks* should be replaced by *Medstead*;
- 2) Whether there is a need for additional employment allocations in Whitehill/Bordon and whether there should be equal provision for all forms of employment there;
- 3) Whether more land has been allocated than will be needed during the Plan period and whether there should be a policy requiring a sequential test for allocations on greenfield sites;
- 4) Whether there is mismatch between the range and quality of employment land and a potential shortfall in accessible housing sites;
- 5) Whether the Dairy Crest Depot site in Petersfield presents an opportunity for a mixed use development rather than a wholly employment use under Policy IB4;
- 6) Whether the Hillier Garden Centre, Liss is suitable for a mixed housing and employment scheme.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.14 Yes, it should, and SD6.006 obliges.

*

6.15 On the second issue, **Dalton Warner Davis** seeks an employment allocation to the west of the Woolmer Way Trading Estate. Policy IB1 (7), however, already proposes an extension to the employment allocation south of the Woolmer Way Trading Estate. The allocated land extends to 2.2 ha and could accommodate some 8000 sq m of Class B1, B2 and B8 Uses. The omission site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) and is part of an extensive area identified as a SINC (Hogmoor Inclosure). The fact that the allocated extension would intrude into it does not justify further encroachment. The SDDP acknowledges, and I accept, that demand for employment (and housing) land

within the District cannot be met without restriction, and a balance with important environmental objectives must be struck. Hence, I do not support an extension of the existing employment allocation on the objection site nor its inclusion in the SPB. I comment above on the priority to be accorded to Class B1 Uses in respect of Paragraph 6.7. The possibility of significant areas of previously-developed Defence Estates land at Whitehill/Bordon being declared surplus within the plan period strongly suggests that it would be wrong to allocate further greenfield sites now. To that extent, the search sequence is followed.

*

- 6.16 On the third issue, the SDDP proposes to allocate an additional 9.6 ha of land for employment use in the District. This, together with 24.8 ha in the adopted Local Plan yet to be developed, provides for a total of 34.4 ha during the plan period. The Council's supply figure is based on an analysis of take-up rates within the District for 13 years up to 2003. The revised figures for 2003 (Document PR60/3849 Appendix 2) shows an average annual take up of some 10,600 sq m. The Council's estimates are augmented by studies undertaken by its consultants, Hughes Ellard and Coopers Lybrand (Documents CD17/4 & CD17/5). The former was up-dated in 2003 (Document CD17/7). In my judgement, and in the absence of any other compelling evidence, the analysis of more than a decade of take-up rates is a reasonable basis for estimating future supply.
- 6.17 The amount of land that the SDDP provides for employment purposes during the plan period depends a good deal upon the assumptions made and the methods of projection used. Hence estimates vary of a supply of between 3 and 8 years beyond the plan period. The loss of the former King George's Hospital land at Liphook to housing would represent about one year's average supply (Document PR60/3849 Appendix 2 Projection C). Land at the R E Lines at Whitehill/Bordon, originally allocated for employment, now has the benefit of planning permission for residential development, and this represents a loss of about half a year's supply of employment land.
- 6.18 Bearing in mind the possibility of Defence Estates land becoming available during the plan period, as well as the prospect of some admittedly limited employment uses at Farringdon Mill and SCU Leydene, I consider that the remaining allocations are suitable in location and extent for the reasonable needs of the District. In coming to this view I am conscious that a reasonable surplus would be desirable to provide choice. However, any forecast of employment land supply is fraught with uncertainty. It can be only a crude estimate and the position must be regularly monitored. The County Council undertakes this on an annual basis (Document CD17/3, paragraph 3.8), and I support this approach.
- 6.19 I agree with the Council that caution is needed when changes arising from population and economic activity rates are applied to estimates of the need and supply of land for employment purposes. These can so easily be affected by uncertainties and unknowns, not least the complexity in the relationship between population/skills, increasing home-working, mobility of the workforce, its access to private transport and employment opportunities in the District and further afield. And so again I see no reason to change the employment allocation, apart from those I recommend in respect of particular sites, pending monitoring and/or a review of the SDDP.

6.20 I agree with **CPRE** that vacancy levels of existing buildings could be a factor that should be taken into account in assessing employment land supply. Evidence at the Inquiry from Vail Williams is that these are at an all time high in central southern England (Document 4, paragraph 7.18, PR60/3849), but the Council's survey of its industrial estates suggests vacancies of 6-10% between 1998 and 2002. Although for only 4 years, this evidence suggests a recent fairly high demand for local accommodation. Whilst vacancy levels elsewhere could affect the take-up and development prospects in East Hampshire, there are limits to the variables and influences that can reasonably be built into forecasts of need and supply. Accordingly, I support the Council's view that no particular account should be given to vacant floorspace in estimating the need and supply of land for employment purposes. Monitoring, however, should indicate any need for a different approach.

6.21 The **CPRE** suggests that the allocation of land for employment should abide by the sequential test. The Council confirms that it has done so, and that its approach follows the strategy for the location of development set out in SDDP Chapter 2 paragraph 2.19. Although I have comments on particular sites, I am satisfied that the Council has properly adopted a sequential approach in its selection process. I comment below on the 2 cases that **CPRE** draws to my attention, namely, the Lord Mayor Treloar Hospital, Alton and The Causeway, Petersfield. There is no need for a policy to confirm the approach that the Council has already taken.

*

6.22 On the fifth issue, in a dynamic and changing economy, it would be surprising if demand in the District for employment and housing land did not exceed supply. That does not mean, however, that employment land should be developed for housing without a careful balancing of the issues in respect of each site. I have no evidence to support the view that the SDDP allocates too much land for employment uses. Whether the Dairy Crest Depot land should be redeveloped for a mixed use scheme will depend on the planning circumstances at the time of an application. The Local Plan should not pre-judge the issues. Suffice it to say that Policy IB4 rightly seeks to retain employment land but allows for the weighing of material considerations.

*

6.23 On the sixth issue, the Hillier Garden Centre is in the AONB countryside some 1.5 km from the centre of Liss, well outside its SPB and adjacent to the A3 trunk road. It fails the sequential test. Garden Centres are usually open in character and frequently located in the countryside. To permit their redevelopment would set an unfortunate precedent. In this case, development would result in the consolidation and extension of sporadic development to the serious detriment of the rural scene. A residential scheme would be harmful for the same reasons.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 6.9

Objections

First Deposit

1272/10397 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Second Deposit SD6.009

1943/12598 Hartley Park Farms Ltd
1278/14734 CPRE

Second Deposit SD6.010

1622/12384 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1289/12674 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1874/12829 House Builders Federation
1878/14719 Prowting Projects

Pre Inquiry Change PIC001.6

1864/15398 Defence Estates

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.6 (page 133).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Plan adequately explains how the supply of employment land is calculated;
- 2) Whether the Plan should allow for the up-date of the review of commercial property during the plan period;
- 3) Whether SD6.010 should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.25 The background to the Council's employment strategy is set out in more detail in its Industrial and Business Land Topic Paper (Document CD17/3). The Industrial and Commercial Land Supply is examined in its Section 3, and Floor Space Requirements are discussed in Section 4. Projections based on past take-up rates and other assumptions are set out in its Appendix 2. The projections are up-dated in the Council's Response (PR113/1278) to the CPRE's objection to SDDP paragraph 6.8. I consider that the explanations are comprehensive rather than no more than adequate, and they do not indicate any need to change the amount of land allocated.

*

6.26 On the second issue, the County Council undertakes monitoring of the supply of business and employment land on an annual basis. I see no need for the Local Plan to detail how that process is, or should be, undertaken.

*

6.27 Thirdly, SD6.010 indicates that where Defence Estates buildings or other land are declared redundant, they should be assessed according to the policies of the Local Plan and, if appropriate, considered in advance of the release of reserve sites for development. In response to objections, the Council proposes to delete this text under PIC001.6 because it accepts that there are no reserve allocations for employment. I support this Latest Proposed Change. The **Defence Estates** concern that its land should be considered before greenfield sites are developed is covered by SD6.168 and PIC016.6. It will also note my recommendations concerning Policies MOD1 and MOD2 and supporting texts.

-0-

6.28 On another matter, I deal with the provision of land for employment at Alton in my examination of the Objection to SDDP paragraph 6.7. No more is needed.

Recommendation

6.29 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC001.6).

INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS LAND ALLOCATIONS

POLICY IB1

Objections

First Deposit

18/5017	Mrs S Lewis (and sisters)
461/6035	Mrs D K Denston
161/6083	E R J Finneron
210/6179	S A J Runalls
1113/7180	Sheet Village Association
1538/7356	Mr H M Clarke
1569/7436	Mr W Curtis
1571/7440	Phillips & Son (Alton) Ltd
1279/7465	Liss Parish Council
1272/7647	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1869/7996	Contaks Construction Company Ltd
1274/8002	Mr B Hopcraft
1887/8110	Unigate Dairies Ltd
1620/8226	Whitehill Town Council
1930/8230	Connaught Quarries Ltd
1570/8568	R W McKenzie
1581/8983	Messrs Langrish
1906/8984	The Brows Farm Partnership
1607/9244	Mrs S Halstead
1695/9266	Tooling Products Ltd
1942/9389	The Bell Cornwell Partnership
1943/9394	Hartley Park Farms Ltd
1947/9445	Redrow (SE) Ltd & Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd
1696/9523	Village Green Plc
1959/9538	The Rushforth Family
16/10264	Alton Promotion & Marketing Forum
1303/12914	Borrow Dental Milk Foundation

Main Issues

- 1) Whether land should be allocated at Alton in general to balance a proposed increase of 400 dwellings, and particularly at the Alton (Chawton) Triangle, east of Wilsom Road and at Kiln Farm;
- 2) Whether the Local Plan should encourage the setting up of major high tech industry in Petersfield and, more particularly, allocate land for industry at The Causeway (South);

- 3) Whether land at Dell Piece East, Dell Piece West and Pyle Farm, Horndean should be allocated for employment purposes, and whether the use of the Wessex Plant site in Rowlands Castle Road should be relocated to Dell Piece East;
- 4) Whether land should be allocated for employment use at Liss and, in particular, at Brows Farm and Andlers Ash Road (land south of Cumbers);
- 5) at Four Marks and, in particular, north of Alton Lane;
- 6) at Lucky Lite Farm, Catherington;
- 7) at Selborne Brickworks;
- 8) and at Langrish.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.30 In Chapter 5.3 of my Report I recommend changes to the housing allocations for Alton to provide for some 300 baseline dwellings. The SDDP proposes some 11.7 ha of land for employment uses in the town, amounting to about one third of the total allocation for the District. Bearing in mind the importance of the town in terms of population and range of services and the high environmental quality of the surroundings, this should ensure a reasonable balance between the housing and employment provision. There is no need to provide yet more land for employment.

6.31 I deal with the proposed allocation for mixed housing and/or employment use at the Triangle in Chapter 5.3 of this Report, and can add nothing to my conclusion that such development should not take place. The development of land east of Wilsom Road would extend the built-up area into the open countryside and up to the A31 road, thereby detracting from the open rural setting of the town at an important approach to it. I deal with the former milk depot at Kiln Farm also in Chapter 5.3. There is no reason why any proposals for this land should not be considered under, for example, SDDP Policy IB4 that seeks to protect existing employment land. The Local Plan should not pre-judge any such planning application.

*

6.32 On the second issue, I deal above (SDDP Paragraphs 6.1 and 6.8) with the balance that needs to be struck between population and jobs. The strategy rightly accepts that commuting is a problem, particularly by the highly skilled workforce, and it seeks to address it by emphasising the need for Class B1 Uses in the envisaged development on allocated land as at Buckmore Farm, Petersfield. I doubt whether the Local Plan could go further in encouraging the provision of a certain type of industry. It is not true to say that there are hardly any sites allocated for companies requiring Class B1(a) and B1(b) premises. All 16 sites allocated under Policy IB1 include Class B1 Uses. It would not be sensible to allocate sites solely for that particular Class, particularly when the Council's consultants advise that it would be difficult to attract Class B1(a) and (b) users to the District (Document CD17/7, page 4). The strategy and the descriptions of the allocations are sufficiently flexible to allow for, and indeed encourage, high tech industry.

6.33 I recommend against the SDDP employment allocation on The Causeway. The Omission Site to which the issue relates is greenfield AONB land that stretches from The

Causeway to the railway. It is several times larger than the allocated site, and its development would extend what would be a damaging intrusion into the countryside resulting from a scheme on the allocated site. The land relates poorly to the existing settlement pattern, and the built form would extend the ribbon and similar development into the open countryside, making this approach to the town appreciably less rural and attractive. The damage to the rural scene would be severe, and the suggestion should not be countenanced.

*

- 6.34 Thirdly, SD6.051 allocates a 0.8 ha site at Dell Piece East, Horndean for employment use (Map No: EC5). I have no reason to disagree. The SDDP designates the land at Dell Piece West as a SINC, as is agreed with the County Council. SDDP Policy R4 allocates it for informal open space (wildlife area). Its allocation for employment uses would not be compatible with the Council's laudable intentions for it. My reasons in Chapter 5.4 of this Report for rejecting Pyle Farm for housing apply with equal force to its suggested allocation for employment purposes. The owners/occupiers of the Wessex Plant Site, Rowlands Castle Road are not offering this land for redevelopment, and the Council has no plans for its compulsory acquisition. Accordingly, the relocation of the use to Dell Piece East or anywhere else is not a matter that the Local Plan can determine.

*

- 6.35 On the fourth issue, I agree that there are good arguments for allocating land for employment development at Liss. This would provide greater opportunities for local people to work near their homes. But Liss is an attractive settlement in a high quality AONB countryside where the constraints of landscape and rural setting are paramount. It may be that the best approach would be the conversion and re-use of existing buildings where available and suitable, as is the case at Brows Farm. I do not, therefore, support the allocation of any land at Liss for employment use, either solely or as part of a mixed development.

*

- 6.36 Fifthly, land is allocated at Station Road, Medstead. It is close to the railway that generally defines the northern boundary of the built-up area of Four Marks and is close enough to be regarded as an allocation for that settlement. I have no reason to doubt the Council's view that it could provide for start up, low-cost units. Policy IB4 should protect existing employment land, and so I do not necessarily accept **Contaks Construction Company Ltd**'s point that it would be lost to housing redevelopment.
- 6.37 Such a loss should happen only where the present use harmed local character or amenity. The Objector's land at Ranch Farm lies to the south of Willis Lane, in the countryside and well outside the SPB for Four Marks. Its allocation would not accord with the Council's strategy, that I support, for locating development in or at the edge of settlements (SDDP paragraph 2.19). Development on this land would intrude into the countryside and increase the likelihood of yet more traffic on country lanes ill-suited for it.
- 6.38 The extensive area north of Alton Lane, Four Marks, is put forward for residential and employment use. I deal with the housing aspects in Chapter 5.3 of my Report, and the same essential considerations apply. The land includes long rear gardens and numerous

fragmented plots of open land, many used as paddocks. It lies beyond the well-defined SPB and its development for either or both purposes would intrude into the countryside and seriously harm the open setting of Four Marks.

*

6.39 Sixthly, I recommend in Chapter 2 of my Report against any change to the SPB to include land at Lucky Lite Farm, Catherington. I can add nothing here, except to remark that industrial estates at Blacknest and Broxhead are subject to a Special Industrial Estate Policy (SD6.097) to control their further expansion because of the consequent environmental impact. This Policy sets no precedent for the allocation of this land for development.

*

6.40 I turn now to the seventh issue. The 6.72 ha or so Selborne Brickworks lies deep in the countryside between Selborne and Whitehill/Bordon. Its allocation would be contrary to the Council's strategy for the location of development that seeks to utilise land within towns and villages and to concentrate the development of greenfield land at the edge of the larger settlements. The Council's proposed allocations for employment uses, modified as I recommend, are sufficient for the plan period. Moreover, this land is not well-located. It is poorly served by public transport, its development would result in a major and damaging incursion into the countryside and would encourage the use of private transport on rural roads ill-suited to accept it.

*

6.41 On the final issue, I deal in Chapter 2 of my Report with the Council's deletion of the SPB for Langrish (Inset Map 30), a decision that I support. I deal in Chapter 5.5 with the suggestion that the site to which the Objection relates should be allocated for mixed housing/employment, and I recommend against it. Any proposals to redevelop the Tooling Products Ltd site would be better considered under SDDP Policy IB4 and any other material consideration.

-0-

6.42 There are other matters. I deal with concerns about the adequacy of land for employment, its marketable quality and the balance to be struck between the competing demand for employment and other land uses in respect of objections to SDDP Paragraphs 6.1 and 6.8. In that latter paragraph, I consider the Objection concerning the suggested extension of the SDDP's allocation of land for employment use to the west of Woolmer Way, Whitehill/Bordon.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 6.11

Objection

First Deposit

1272/7655 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Main Issue

Whether the reference to a notional density of 3,500 square metres per hectare should be retained.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.44 This notional density is a useful guide to the floorspace that could result if an allocation were developed. It is clear that the figure is notional and it should be retained.

Recommendation

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

ALTON BUSINESS PARK AND ALTON SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS, ALTON

POLICY IB1 (1)

Objections

First Deposit

90/5653 S E Water Plc (Dynamco)
1724/8583 Dr J Chatfield

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the text should indicate that development in Alton will require reinforcement of the water supply;
- 2) Whether new businesses should be subject to clauses or similar to ensure the protection of the river and whether the river channel should be otherwise protected and provision made for a buffer strip along its banks for walking.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.46 Yes, it should, and SD6.022 obliges. Developers will be expected to contribute to any off-site works necessitated by their schemes. The Council confirms that any requirements will also be set out in a development brief for the allocated land.

*

6.47 Detailed matters for protection of riverbanks and the required distance between a development and river bank would be a matter for the development brief. The Environment Agency would be consulted on any schemes and it would safeguard by all suitable means the river, its banks and access to it. The text usefully requires a footpath/cycleway link and extensive planting along the Caker Stream within the scheme for the allocated land. SDDP paragraph 3.32 ensures that the effect on wildlife corridors, including buffer zones along watercourses, are taken into account in considering the impact of development proposals. This applies to the Caker Stream, and it would be sensible to modify the SDDP accordingly. The implications should also be set out in any development brief prepared for the land.

Recommendation

6.48 I recommend that the SDDP be modified to include a reference (at the end of the paragraph preceding SD6.022) to the need to take into account the importance of the Caker Stream as a wildlife corridor in the preparation of a development proposal.

LORD MAYOR TRELOAR HOSPITAL (LMTH), ALTON POLICY IB1 (2)

Objections

First Deposit

1971/9003	T Pinchen
1939/9349	LMTH Co & Maybourne Projects Ltd
1862/9638	Chawton Parish Council
1673/9948	The Alton Society
1931/9248	Secretary of State for Health

Pre Inquiry Change PIC002.6

1953/15324	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
------------	--------------------

Main Issues

- 1) Whether this greenfield site is needed for business use and whether, correctly, it is larger than that proposed in the adopted Local Plan;
- 2) Whether development will create traffic problems at Butts Bridge and at the Chawton Park/Whitedown Lane junction.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.49 It is regrettable that this attractive greenfield site of about 3.8 ha is to be allocated, but it results essentially from the shortage of sufficient and suitably located previously-developed land. This implies incursions into the countryside. In landscape terms, this is an attractive site that the supporting text acknowledges and which any scheme for it should respect. It is one of the 6 key sites that the SDDP identifies for employment use. In view of the importance of Alton, it makes good sense to allocate to it as much as about one third of the total business development for the District. This is an edge of settlement site, adjacent to the curtilage of the former hospital buildings, and is in line with the location strategy set out in the SDDP at its paragraph 2.19. The allocation is needed, and should proceed.
- 6.50 The allocation in the adopted Local Plan applies to the curtilage of the former hospital complex and is for an estimated floorspace of about 12,000 sq m, to be reduced if constraints of landscape require it. The employment allocation, however, was not defined. The estimated floorspace resulting from the SDDP allocation is, again, 12,000 sq m, but it is a different site. It is not possible, therefore, to make a comparison of sizes. There is no evidence to suggest that the SDDP allocation is larger than is needed, and I see no reason to modify the SDDP on this count. The matter of marketability is raised. This is more the concern of the prospective developer who will no doubt examine the financial viability of the proposals in considerable depth. I am not convinced from the evidence put to the Inquiry that a scheme for the land would fail on this count.

*

6.51 On the second issue, I deal with the objections to the traffic impact of the combined residential/business allocation in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. In short, there is no objection in principle on highway or traffic grounds to the development of this site for employment purposes.

-0-

6.52 On another matter, the text following PIC002.6 is misleading and should be deleted. It continues the incorrect impression that, as with the adopted Local Plan, the business allocation relates to the former hospital site. The SDDP allocation is of adjoining land, a field to the west of the former hospital complex. To clarify the position, paragraph 6.11.i.2 should be revised.

Recommendation

6.53 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

Paragraph 6.11.i.2

Lord Mayor Treloar Hospital: Land adjacent to the curtilage of the former hospital buildings is suitable for business uses. The site has a special landscape quality....

....The developer of the site must demonstrate how the business use will integrate with the development of the adjoining hospital site and the wider surroundings; this will require the production of a masterplan for the whole area.

And in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC002.6), thus deleting the entire paragraph that starts ***The site is suitable for continued...*** and ends ***The site is also suitable for housing use (see Policy H1).***

FORMER KING GEORGE'S HOSPITAL, LIPHOOK

POLICY IB1 (3)

Objections

First Deposit

1879/8060 Concise Construction Limited
1929/9205 Danbuild Southern Ltd
1940/9364 Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd
1031/9887 G May

Second Deposit SD6.030

3849/13431 Helical (Liphook) Limited

Second Deposit SD6.031

3849/13433 Helical (Liphook) Limited

Main Issue

Whether the site should be allocated for housing or employment.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.54 This site has been proposed for employment development for some 14 years. It has the benefit of an extant outline planning permission (F23650.012) for 10,000 sq m of Class B1 floorspace. The Council, advised by its consultants Hughes Ellard, accepts that both this site and the District are unlikely to be attractive to developers or tenants for Class B1 (a) and (b) development. Thus on this land it seeks to promote a Class B1(c) industrial use with a high office content.
- 6.55 I do not dispute the Council's evidence that what is required in the District is modern, high quality buildings and that this site could provide it. But in view of the planning history of the land, I have strong reservations that the Council's aspirations for it will be achieved. It has been marketed for employment purposes since the hospital use ceased in 1989. Whilst the intensity and effectiveness of the marketing during that time is criticised, the site has failed to attract pre-let developers following the refusal of planning permission for offices for Lloyds Register of Shipping (1994). That is despite a location and setting that must rank as one of the most attractive in terms of accessibility and landscape in the District.
- 6.56 The Council's response to this lack of interest is to argue that only a speculative development is likely to come to pass. Hughes Ellard cites examples of speculative schemes having been let successfully in Havant and along the M27 corridor. Due to the lengthy period during which this site has failed to attract an employment development of any type, I fear that there would be yet another very long wait before a suitable speculative development could be secured. I am, therefore, more inclined to accept the Objector's view that East Hampshire is not such an attractive employment location

compared with competing employment centres within the sub-region like the Southampton/Portsmouth/Fareham (M27) axis to the south and Guildford to the north. They have better communications and possess a critical mass of population and economic activity that is more attractive to speculative industrial development.

- 6.57 The A3 road at Hindhead is often congested with long queues of vehicles, a problem not likely to be eased until the completion of the proposed by-pass/tunnel due in 2009. This should improve the attractiveness of Liphook, but a late completion of a road scheme is always a possibility and could make speculative developers even more cautious. Low unemployment and the prospect of difficulty in engaging staff locally could be a further factor against securing a suitable speculative scheme.
- 6.58 Thus I consider that the planning system would fail if this prime, previously-developed land were to remain unused indefinitely. It should be developed sooner rather than later and for a use that would make the best of its outstanding features. That is most likely to be achieved through a residential development with a design and layout along the lines of that presented to the inquiry by **Helical (Liphook) Limited** on the indicative Plan 10007/01A. I must stress, however, that I do not support the Objector's proposal for a Retirement Village for the reasons set out in Chapter 5.3 of my Report.
- 6.59 In the event of my recommending against an employment allocation here, the Council suggests that the site be allocated for mixed employment and residential development. The high quality of the land would indeed present a challenge to a designer in achieving a sufficiently high standard of residential amenity in such a scheme. I am not convinced, however, that the introduction of a significant amount of employment floorspace would do justice to the high quality of the surroundings, and accord with the high quality residential environment that should be sought. Hence I do not recommend such an approach. Should demand for home/work units exist, however, a limited number of them could provide an appropriate and interesting mix in an approved scheme.
- 6.60 Some representations refer to the amount of employment floorspace that could be achieved, the extent of the developable area and the appropriateness of the focus on Class B1(c) Use. I have considered them, but they are better left to the more detailed consideration of the land and its opportunities that should be examined during the preparation of the Masterplan. Other comments refer to the need for a cycle route between Liphook and Haslemere to provide for another mode of transport. This is of relevance to a residential scheme and the development brief should take it into account.

Recommendation

- 6.61 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of the former King George's Hospital site from the allocations listed in Policy IB1.

ORDNANCE SUPPLY UNIT (OSU), LIPHOOK

POLICY IB1 (4)

Objections

First Deposit

1577/7448	E T Hawkins
1929/9208	Danbuild Southern Ltd
1611/9497	Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
1530/10055	Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society

Main Issues

- 1) Whether this land is suitable for employment use and, if so, whether it should be limited to 5000 sq m of floorspace;
- 2) Whether the buildings should be restricted to a “human” scale and whether the site should accommodate small retail units.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.62 The allocation represents the final redevelopment phase of the former, extensive, Ordnance Supply Unit. Redevelopment has taken place for mixed uses including residential, a superstore and community use. The Council confirms that the allocation is an important part of the District’s supply of employment land. I have no reason to doubt that. It is well located, within the SPB of a sustainable settlement, close to a local centre in the village and the railway station. Its retention for employment purposes will be the more important if my recommendation to delete the allocation at the former King George’s Hospital site is accepted. I do not support its allocation for residential use. It would seriously detract from the balance in uses that are sought for the redevelopment of the wider site and the settlement.
- 6.63 The supporting text acknowledges that an employment use might generate additional heavy traffic. To help deal with that prospect it is proposed to restrict development to Class B1 uses. I see no reason to reduce the indicative floorspace (10,000 sq m) as is suggested. The site is well located in relation to railway and road access in accordance with advice in PPG 13. It should be developed in the most effective way in keeping with its location and surroundings.
- 6.64 The scale and form of development would be considered in the preparation of a development brief rather than as part of the Local Plan. However, the text prescribes the expected height of the buildings that would face The Green and accepts that small retail units could be suitable as part of this frontage. I have no reason to disagree.

Recommendation

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

BEDFORD ROAD, PETERSFIELD
POLICY IB1 (5)

Objection

First Deposit

897/8507 The Ramblers' Association

Main Issue

Whether Footpath 3, which crosses the site, will be protected.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.66 Planning permission has been granted for the development of the site. Protection of the footpath can no longer be secured through the Local Plan if it has not been secured as a condition of the planning permission.

Recommendation

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

TELECOM EXCHANGE/GUADALOUPE CAR PARK, WHITEHILL/BORDON

POLICY IB1 (6)

Objections

First Deposit

368/5826 Hampshire Constabulary

Second Deposit SD6.013

1882/13569 BT Group Plc

Second Deposit SD6.035

1882/13572 BT Group Plc

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the cumulative effect of all developments in the area will unacceptably burden police resources;
- 2) Whether the site should be considered as an employment allocation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.68 While a land use plan will have consequences for policing in the District, it is not a matter that can be addressed or resolved through the Local Plan. A similar objection is made to other proposals.

*

6.69 **BT Group Plc** confirms that its site is not at present surplus to requirements, but it opposes the deletion of its allocation for employment use. The site remains identified as suitable for commercial recreation/leisure use (Policy LC3) and hotel development (Policy TM4). However, the supporting text to the policies is not prescriptive. Suitability would depend on the viability of the suggested uses at the time the site becomes available for redevelopment.

6.70 If developers for the specified uses do not come forward, it would not be unreasonable for the Objector to seek to have any redevelopment proposal for the site considered for business purposes under SDDP Policy IB2. Any nature conservation interest the site may possess would be considered against the provisions of SDDP Policy C5. I see no need for a further change to the SDDP.

Recommendation

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

**LAND SOUTH OF WOOLMER TRADING ESTATE,
WHITEHILL/BORDON
POLICY IB1 (7)**

Objections

First Deposit

479/5598	Mr & Mrs H S G Martin
368/5831	Hampshire Constabulary
699/6011	Mrs P Gardner
1518/7323	Cllr Mr A Carew
1289/7969	Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1622/8458	English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1864/10300	Defence Estates

Main Issue

Whether development would harm the SINC, badger set and result in the loss of trees, impose an unacceptable burden on existing roads and result in undesirable levels of light, noise and air pollution.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.72 This allocation is carried over from the adopted Local Plan and the Council confirms that outline planning permission has been granted. The principle of development, therefore, has already been established. The Council acknowledges the nature conservation interest of the site and confirms that mitigation measures have been agreed as part of the permission. The highway and traffic implications of the proposal were considered at the same time, as were the other matters identified. If the development does not proceed, an extant planning permission would still represent a fall-back position against which any fresh application would be considered.

-0-

6.73 There are other matters. SD6.037 rightly changes the description of the land to *Land South of Woolmer Trading Estate* and the text no longer refers to ownership of the site. The planning permission will have included any relevant conditions concerning occupiers of the proposed floorspace.

Recommendation

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

LAND ADJACENT OT BENTLEY INDUSTRIAL CENTRE, BENTLEY

POLICY IB1 (8)

Objections

First Deposit

533/5712 Mr & Mrs J Walker
1540/7371 Mr & Mrs A D Blizzard
1941/8039 J E Trimming (Builders) Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.039

3946/13210 Mr R J Leonard

Main Issue

Whether this allocation is needed and, if so, whether the development could be satisfactorily accommodated in the surroundings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.75 This allocation represents a modest extension of about 0.26 ha to the existing Industrial Centre with the prospect of providing small units totalling some 1000 sqm of floorspace dedicated to Class B1 and B2 uses. The Council points to the history of high occupancy in the existing Centre as justification of need. Its development would provide job opportunities for local people and thereby the potential to reduce commuting to other places and the resulting traffic on local roads. In Chapter 5.4 of my Report I recommend against the allocation of land at Bentley for residential development. My recommendation here does not invalidate my reasons for doing so. A substantial housing scheme or schemes would still result in too much reliance on the private car to travel to larger settlements.
- 6.76 The supporting text requires a layout and design of the scheme to minimise any serious loss of amenity to nearby residents. Rightly, access must be through the existing Centre. For all these reasons, I accept that the development could be satisfactorily accommodated in the surroundings.

Recommendation

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

FARRINGDON MILL, LOWER FARRINGDON POLICY IB1 (9)

Objections

First Deposit

713/6029 Ms A Shewan
1579/7451 Mr & Mrs D J Gilchrist
679/8337 The Hon J Cavendish
2009/8644 Mr & Mrs M Smith
2012/8647 N Corbett

Second Deposit SD6.046

4037/12161 Thomas (Hampshire) Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.047

1926/12411 Squires Bridge Homes Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether this allocation is required and whether its re-allocation from residential to industrial and business can be justified (SD6.047);
- 2) Whether the proposed general industrial allocation would erode the rural character of its frontage to the A32 road;
- 3) Whether the proposed access would be safe and convenient and whether it could be better provided from the north.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.78 The SDDP allocations for the Farringdon Mill site are for 1 ha of employment and 0.5 ha for housing. The business allocation covers land that is already developed for that purpose as well as paddock land to the east. It is anticipated that the paddock would provide an alternative access to the A32 road to the employment land and, possibly, to the housing allocation. In Chapter 5.3 I recommend against a residential allocation at this settlement. If my recommendation is accepted, the only reasonable alternative to the urgent need of bringing this semi-derelict site into productive use is for more employment/business use.

*

6.79 Secondly, the land is reasonably large. This means that it should lend itself to a layout and landscaping scheme which would ensure that any redevelopment could be successfully integrated into the existing settlement and not erode the rural character of its road frontage.

*

- 6.80 Thirdly, the difficulty in providing a satisfactory access onto the A32 road has long prevented redevelopment of the site. There is no evidence to suggest that the Council's latest proposal to include the paddock land would not overcome that difficulty. The supporting text goes into some detail to ensure that any new access would respect the character and setting of the village.
- 6.81 Traffic calming measures should be introduced along the A32 although, as I mention in Chapter 5.3, I do not accept that they should depend upon a redevelopment scheme for the land. **Thomas (Hampshire) Ltd** is convinced that an access from the north is not possible. However, I see no objection to the text retaining a reference to that option, since it would not be sensible to close down any prospect of resolving this long running obstacle to development.

Recommendation

- 6.82 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by extending the employment allocation over the whole of the pink (H1) land shown on Inset Map 13.

LONDON ROAD, HORNDEAN

POLICY IB1 (10)

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.015

3837/11657 S RWittcomb
876/12118 Horndean Parish Council

Latest Proposed Change

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

Main Issues

Whether the land should be allocated for a commercial use or for part recreation and part business uses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.83 This 0.6 ha site lies between a caravan park and a small industrial/commercial estate (Hillside Industrial Estate) adjacent to the A3(M) road. In the FDDP it was allocated for employment use because lack of funding made it unlikely that a previous allocation for public open space would come to fruition. The Parish Council objected to the loss of the open space allocation because of the high priority it placed on a need to provide a children's play area and an access/interpretation area for the adjoining open space, Catherington Lith.
- 6.84 The Council responded by deleting the employment allocation (SD6.049) and re-allocating the site for public open space (SD7.149). Subsequently, the Parish Council suggested that the most realistic way forward would be to allocate a limited part of the site for industrial/business purposes, or as an extension to the caravan site, in order to fund public open space on the remainder. Hence the Latest Proposed Change, to which I have received no objection. This seems to be a sensible compromise and I support it.

Recommendation

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

SOUTH OF KEYDELL NURSERY, HORNDEAN NEW SECOND DEPOSIT ALLOCATION SD6.016

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.016

1303/12915 Borrow Dental Milk Foundation
1906/13554 The Brows Farm Partnership
1278/14750 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether, in view of the constraints that apply to it, this greenfield site is rightly allocated for employment purposes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.86 I deal with the totality of the employment allocations and the need to use greenfield sites to meet supply in respect of objections to Paragraphs 6.1, 6.7 and 6.8.
- 6.87 This 0.8ha site lies outside the SPB for Horndean and between it and the A3(M) road. It is well contained by trees and a steep bank along Dell Piece East (B2149) and a motorway approach road from which access is obtained. A bridleway separates the site from a small oil field to the west. Reinforcement of the vegetation alongside the bridleway would be required as part of any development. The Council acknowledges that the existing access would not be suitable for any intensification of use and puts forward the possibility of a new access onto Dell Piece East. The site is within an area of aquifers, which will also need to be protected from pollution. With these proposed safeguards as a condition of development there is no sustainable objection to an employment use of the site.
- 6.88 The site is compared with land at Dell Piece West. It is, however, much better placed and screened for an employment use than is Dell Piece West whose designation as a SINC is a determining factor in its unsuitability for employment or any other built development.

Recommendation

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

STATION APPROACH, MEDSTEAD

POLICY IB1 (11)

Objections

First Deposit

88/5336	Thames Water Property
368/5852	Hampshire Constabulary
1108/7146	Ms J M Burrell
1110/7158	Mr G J Lampton
1111/7165	Mr A Parkes
1658/7685	J Carne
1761/7760	Mr B Hoff
1730/8586	Mrs K M Hoff
1835/9294	Medstead Parish Council
1699/9529	Mr & Mrs Fish

Pre Inquiry Change PIC004.6

1835/15205	Medstead Parish Council
------------	-------------------------

Main Issues

- 1) Whether too much employment land is being allocated in Station Approach, whether general industry would be appropriate and whether it would detract from views from the Watercress Railway;
- 2) Whether the access to the site is, or could be made, safe and convenient.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.90 Although the existing employment allocation along Station Road appears to have been slow in take-up, the Council confirms that the majority of the site has now been developed. The proposed allocation is of modest size (0.6 ha) and appropriately located to serve both Four Marks and Medstead. The possibility that development would attract employees from outside Four Marks/Medstead is no reason for not offering local employment opportunities. With no residential uses close by, I see no objection to the provision here of Class B2 Uses. A well-designed scheme is unlikely to detract in any material way from views from the railway.

*

6.91 Secondly, more traffic along Station Approach would be generated but it would be modest owing to the small scale of the development. The Council would require a traffic impact study to employ mitigation measures to reduce or overcome any adverse effects. There is no objection in principle on this count. The Latest Proposed Change requires the developer to extend the proposed pedestrian/cycle link between the site, the reserve housing allocation on Lymington Bottom Road and Medstead. In Chapter 5.3, however, I recommend against this allocation. I agree with the **Medstead Parish Council** that an improved access for pedestrians and cyclists to Medstead village centre would be too

damaging to the rural environment. It should not be required. This means that the SDDP should not be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC004.6), although some changes to the text are needed to accord with my Conclusions.

-0-

- 6.92 On another matter, any prospective developer would be required to consult Thames Water regarding the disposal of foul and surface water from the site. That should meet the Objectors' concerns. On the basis of the caveats that I identify, the development should proceed.

Recommendation

- 6.93 I recommend that, apart from that following my Conclusions in paragraph 6.91, no modification be made to the SDDP.

PETERSFIELD

POLICY IB1 (12)

Objections

First Deposit

68/5307	Environment Agency
490/5604	J A Gordon-Smith
811/6269	Mr K R Harris
911/6482	Mr M Shaft
1686/7726	N D Harrison
1701/7736	Françoise Harrison
1841/7914	R T G Marks
1578/8878	The Petersfield Society

Second Deposit SD6.058

1791/13859	Buriton Village Association
3824/14485	Hawthorne Kamm Ltd

Main Issue

Whether this allocation would result in unacceptable damage to the countryside/AONB.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.94 This proposed allocation, The Causeway (South), is in respect of a 1.4 ha field at the southern limits of the town. It would provide some 5000 sqm of Class B1 floor space, of which about half would be for an enterprise centre.
- 6.95 The proposal would extend ribbon and similar development on the western side of The Causeway into the countryside. Existing buildings already stretch some 500 m beyond the more consolidated built-up parts of the town. The allocation would lead to a most damaging intrusion into the attractive rural setting of this historic market town and into the specially protected landscape that surrounds and washes over it. The Causeway hereabouts is one of the most attractive and prominent gateways into Petersfield and for all these reasons this open land demands the strongest possible protection. The Council should not contemplate the threatened intense damage.
- 6.96 Development could be supported only if the need for it were shown to be overriding, and I am not satisfied that this is the case. I consider the totality of the supply side of employment land in respect of objections to SDDP paragraphs 6.1, 6.7 and 6.8. Whilst I support the general thrust of the Council's supply side calculations, I am not persuaded that the need for employment land justifies the development of this particularly sensitive site. There could well exist a demand for starter units and an enterprise centre to serve Petersfield, but I do not see why those types of accommodation could not be provided on other allocated land, for example at Buckmore Farm.

- 6.97 If that option is not available and it is absolutely necessary to find more land for employment purposes in this part of the town, the Council should explore the possibility of developing land to the south of the County Council's highway depot. Access to it is likely to present problems, but might be secured in connection with the development of the Housing Omission Site to the south of Larcombe Road/Test Close that I recommend for reserve provision.
- 6.98 The supporting text shows that the Council is well aware of the sensitivity of the allocated employment site. But I am not persuaded that a requirement for a high standard of design, control of height of buildings and the use of strong landscaping would overcome the fundamental objection to the proposal. Again, this arises from the mere presence of buildings on the site, the harm to the open rural setting of the town, loss of countryside and consequent harm to the AONB.
- 6.99 Were the allocation to be acceptable in principle, there is no evidence to suggest that concerns over traffic, residential amenity, water quality, susceptibility to flooding and nature conservation would present insurmountable obstacles. But those considerations do not outweigh the basic objection to the allocation. It should not proceed.

Recommendation

- 6.100 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by deleting from IB1 the employment allocation 12 at The Causeway (South), Petersfield.

BUCKMORE FARM, PETERSFIELD

POLICY IB1 (13)

Objections

First Deposit

68/5308 Environment Agency
1945/9422 Bryant Homes and J S Bloor (Newbury) Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.067

1945/12696 Bryant Homes and J S Bloor (Newbury) Ltd
3813/14684 Southern Service Stations Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.071

3813/11552 Southern Service Stations Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the allocation should allow for mixed, including residential, use;
- 2) Whether its development would have a detrimental impact on the high water quality and nature conservation value of the River Rother and its tributaries;
- 3) Whether the reference in SD6.067 to the possibility of the farm buildings being used for hotel/motel use is too prescriptive;
- 4) Whether the land allocated for an hotel should include leisure, retail or other uses, and whether the allocation of part of the site for hotel use (SD6.071) should be replaced by employment use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.101 I recommend against the allocation of land at The Causeway (South) for employment purposes, and that implies that other land allocated for employment purposes in Petersfield will need to be protected unless regular monitoring suggests there is over-provision. At present there is no indication that that is the case. I am satisfied that sufficient land for housing will be provided in the Local Plan. That conclusion, and the loss of the allocation at The Causeway (South) indicates that this land at Buckmore Farm should be reserved in its entirety for employment use.

*

6.102 On the second issue, I note that the supporting text draws attention to the possibility that development may have a detrimental impact on the high water quality and nature conservation value of the River Rother and its tributaries. Rightly, developers will be required to investigate this potential impact and identify any necessary measures of mitigation that would have to be agreed with the **Environmental Agency**. That is as far as the SDDP can go on this matter.

*

6.103 Thirdly, **Southern Service Stations Ltd** queries the statement in the text that the Listed Buildings at Buckmore Farm might be used for hotel/motel use in association with the motorist's service area to the south. The Company says that their conversion to a budget hotel would be too expensive and that they are too far from the service area. But the statement is no more than a suggestion, as is the conversion for business purposes. It is not too prescriptive.

*

6.104 On the fourth issue, the Council sees a need for an hotel in Petersfield, and this site is regarded as being in the best location to attract a developer. Its proximity to the town centre, the service area and the A3 road are points in favour of it. The suggested removal of the Policy TM4 allocation and a widening of the uses to include leisure, retail, or even Class B1 uses are likely to defeat the Council's intentions for the site. Despite the long period since the proposal for the hotel was first mooted, the allocation should remain in its entirety for that use and the marketing for a modest sized scheme to continue.

6.105 Should the allocation continue not to attract interest, the Council should review the position. In that event a business use would seem to be the most appropriate alternative. It would not help the Council's reasonable aspirations for the text to refer to alternative or additional uses or to delete the allocation.

Recommendation

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

KEYLINE BUILDERS MERCHANT SITE, ROWLANDS

CASTLE

POLICY IB1 (14)

Objections

First Deposit

39/5035	Mr M Wilson
498/6110	Mark & Christine Seaman
211/6239	P R Lewis MBE
1117/6447	Mrs D Kennedy
1118/6449	Mr C Major
1755/7787	Mr S Lindley Hall
1591/9112	Rowlands Castle Parish Council
1386/9467	Mr W B D Wardle
1387/9472	Mrs M Wardle
1852/9584	C N Hawkins
1891/9717	Travis Perkins
1080/9994	Captain M J M Wilkin
1564/10068	Mr D K Stock

Second Deposit SD6.018

1891/11553	Travis Perkins
1666/13052	Cllr Mr D Clegg

Second Deposit SD6.072

1666/13053	Cllr Mr D Clegg
------------	-----------------

Second Deposit SD6.073

3810/13474	Portsmouth Water
------------	------------------

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC005.6 (page 140).

Main Issue

Whether an allocation for general industry is appropriate and, if so, whether it should be enlarged.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.107 This 1 ha site is being used as a builders' merchants. It is bounded by woodland except on the eastern boundary where it abuts the railway line. In response to objections to the

allocation that originally included general industrial use (Class B2), the Council accepts that use of the land should be restricted to Class B1 so as to reduce the volume of HGV traffic, noise and other disturbance. The Council considers that any potential increase in traffic from a B1 use would be offset by the generation of fewer trips to and from it by HGVs. The landowner, **Travis Perkins**, objects to this change on the grounds that it would reduce its options in the event of cessation of the present use.

- 6.108 This is a very sensitive site and existing traffic already gives rise to complaints by local residents. The approach to the site is through narrow residential roads and the village centre, and the Council's attempt to limit HGV traffic by restricting any future use to Class B1 is reasonable in the circumstances. The Highways Authority does not object on the grounds that local roads could not safely and conveniently accommodate the traffic generated by a Class B1 Use, and I have no reason to think otherwise. In any event, the Council would no doubt insist on a transport assessment and travel plan under its New Policy (PIC001.4) as part of any proposal to develop a site of this size for employment purposes.
- 6.109 Existing buildings are set in attractive woodland. The SPB for the village tightly encloses the apron and buildings associated with the present use. Its boundary is logical and identifiable on the ground. Any extension of the allocation into the surrounding countryside would encroach into the woodland setting of the village and would be tantamount to giving support to an extension of the use. It would be wrong for the Local Plan to pre-judge any future applications for planning permission in that way. Any such proposal should be considered on its merits under Policy IB3 and any other material considerations.
- 6.110 PIC005.6 requires developers to contribute to a scheme to protect the ground water in the area. This is a reasonable precaution, given the need to keep aquifers free of pollutants. But there is no evidence to support concerns that development would result in insurmountable problems relating to such matters as drainage and subsidence. Nor am I persuaded that it would prevent use of the bridleway.

Recommendation

- 6.111 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC005.6).

R E LINES BARRACKS, WHITEHILL/BORDON POLICY IB1 (15)

Objections

First Deposit

68/5287	Environment Agency
88/5338	Thames Water Property
368/5832	Hampshire Constabulary
1101/6226	Mrs L White
1272/7699	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
2022/8912	P Gauld
1864/10298	Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD6.075

1620/13516 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether the site should be used for housing or as a sixth form college rather than for employment use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.112 The future of this 1.6 ha site was settled on 17 March 2003 by the grant of planning permission on appeal for residential redevelopment.

Recommendation

6.113 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of *Barracks R E Lines at Fire Station Cross Roads, Whitehill/Bordon*, item 15 in the list of Policy IB1 allocations.

THE DEPOT, LONDON ROAD, HOLYBOURNE SECOND DEPOSIT NEW ALLOCATION SD6.020

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.020

1932/12497 Allison and Garwood Ltd
1278/14752 CPRE

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC006.6 (page 140).

Main Issue

Whether this land should be allocated in its entirety for employment use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.114 I deal with the objections to a mixed form of development for this land in Chapter 5.3 of my Report, and conclude that it is suitable for a mix of employment, housing and open space. In dealing with objections to HAB4, I support the Latest Proposed Change that deals with traffic management measures. I also recommend a reference in the supporting text to the need for an archaeological evaluation. I repeat that recommendation here.

Recommendation

6.115 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC006.6) and that to the supporting text of HAB4 and IB1 be added a reference to the archaeological importance of the site and the need for an archaeological evaluation to be undertaken prior to redevelopment.

INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT WITHIN SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES (SPB)

POLICY IB2

Objections

First Deposit

511/7018 Headley Parish Council
1272/7660 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
910/8755 Headley Residents' Association

Second Deposit SD6.078

1620/13517 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issues

- 1) Whether there should be a presumption in favour of new industrial/business development or expansion/intensification of existing uses within an SPB where a site has not been identified in the Local Plan;
- 2) Whether the restraint to development that would harm character of roads introduced by SD6.078 is necessary.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.116 This is a criteria based policy. It contains sufficient safeguards for the rejection of proposals for wrongly-located or badly-sited development. It encourages business development in SPBs in a District that is generally poorly provided with local employment opportunities and where 40% of the work force has jobs elsewhere. It seeks to provide a balance of land use within settlements where high residential land values will tend to work against the re-use of employment land for other purposes. It accords with national policy in PPG 4 that Local Plans should not seek unreasonably to restrict commercial and industrial activities of an appropriate scale in primarily residential areas.

6.117 The SDDP introduces SPBs for more and smaller villages. It is sound planning policy to protect from unacceptable levels of traffic the character of the rural roads serving these settlements. Many of these narrow roads are a delightful feature of rural East Hampshire, and I applaud their protection.

Recommendation

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

INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

POLICY IB3

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7344	CPRE
910/8758	Headley Residents' Association
1578/8879	The Petersfield Society
1835/9295	Medstead Parish Council
1847/9565	Sussex Downs Conservation Board
1625/9793	Countryside Agency
1530/10056	Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society

Second Deposit SD6.082

1639/12979	East Hampshire AONB Office
1278/14765	CPRE
1871/14893	Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should be negatively worded and put the onus of proof of acceptability of a development on the developer;
- 2) Whether expansion/intensification should be prevented in order to protect premises suitable for starter units;
- 3) Whether another criterion is required to deal with situations where cumulative impact would be too great;
- 4) Whether there should be 2 policies to address new and existing development, and whether impact on landscape and the AONB should be taken into account.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.119 SD6.082 makes significant changes to the Policy. New development is now clearly limited to rural diversification (SDDP Policy C14) and the conversion of buildings in the countryside (SDDP Policy C15). I do wonder, however, whether reference to these Policies here is necessary, in that the Local Plan will have to be read as a whole and these 2 policies would apply in any event if relevant. Criterion a) should be deleted.
- 6.120 Generally, development in the countryside will not be permitted and the stringent criteria in the Policy make a negatively drafted Policy unnecessary. The usual format of positive drafting should apply. But it will remain for the Council to show harm, rather than the developer to show acceptability. The reference to *outside Settlement Policy Boundaries* is removed, rightly so because land beyond SPBs is countryside by definition.

*

6.121 On the second issue, the reasonable expansion/intensification of established uses is limited to their existing sites. SD6.082 thereby meets the main criticisms levelled at FDDP Policy IB3. The control placed on expansion/intensification of established uses in the countryside should keep small operations small so as to retain a stock of starter units. The Policy could not reasonably do more in pursuit of this laudable objective, and no modification is called for on this point. I like the reference to sunken lanes in the Policy.

*

6.122 Thirdly, awareness of the cumulative impact of even small developments is suitably acknowledged in the supporting text (SD6.086), and there is no need to repeat it in the Policy. The criteria can be applied to effect on both the site itself and on the surroundings and so cumulative impact is, in any event, taken into account. Nor is it necessary to have 2 policies to distinguish between new and existing premises. The Policy loses none of its efficacy in addressing both sorts.

6.123 Landscape is adequately protected. SDDP Policies C14 and C15 include suitable criteria for doing so. Policy IB3 refers to the character and appearance of the countryside, and this would include matters of landscape. Any development within or adjacent to an AONB would need to conform with SDDP Policy C2.

Recommendation

6.124 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY IB3

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS IT IS FOR THE REASONABLE EXPANSION OR INTENSIFICATION OF AN ESTABLISHED INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS USE WITHIN AN EXISTING SITE, PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD NOT:

- A) RESULT IN....***
- B) HARM THE CHARACTER.....***
- C) GENERATE TRAFFIC....***
- D) HARM THE AMENITY....***
- E) LEAD TO EXCESSIVE USE OF THE CAR.***

RETENTION OF INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS USES POLICY IB4

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 135.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC007.6, PIC008.6, PIC009.6, PIC010.6 & PIC011.6 (pages 143 and 144)

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should allow for unviable, small employment sites in the countryside to be developed for residential purposes and whether certain other requirements of the text are reasonable in all respects;
- 2) Whether the compensatory provisions at SD6.090 (replaced by PIC011.6) are appropriate matters for negotiation;
- 3) Whether the text conflicts with paragraph 5.21 of the SDDP;
- 4) Whether the Holybourne Oil Terminal should be returned to greenfield condition as agreed by the County Council, and whether the SCATS depot should continue to be used commercially;

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.125 The Policy seeks to retain employment uses within both SPBs and the countryside. It generally prevents the re-use of employment land in a District where unrestrained market pressure could result in a substantial loss of its limited supply. That is the correct approach, although accordance with certain criteria may constitute a case for redevelopment for another use. I would expect instances where re-use is justified to be uncommon, and in view of the stringent nature of the criteria, there is no need for the Policy to say so. PIC010.6 allows the Council to consider granting planning permission for a re-use where there would be an overriding benefit. To me, that includes *overriding benefit to the local community* and there is no need to labour the point. Any environmental improvements brought about by the re-use would seldom overcome the disadvantages of poor location and any consequent greater use of private transport on narrow rural roads. Overall matters of sustainability should prevail.

6.126 It would be reasonable for the Council to require evidence of realistic and active marketing of a site to test any claims of non-viability of a particular current enterprise. This is an accepted means of establishing whether there is, in fact, a demand/need for premises, the re-use or redevelopment of whose site is sought. The process of obtaining that evidence may result in some delay, but that must be set against the general need to retain a limited supply of employment land. On balance, but subject to some fine-tuning, the Council has got the Policy and its supporting text about right. Firmness combines with flexibility.

6.127 PIC007.6 sets out other considerations that might be advanced in support of the re-use of a site and which the Council would take into account. They include the physical characteristics of the site and the viability of the enterprise. Any deficiencies of a premises in terms of size, shape, location or viability could be tested only through a proper marketing exercise. These factors are reasonable. The decision-maker would judge the weight to be attached to them in the usual way in the determination of an application for planning permission. Neither this, nor the other requirements of the text, amounts to an *indiscriminatory protectionist stance*, as suggested by **Cala Homes (South) Ltd**. The Policy should not be changed to specify the degree of harm that might be caused. *Unacceptable adverse impact* replaces *significantly*, but there is no need for either or similar qualification. I comment on this matter in my letter to the Council's Chief Executive and in respect of objections to Policy GS1, and I can add nothing here.

6.128 The Policy should not be changed to identify every site against which its provisions would be applied. It is criteria-based, a suitable approach in these circumstances, and accords in that respect with the advice in the Good Practice Guide. It would not be improved, as is suggested, by replacing *redevelopment* with *development*. *Existing* as used to describe *industrial or business sites* is redundant for obvious reasons and could be omitted without loss of meaning or clarity.

*

6.129 I turn now to the second issue. The compensatory provisions of SD6.090 are moved to, and expanded in, PIC011.6. They have given rise to objections on the grounds that they are both novel and unlawful. In my experience, they are certainly novel. The Council envisages them applying, but rarely so. I concur. It might be where the loss of an employment site and the environmental improvements associated with its redevelopment were finely balanced with the possibility that some compensatory provision could tip the balance. Provided that any such provisions were in accordance with the advice set out in Circular 1/97, there is no objection to the reference. As I often say, reasonableness in all its aspects is the key. But I have my doubts about the provision of accommodation for key workers and am not persuaded that it could be properly linked to the loss of employment land. This example seems to take reasonableness to its breaking point. It should be excised, with the Council relying on SDDP Policy GS4 and the Circular if it thinks it has a case in such circumstances for negotiation.

*

6.130 Thirdly, SDDP paragraph 5.21 advocates the use of surplus office space and redundant commercial premises as examples of accommodation that could be suitable for conversion to housing. The preceding paragraph, however, points out that employment and community facility land are important to the vitality and viability of a settlement and their development would be resisted. I agree with the **Medstead Parish Council** that there is an apparent ambiguity that amounts to conflict within Chapter 5 and between its paragraph 5.21 and Policy IB4. It would be sensible to delete this reference in paragraph 5.21 notwithstanding that exceptions to Policy IB4 may be permitted in certain circumstances. The protection of employment land is too important an issue for the Council to be giving mixed signals to prospective developers, particularly with the intense pressure to re-use such land for housing.

*

6.131 Lastly, the SDDP does not propose to locate employment uses on the Holybourne Oil Terminal site. Any proposals for this land would be considered under development plan

policies and any other material considerations. The SCATS depot has been granted planning permission for residential redevelopment, which is nearing completion.

-0-

- 6.132 There are other matters. The Council's Urban Housing Capacity Study (Document CD16/2) was carried out in accordance with the Government's advice in "Tapping the Potential". Source B, Schedule C deals with the Council's review of previously-developed, non-residential, land. It would not have been realistic or sensible to include in its Study existing employment sites that are protected by Policy IB4 or allocations under Policy IB1. That would undermine the Council's general and laudable intention to protect them.
- 6.133 The amendment to the wording of the text suggested by **J Roberts** would not improve the clarity of the Policy. Moreover, it is deficient in its omission of evidence of proper marketing. I deal with the site-specific objection relating to the **J B Corrie** premises in Frenchmans Road, Petersfield in Chapter 5.3 of my Report.

Recommendation

- 6.134 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC007.6, PIC008.6, PIC009.6, PIC010.6 and PIC011.6) apart from:

A. POLICY IB4

TO RETAIN INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS USES, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS SITES FOR OTHER USES ONLY IF THE PRESENT USE HARMS THE CHARACTER OR AMENITY OF THE NEARBY AREA OR THE SITE HAS RESTRICTED POTENTIAL DUE TO FACTORS SUCH AS:

A. ITS SIZE, SHAPE, LOCATION OR ACCESS; OR

B. PROOF OF FINANCIAL UNVIABILITY FOR INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS USE; AND

C. NO REASONABLE OFFER HAVING BEEN RECEIVED FOR SALE OR RENT, FOLLOWING REALISTIC AND ACTIVE MARKETING UNDERTAKEN TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY,

B. by the deletion of the last sentence of SD6.094, and as follows:

C. Paragraph 5.21

Examples could include non-viable shops, under-used space above shops and under-used institutional buildings within settlement policy boundaries.

SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL OR BUSINESS AREAS

LASHAM AIRFIELD

POLICY IB5

The Objections

First Deposit

1907/8169 Mr G Fothergill

Main Issue

Whether the policies for Special Industrial or Business Areas or Estates should include Upper Adhurst Industrial Park, Sheet.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.135 Policies IB5 and IB7 identify particular industrial areas which are located in the countryside and where further expansion would not be appropriate. They restrict further development which would result in expansion beyond their policy boundaries. The Council confirms that there are some industrial sites in the countryside where proposals for their development would be determined under Policy IB3. They include the Upper Adhurst Industrial Park, which is in the AONB and beyond the SPB for Petersfield/Sheet.
- 6.136 These circumstances make the application of Policy IB3 particularly appropriate, although other considerations might be material. That said, further development at Upper Adhurst Industrial Park would not sit comfortably with the general strategy of locating development. That is set out in SDDP Policy GS2 paragraph 2.19, and I support it. It is not a place where expansion/consolidation should be encouraged, and the land should not be identified as a Special Industrial Area.

Recommendation

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

BROXHEAD INDUSTRIAL AREA

POLICY IB7

Objection

First Deposit

910/8760 Headley Residents' Association

Main Issue

Whether expansion at this site should be resisted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.138 SDDO paragraph 6.25 states that any further expansion beyond the policy boundary would be unacceptable. This should ensure that development would not intrude into the countryside, as is feared. No modification is required. SDDP Appendix D explains the Council's Enforcement Procedures and how it intends to exercise them.

Recommendation

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

TOWN AND VILLAGE CENTRES

PARAGRAPH 6.26

Objection

Second Deposit SD6.100

1872/12839 Hampshire County Council

Main Issue

Whether Whitehill/Bordon should be identified as a town centre.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.140 The objection is to calling this settlement a town. But this paragraph defines the centre of Whitehill/Bordon as a town centre in terms only of Structure Plan Policy S1. It merely states that this settlement lacks the range of facilities that others of similar size, such as Petersfield and Alton, possess. Town is not defined, in population or other terms, in either the Structure Plan or the SDDP. There is no need for modification. Any need for expansion of the centre, and the best way of securing it, will presumably be considered as part of the Masterplan for Whitehill/Bordon and its environs. That is of more consequence than terminology at this stage.

Recommendation

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

TOWN CENTRE DEVELOPMENT

PARAGRAPHS 6.28 & 6.29

Objection

Second Deposit SD6.101

1872/12842 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD6.105

1872/12845 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD6.106

1872/12847 Hampshire County Council

Main Issue

Whether Whitehill/Bordon should be a “town centre” in the Structure Plan hierarchy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.142 The Council designates the 2 centres in Whitehill/Bordon as a “town centre” in terms of Structure Plan Policy S1. I have much sympathy with the Council’s position, but it would lead to conflict. Whitehill/Bordon and Lindford have a similar population to Petersfield, but with fewer facilities. Not surprisingly, District and Town Councils wish to see them expanded and up-graded. That could reduce the number of trips, especially by car, to places with better facilities. I am, however, reluctant to recommend a course of action that did not accord with the adopted Structure Plan, especially as any change of status to “town centre” could have implications for other settlements in and beyond the District. That is a matter more within the competence of the County Council. The findings and proposals of the soon to be adopted Masterplan may be other relevant considerations in any review of status.
- 6.143 The **Hampshire County Council** does not object to some increase in the size of these 2 centres to provide for more and better facilities. Presumably, however, that view is based upon the smaller areas that the FDDP designates as Local and District Centres. Since then, SD6.103 shows a new town centre of more than twice the size of the 2 FDDP areas. It combines the Local and District Centres and includes the large residential area between them. Any findings of the County Council about absence of significant impact of it on other shopping centres may persuade it to review the status of the Whitehill/Bordon centres. The scale of any redevelopment of surplus Defence Estates land, its location and the Masterplan proposals could have implications for the right size, suitable location and correct status of the shopping centre. Those matters should not be pre-judged now, as the SDDP purports to do. Meanwhile, to avoid present conflict with the Structure Plan, I recommend a modified text.

Recommendation

6.144 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of SD6.103 (Map EC10), SD6.105 and the reference in SD6.106 to *town centre*, by a return to the text and Inset Map designations in the FDDP and as follows:

Paragraph SD6.101

Although the Forest Centre is identified as a District Centre, it and the Local Centre on the High Street are small relative to the population of the settlement. The Council considers that it deserves a substantially extended range of facilities within a centre that should be elevated to “Town Centre” status under Structure Plan Policy S1. It will make representations to the County Council to effect that change. The higher status would reflect the Council’s intentions for the centre(s) and encourage the provision of much needed additional facilities. Local centres comprise....

DEVELOPMENT IN TOWN AND VILLAGE CENTRES POLICY TC1

Objections

First Deposit

476/5588	H Hoffman
368/5823	Hampshire Constabulary
180/6157	Mr D K Snelling
1101/6230	Mrs L White
1286/7455	Four Marks Parish Council
1709/7915	Quadrant Estates & Railtrack Plc
1870/7998	Tesco Stores Limited
1886/8107	Ushers of Trowbridge plc
1578/8882	The Petersfield Society
1890/9715	Coors Brewers Ltd
1666/9900	Cllr Mr D Clegg
1530/10057	Bramshott & Liphook Preservation Society

Second Deposit SD6.102

1872/12843	Hampshire County Council
------------	--------------------------

Second Deposit SD6.103

1872/12844	Hampshire County Council
68/14933	Environment Agency

Second Deposit SD6.104

68/14934	Environment Agency
----------	--------------------

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy should make it clear that Class A2 and A3 uses are appropriate in a town centre;
- 2) Whether the criteria should be changed or augmented in any way;
- 3) Whether town centre boundaries should be changed to include the Malt House at Alton, or to exclude or include land at Petersfield;
- 4) Whether the Local Centre in Four Marks should be changed to exclude the Windmill Public House, and whether the proposed extension to the shopping area in Drift Road, Clanfield is in the best location;

- 5) Whether the garden at the rear of the Royal Anchor Hotel, Liphook should be protected from development and whether SD6.104 would result in building on open space in the extended village centre.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.145 The Policy relates solely to retail, leisure, entertainment and cultural facilities. But SDDP paragraph 6.27 makes it clear that the Council will aim to provide a healthy mix of uses in town centres. This is encouraged in national guidance in PPG 6. Class A2 and A3 Uses contribute to the diversity in a town centre, and hence particular proposals for them may be acceptable in such a location. SDDP Policies S2, S3 and S4 and paragraphs 6.29, 6.30 and 6.46 set out the strategy for dealing with non-retail uses in town and village centres and within primary and secondary shopping frontages in particular. The Local Plan will have to be read as a whole. A reference in Policy TC1 to Class A2 and A3 Uses would not assist when their acceptability is subject to caveats that are explained elsewhere.

*

6.146 On the second issue, I agree that criterion (c) would be more meaningful with *alter* replaced by *harm*, which should not be qualified. Presumably an alteration for the better, provided that it did not undermine the Structure Plan hierarchy for centres and its intentions, would not fail a proposal. The need to build with security in mind is an aim of which developers of commercial schemes should already be aware through other mediums than a Local Plan. "Secured by Design" standards strike me as being more the subject of Supplementary Planning Guidance, and they should not be elevated to the status of a policy in an adopted Local Plan. For these reasons, such an additional criterion should not be included in the Policy. Criterion d) is unnecessary. Policies S2, S3 and S4 would apply in any event when relevant.

*

6.147 Thirdly, the former Malt House is in leisure use with private allotments and a car park taking up much of the rest of the site. The Council's Consultants, Hillier Parker, carried out a Shopping Study in 1997 (Document CD17/8) and concluded that, in the absence of any demand, there was no need to allocate further retail sites as part of the Second Review of the Local Plan. They advised against the preparation of a further study until shopping patterns had settled down following the completion of Tesco stores in Petersfield and Bordon. The Objector claims that if the site were within the town centre, it could be readily marketed and there would be no difficulty in securing its development and occupation by a national high street trader.

6.148 The Council confirms that, if demand were shown to exist for further town centre uses, other sites are available within the designated boundary that should be developed first. That is an eminently sensible approach. It makes good planning sense to develop vacant sites in the town centre before entertaining its enlargement. No doubt the Council will keep the demand and need for additional retail and other town centre uses under review. Meanwhile, the Malt House site is very much tucked away behind the main shopping frontages along the High Street and even further from that shopping core than the Sainsbury's store in its edge of centre location. In the absence of evidence to persuade me that the town centre boundary is defined too tightly, I see no reason to recommend any modification. Crucially, it would not improve the SDDP.

6.149 The boundary of the Petersfield town centre is based on a ring of streets that encircle its historic core, but extended to include the Tesco store to the south. Although the boundary includes some elements of residential use, particularly on the periphery, uses normally expected in a town centre prevail and I do not accept that it is too widely defined. In contrast, **Quadrant Estates and Railtrack Plc** seek an extension to include land on the northern side of the railway comprising a former coal yard in Station Road. Planning permission has been granted for development of the site for non-food retail use. Retail uses are bound to occur beyond town centres, which here is marked by an obvious and entirely suitable physical feature in the form of the railway. Indeed, the railway distinguishes a change in character of the built up area. The SDDP would not be improved by a modification changing the boundary of the town centre to take account of the permission.

*

6.150 Fourthly, although on the opposite side of the A31 road to the local centre in Four Marks, the Windmill Public House occupies a large site. A public house is an appropriate use for inclusion in a local or any other centre. I see no objection to its continued inclusion within the defined local centre.

6.151 The boundary of the local centre at Drift Road includes the plots of 30 or so dwellings around the existing core of shops. If an extension of the centre is required in the future, it makes for better planning to focus on the existing nucleus of shops and other facilities that are conveniently located within the main residential areas. The bigger the centre and the wider its range of attractions, the greater the scope for linked trips and reduction in the number of journeys by car. A larger local centre should have a better chance to attract and encourage investment. Conversely, a diffused pattern of attractions is likely to have the opposite effects. The Council does, however, accept that a shop at Green Lane could be a useful local facility should the Reserve Housing Site be developed. I am not persuaded otherwise.

*

6.152 On the fifth issue, the garden of the Royal Anchor Hotel, Liphook lies within both the defined village centre and the Conservation Area. Any proposal to develop in the garden would be considered in the context of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Its Section 72 requires the Council to pay special attention *to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*. That is a high level of protection for a large garden attached to a prominent building and its setting that for many years has made a worthy contribution to the open character of the village centre. That should suffice.

6.153 The “Village Green” is located within the extended village centre boundary under SD6.104. Its function and use as public open space strongly associates it with the rest of the village centre, and so I support this aspect of the SDDP. And, as public open space, it would be protected as such from development. No modification is needed.

-0-

6.154 On other matters, I deal with the Council’s proposed change to the status of the Whitehill/Bordon centre in connection with objections to SDDP Paragraph 6.28. I recommend against it, and in favour of a modified text. There is nothing to persuade me that the Forest Centre should be redeveloped for housing and a new centre built on surplus Defence Estates land, but that may be for consideration in the preparation of the Masterplan.

6.155 The grounds of Whitehill Chase provide the only open land in the proposed extended boundary shown on SD6.103 and so they would, at least for the present, remain outside the designated District and Local centres.

Recommendation

6.156 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the replacement in Criterion c) of *materially alter* with ***harm*** and by the deletion of Criterion d.

LARGE RETAIL, LEISURE AND ENTERTAINMENT USES POLICY TC2

Objections

First Deposit

586/6779 Town Planning Consultancy
1578/8883 The Petersfield Society
1835/9297 Medstead Parish Council
1872/10208 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD6.109

3863/11749 William Morrison Supermarkets Plc
3812/13485 B&Q Plc

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy overlooks its effect on small businesses;
- 2) Whether it should rule out large scale shopping/entertainment uses;
- 3) Whether any other modification is required.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.157 The Policy lays down a suitable framework for the determination of planning applications for large schemes that developers seek to provide at edge of, and outside, centres. Normally, a developer would be required to undertake a shopping impact study to show what effect a proposed retail scheme would have on established town, district and local centres. Any study should cover small businesses and the contribution they make to the health and diversity of a centre. The Policy is criteria-based and framed to protect established centres. That accords with national policy in the Good Practice Guide and in PPG 6. In Criterion d, *as a whole* adds nothing, and SD6.108 rightly deletes it.

*

6.158 Secondly, the SDDP defines large as a development of more than 500 sqm. I accept that that is appropriate in the local circumstances of the small, attractive towns and other settlements of East Hampshire. Each proposal would, in any event, be assessed on its merits. There could be situations where a large development proposal, thus defined, might be acceptable and could contribute to the health and diversity of a centre. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to rule out such schemes. Rightly, the Policy does not do so.

*

6.159 On the third issue, Criterion (f) is suitably restrictive in seeking to prevent the development of housing, employment and open space allocations for other purposes. Given the rural character of the District and the scarcity of land available for these 3 key

uses, it is not unreasonable for the Council to place a higher priority on those allocations and their protection than on proposals for retail, leisure and entertainment uses. SD6.109 provides more flexibility in that it acknowledges that the redevelopment of land in appropriate locations might present opportunities for large developments. Moreover, it would be open to a developer to seek to press for an exception to be made to policy where a powerful case can be made.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 6.34

Objections

First Deposit

1872/10206 Hampshire County Council

1872/10209 Hampshire County Council

Second Deposit SD6.111

1620/13600 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether paragraph 6.34 is justified in seeking to prevent the sub-division of shopping units.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.161 The Council accepts that the supporting text should make it clear that the sub-division of shopping units should be prevented so that there is no change in character as a result of the development. Change SD6.111 provides that clarification. The use of conditions to prevent sub-division of large units is a recognised means of preventing a change in character and function. This approach is advocated in national guidance in PPG 6. The provision is not too restrictive and it should stay.

Recommendation

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

POLICY TC3 & PARAGRAPH 6.36

Objections

First Deposit

88/5341	Thames Water Property
368/5830	Hampshire Constabulary
1620/8225	Whitehill Town Council
1870/10106	Tesco Stores Limited
1870/10107	Tesco Stores Limited
1872/10210	Hampshire County Council Chief Execs

Main Issue

Whether the Policy and supporting text in respect of the Local Centre at Chalet Hill and High Street, Whitehill/Bordon are reasonable in terms of requirements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.163 SD6.113 and SD6.116 delete both Policy and supporting text. Paragraphs 6.35 and 6.37 are relocated. The question of the capacity of the existing surface water sewer and its ability to take run-off from additional car parking space is a matter for any development brief and pre-application discussions.
- 6.164 I have already commented on the implications for policing resources earlier in this part of my Report.

Recommendation

- 6.165 I recommend that no change be made to the SDDP.

RETAIL ALLOCATIONS

POLICY S1

Objections

First Deposit

815/6277	Town Planning Consultancy
1272/7668	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1505/10010	P Whitmarsh
1644/10239	Alton Town Council
16/10268	Alton Promotion & Marketing Forum

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy unreasonably restrict development;
- 2) Whether additional land should be allocated for retail development at Alton and Petersfield; whether the area to the north west of Draymans Way should be allocated for retail development (large variety store); whether allocations should be made in respect of non-food retail uses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.166 The policy proposes 2 shopping allocations in the District and Local Centres at Whitehill/Bordon. It restricts them to retail use only. Proposals will be expected to comply with Policy TC1, not Policy TC2 of the FDDP (SD6.119). It is not unreasonable given the relatively poor range of shopping available within this large settlement, at least by the District's standards, that the Council should seek to improve the shopping offer available to its residents. SDDP Policy TC1 lays down a number of criteria, all of which are protective of the District's shopping centres. The Council's Consultants support this approach in their Study of Shopping in the District (Document CD17/8, paragraph 10.14). These restrictive measures are reasonable given the paucity of retail provision in the settlement. The reference in the Policy to Policy TC1 is unnecessary, in that it is already in the SDDP which should be read as a whole.

*

6.167 On the second issue, there is no compelling evidence to show that either town centre cannot accommodate compatible development needs during the plan period. No doubt the Council will keep the matter under review. **Alton Town Council** would like to see the area to the north of Draymans Way used for additional retail use and it cites one large anchor variety store and several medium and smaller units as being suitable on the car park. This area is already within the town centre boundary. Such schemes can be only developer-led, and I do have my doubts that a town the size of Alton could support a store of the type and scale envisaged. Nevertheless, should a developer wish to pursue that or any other retail proposal in that area behind the High Street, I see nothing in the SDDP that would obstruct it in principle.

Recommendation

6.168 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of the final sentence of Policy S1.

PHASE 2, FOREST CENTRE, WHITEHILL BORDON POLICY S1 (a)

Objections

First Deposit

368/5829 Hampshire Constabulary
1375/9316 Lindford Parish Council

Main Issue

Whether public transport links to the centre should be improved.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.169 Better public transport to serve the centre is not a matter for the Local Plan unless there are land use implications.

–0–

6.170 On another matter, I have already dealt with the Hampshire Constabulary's point in this and other Chapters of my Report.

Recommendation

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

**BORDON MOTORS/MASONIC HALL SITE,
WHITEHILL/BORDON
POLICY S1 (b) AND PARAGRAPHS 6.40 AND 6.42**

Objections

First Deposit

82/5085	David and Peggy Ross
130/5137	Mr G J Twinn
88/5340	Thames Water Property
368/5828	Hampshire Constabulary
652/5920	Mr D C Platford
1872/10205	Hampshire County Council
1872/10207	Hampshire County Council
1872/10211	Hampshire County Council

Main Issue

Whether any more shops can be justified in Whitehill/Bordon because of the increased traffic that would result from them, and whether local sewerage system could cater with more development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.172 There is no compelling evidence to demonstrate that more shops would seriously overload local roads. Only a small part of this site remains to be developed. The text should be up-dated to reflect the development that has taken place.
- 6.173 A Tesco foodstore has been erected on the site. Its impact on the Forest Centre will no doubt be monitored. It is too late to restrict the items sold from the store.
- 6.174 SD6.125 rightly deletes *as a whole* in paragraph 6.42.

Recommendation

- 6.175 I recommend that the SDDP be modified to acknowledge that development has already taken place on this site.

NON RETAIL USES IN SHOPPING CENTRES

PRIMARY SHOPPING FRONTAGES

POLICY S2

Objections

First Deposit

59/5062 The Marden Group, c/o Elizabeth Lawrence
1927/8222 Consignia
16/10265 Alton Promotion & Marketing Forum

Second Deposit SD6.130

1620/13604 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

- 1) Whether the Policy should be less restrictive;
- 2) Whether the defined Primary Shopping Frontage in Petersfield should be modified to exclude Nos 29-32 The Square, including the Head Post Office, and 2-8 Swan Street;
- 3) Whether Whitehill/Bordon should be added to the Policy.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.176 The second paragraph of the Policy introduces a degree of flexibility. It seeks to prevent the creation of 3 or more continuous non-retail uses in a frontage, or more than 40% of the street frontage being in non-retail use. The street frontage is measured 50 m either side of the application site. This is a reasonable concession to non-retail uses. Any greater flexibility is likely to threaten the primary shopping function of a centre, and the restrictions should not be further eased. This second paragraph is, however, more in the form of an explanation of how the Policy will be applied. It would therefore be better as supporting text.

*

6.177 On the second issue, The Square in Petersfield is at the historic core of the town and 3 of its sides, including the 4 Objection properties, are included in the primary shopping frontage. The Square plays host to the weekly market on Wednesdays and Saturdays, so it is at the hub of shopping activity in the town. Shopping facilities in the centre have been expanded by the development at Rams Walk. This does not appear to have led to a diminution in the contribution that The Square makes to the primary shopping function. Rams Walk leads towards The Square and the latter provides a link between the High Street, Chapel Street and Lavant Street that are part of the shopping heart of the town centre. The Square plays such an important role in the life and vitality of the centre that

it should not be downgraded by truncating or weakening its primary shopping function. That would be the effect of the suggested exclusions.

- 6.178 The Council accepts that, if the primary shopping frontages are to be protected, only the most important frontages should carry that designation. Thus SD6.131 designates Nos 2-6 Swan Street as secondary rather than primary shopping frontage. No 8 Swan Street is not in a designated shopping frontage. The entire frontage of Nos 2-8 is one of limited length, at some distance from the main shopping parts of the town centre at The Square and certain streets leading from it. These Objections call for no modification of the SDDP.

*

- 6.179 On the third issue, the primary shopping frontages in Whitehill/Bordon are of a more limited scale than at either Petersfield or Alton and so their role and character is more vulnerable to changes to non-retail uses. Policy S3 aims to protect primary shopping frontages in the District's smaller centres and is correspondingly more restrictive than Policy S2. It therefore provides the best protection for shopping in Whitehill/Bordon. The SDDP would not be improved by moving the protection for primary shopping frontages from Policy S3 to Policy S2 as the **Whitehill Town Council** suggests. That could undermine what the Town Council rightly seeks to protect.

Recommendation

- 6.180 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by relegating the second paragraph of the Policy to supporting text.

POLICY S3 AND SECOND DEPOSIT DRAFT PARAGRAPH SD6.134

Objections

First Deposit

1927/9191 Post Office Property Holdings

Second Deposit SD6.134

1620/13608 Whitehill Town Council
1927/14697 Consignia

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC012.6 (page 150)

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Policy is too restrictive;
- 2) Whether SD6.134 should be modified to explain that, in Whitehill/Bordon, A3 uses will be discouraged and A1 uses encouraged, and whether it unreasonably tightens control even further with regard to changes of use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.181 The Policy does not permit proposals that would result in a continuous frontage of 2 or more non-retail uses. This represents a reasonable measure of protection in the smaller centres of the District which are likely to be particularly vulnerable to pressure to change to non-Class A1 uses. Even a relatively small loss of the primary shopping function in these centres could be harmful to their vitality and viability because of their small scale and relative fragility. As the Council points out, the Policy as drafted could result in a non-shopping use in every second unit. That represents sufficient, indeed generous, flexibility for this type of centre. If the Policy leads to too many vacant units as postulated by the Objector, the Council would no doubt reconsider its suitability. There are no grounds for weakening it without evidence that it is failing in its objective.

*

6.182 Secondly, pressure to bring more Class A3 uses into shopping frontages is not uncommon in centres of all sizes throughout the country, and there is no reason for any such explanation with respect to Whitehill/Bordon. The harm to a frontage or centre where there are too many Class A3 uses is given as an example where the formulae may need to be outweighed so as to maintain viability and vitality. It is a reasonable response to a situation that could arise in the implementation of the Policy. It does not unreasonably tighten the Policy even further, but makes clear that a purely formulaic approach to development control may need some fine-tuning.

Recommendation

6.183 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC012.6).

SECONDARY SHOPPING FRONTAGES

POLICY S4

Objection

First Deposit

1644/10238 Alton Town Council

Main Issue

Whether Turk Street, Alton should be added to the secondary shopping frontage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.184 The Council accepts that Turk Street, with its mixture of Class A1, A2 and A3 uses, contributes much to the vitality and viability of the town centre. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. SD6.136 rightly designates Turk Street as a secondary shopping frontage.

Recommendation

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

THE CONTROL OF SHOPS ON FARMS

POLICY S6

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7350 CPRE
910/8763 Headley Residents' Association

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should exclude the establishment of supermarkets, and whether it is sufficiently rigorous to control any future expansion of farm shops.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.186 Criterion a) allows for the introduction of a retail use on a farm only where the scale and scope of the proposal would not harm the viability of retail facilities in any nearby town or village. This provides sufficient safeguard to prevent the establishment of retail outlets of the size of supermarkets and Country Markets, or the expansion of existing outlets to that magnitude. Although there may have been difficulties experienced with this type of use in the past, the Council's enforcement powers should be adequate to curtail operations that are harmful and unauthorised.
- 6.187 The Council may wish to reconsider the drafting of the Policy. The expansion as well as the introduction of a retail use should be anticipated. There is no need to cross-refer to Policy C14 which can be brought to bear in any event where relevant. The last paragraph is more in the form of supporting text, in that it explains how the Policy might be applied. I recommend accordingly.

Recommendation

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

POLICY S6

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE INTRODUCTION OR EXPANSION OF A RETAIL USE ON A FARM WILL BE GRANTED PROVIDED THAT ITS SCALE AND SCOPE WOULD NOT HARM THE VIABILITY OF RETAIL FACILITIES IN ANY NEARBY TOWN OR VILLAGE.

Any planning permission for such a use may limit by condition the range or source of the goods sold, or both.

GARDEN CENTRES

POLICY S7

Objections

First Deposit

1272/7684 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
910/8764 Headley Residents' Association

Second Deposit SD6.138

1620/13610 Whitehill Town Council

Second Deposit SD6.139

1620/13612 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is too restrictive or not of sufficient rigour.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.189 Similar considerations arise as with farm shops. SD6.138 & SD6.139 ensure that garden centres will not be established where they would harm the viability of retail facilities in nearby towns and villages and warns that conditions may be imposed to control the range of goods sold. This is a prudent approach. Competition within the retail sector needs to be confined to the established town and village centres. They have the potential for linked trips thus reducing reliance on the private car and their continued health is paramount in maintaining the quality of life in the District.
- 6.190 The Policy is in line with the shopping strategy at SDDP paragraph 6.26. It strikes the right balance between firmness and flexibility and there is not much wrong with it. The Council may, however, wish to consider my redraft of Criterion b) which I believe would be more specific and anticipate any problems of access. There is no need to refer to *local* landscape. That could lead to spurious argument. I would also suggest that SD6.139 be relegated to supporting text.
- 6.191 Enforcement powers and the imposition of appropriate condition(s) should be sufficient to control the range of goods sold from new garden centres.

Recommendation

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

POLICY S7

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR GARDEN CENTRES WILL BE GRANTED ON SITES WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSAL:

A. IS NOT INTRUSIVE IN THE LANDSCAPE;

- B. WOULD NOT RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY;***
- C. As in SDDP***
- D. As in SDDP.***

and by the relegation of SD6.139 to supporting text.

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

POLICY TM1

Objections

First Deposit

292/5620	Mr A Blackham
1278/7352	CPRE
1272/7688	East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
920/8504	Binsted Parish Council
1304/8776	Country Landowners Association
1859/9618	Alice Holt Action Group

Main Issues

- 1) Whether tourist facilities should be restricted to small scale development;
- 2) Whether the Policy pays sufficient attention to nature conservation interests, noise, tranquillity and light pollution;
- 3) Whether sub-paragraph d) is too restrictive.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.193 The Policy sets guidelines for the promotion of sustainable tourism that serves the interests of both economic growth and the conservation of the environment (SDDP paragraph 6.57). Tourism is an established activity in East Hampshire and has been so for many years. In view of its scenic quality and its historic and literary associations, the District will continue to have much to offer in this regard, and so the Local Plan should include a policy against which proposals for further facilities can be judged. Most tourist visits are no doubt undertaken by private car, but the Policy rightly seeks to ensure that small-scale facilities can be visited by a choice of means of transport.

6.194 To achieve a balanced and sustainable approach to tourism in a District that is predominantly rural and with a large part of it within an AONB, it is right to ensure that the scale of new development is small in recognition of those vital characteristics. The Council thus correctly deletes the reference to theme parks and residential holiday centres, on the grounds that such facilities are unlikely to be appropriately accommodated within a sensitive landscape. I agree. *Small in scale* should stay.

*

6.195 Secondly, the Policy is framed to protect the landscape, nature conservation and historic interests. Policies P2, P4 and P5 (air, noise and light pollution) would apply where relevant to any proposal. I am confident that these policies are sufficient to ensure that these important aspects would be carefully weighed in any proposal for tourist development.

*

6.196 Criterion d) requires a proven need to be established before new development would be permitted in the countryside. It is, however, more for the Council to show demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance than for the applicant to prove need. It would no doubt rely where relevant on harm to the intrinsic character of the countryside, to the AONB and to any other material consideration such as those to which the rest of the Policy refers. Criterion d) should be deleted.

Recommendation

6.197 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of Criterion d).

VISITOR ACCOMMODATION WITHIN SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES

POLICY TM2

Objections

First Deposit

1272/10422 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should more actively encourage new accommodation for visitors.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.198 The Policy suitably sets out the context against which applications for visitor accommodation will be considered. The Local Plan will not be a means of promoting tourism. That is for the Council's Economic Development Team through the Tourism Marketing Officer.

Recommendation

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

VISITOR ACCOMMODATION OUTSIDE SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES POLICY TM3

Objections

First Deposit

1304/8777 Country Landowners Association
1847/9567 Sussex Downs Conservation Board
1862/9679 Chawton Parish Council
1272/10423 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Main Issues

- 1) Whether Criterion d) should be extended to include working rural estates;
- 2) Whether the reference to Policies C14 or C15 should be modified to *AND/OR*, and whether the Policy should include the points covered by Policy TM2 (b) and (c).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.200 I would expect working rural estates to be mainly or entirely found outside SPBs, and it is these rural parts of the District to which the Policy applies. And there is nothing in it that suggests that it would not apply to such estates. There is no need for further clarification.

*

6.201 SD6.153, SD6.154 and SD6.155 meet the points relating to Policies C14, C15 and TM2 b) and c). As mentioned before, however, I see no need to cross-reference one policy with another. The Local Plan will be read as a whole and due weight given to every relevant policy in the determination of planning applications and the attachment of conditions. I also invite the Council to take account here of my recommendation concerning Policy S7 b) which relates to highways and traffic.

6.202 My comments on the whether the Policy should encourage provision of visitor accommodation are set out in relation to Policy TM2.

Recommendation

6.203 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion in Criterion d) of the references to Policies C14 and C15.

HOTEL ALLOCATIONS

POLICY TM4

Objection

First Deposit

1570/8565 R W McKenzie

Main Issue

Whether land in the Chawton Triangle is suitable for a budget hotel.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.204 I deal with the proposed allocation for mixed housing and/or employment use at Chawton Triangle in Chapter 5.3 of my Report. As I explain there, a hotel would be equally objectionable as residential and/or employment development on this open land at this approach to Alton.

Recommendation

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

LAND SOUTH OF WOOLMER TRADING ESTATE POLICY TM4 (a)

Objections

First Deposit

368/5836 Hampshire Constabulary
479/6063 Mr & Mrs H S G Martin
1289/7971 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1622/8460 English Nature

Main Issues

Whether the allocation for an hotel south of the Woolmer Trading Estate, Whitehill/Bordon would harm nature conservation interests and SINC.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.206 I have already commented on the allocation of this site in connection with objections to Policy IB1(7). The principle of development is established by the grant of outline planning permission. The Council acknowledges the nature conservation interest of the site and confirms that mitigation measures have been agreed as part of the permission.

Recommendation

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

**TELECOM EXCHANGE/GUADELOUPE CAR PARK
WHITEHILL/BORDON**

POLICY TM4 (b)

Objections

First Deposit

368/5837 Hampshire Constabulary
699/6513 Mrs P Gardner

Main Issue

Whether this land should be developed.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.208 I deal with objections to the mixed use proposed for this land in connection with Policy IB1 (6).

Recommendation

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

BUCKMORE FARM, PETERSFIELD

POLICY TM4 (c)

Objection

First Deposit

1945/9423 Bryant Homes and J S Bloor (Newbury) Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.158

3813/14682 Southern Service Stations Ltd

Second Deposit SD6.164

3813/14683 Southern Service Stations Ltd

Main Issue

Whether the allocation should be for mixed development, including residential.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.210 I deal with the suggestion that this site should be used for mixed development, including residential, in respect of objections to Policy IB1 (13). I conclude that it should not. The land should remain allocated for an hotel.

Recommendation

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

**ST LUCIA LODGE, LINFORD LODGE, WHITEHILL/BORDON
SECOND DEPOSIT NEW HOTEL ALLOCATION SD6.159**

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.159

1864/13457 Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD6.160

68/14935 Environment Agency

Second Deposit SD6.162

1864/13458 Defence Estates
1620/13614 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether the site should remain allocated for an hotel and whether its wildlife corridor should be protected from development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.212 Planning permission has been granted on appeal for the change of use of this building to residential. There is also a lack of evidence that the Whitehill/Bordon area needs as many as 3 hotels. I presume that the permission takes account of the nature conservation interests on the site. This allocation should be deleted, to reflect current circumstances.

Recommendation

6.213 I recommend that the SDDP be amended by deleting changes SD6.159 and SD6.160.

CAMPING AND TOURING CARAVAN SITES

POLICY TM5

Objections

First Deposit

93/5682 Councillor Mr J Crowhurst

Main Issue

Whether a camping/touring caravan site could be suitably provided in Petersfield.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.214 A site is proposed in the Queen Elizabeth Country Park, to the south of Petersfield, under Policy TM6. This is about 5 km from the town centre. Applications for any other proposals would be determined, on their merits, against the criteria of the Policy and any other material considerations.

Recommendation

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

CONFERENCE FACILITIES

POLICY TM7

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.166

1303/11723 Borrow Dental Milk Foundation
1620/13615 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether the Policy is too restrictive in applying only to land outside Settlement Policy Boundaries.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.216 SD6.166 deletes the reference to *small scale* conference facilities and applies the Policy to land outside SPBs. Given the landscape constraints within the District, the Policy now strikes a balance between the provision of this type of use and the protection of the environment. The **Whitehill Town Council**'s suggested amendments would not improve the clarity of the Policy or give it more flexibility.

Recommendation

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

BUILDINGS OR LAND SURPLUS TO REQUIREMENTS POLICY MOD1

Objections

First Deposit

1289/6853 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1278/7355 CPRE
1272/7702 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
1620/8323 Whitehill Town Council

Main Issue

Whether this Policy should be made more instructive.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.218 I refer in previous sections of my Report to the **Defence Estates** land at Whitehill/Bordon, the possibility that at least some of it is likely to become surplus and be put forward for development by the end of the plan period. I acknowledge the implications for important nature conservation interests that are likely to be a formidable constraint on its realistic availability. This is a matter that the urgently needed Masterplan should take into account so as to avoid the potential damage to which the **Hampshire Wildlife Trust** refers and the prospect of piecemeal development that rightly concerns **CPRE**. The evidence is that the constructive dialogue with the **Defence Estates**, to which **East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry** refers, is taking place.
- 6.219 This is the context of the Policy. The main parties are committed to the preparation and speedy adoption of the Masterplan and in that light I see no need for substantial modification of the Policy. There should be no good reason to prevent the redevelopment of **Defence Estates** land in the main built up area provided that it did not seriously offend other development plan policies.
- 6.220 I regard the intended Masterplan, and the consultations that are taking place in its preparation, as being of crucial importance in guiding future development in Whitehill/Bordon. But presumably it will be Supplementary Planning Guidance and not part of the adopted Local Plan, and so reference should be made to it in the supporting text rather than in the Policy. I recommend accordingly with regard to Policy MOD1 and SDDP paragraph 6.70 below.

Recommendation

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

POLICY MOD1

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE RE-USE AND REDEVELOPMENT OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER LAND WITHIN

***SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES WHICH IS DECLARED SURPLUS TO
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE REQUIREMENTS PROVIDED THAT THEY ARE IN
KEEPING WITH THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDINGS.***

PARAGRAPH 6.70

Second Deposit SD6.168

1620/13621 Whitehill Town Council
1864/11724 Defence Estates
1622/12393 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1289/12677 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1878/14715 Prowting Projects Ltd

Pre Inquiry Change PIC013.6

1620/15248 Whitehill Town Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC013.6 (page 157).

Main Issue

Whether the text adequately reflects Circular 1/97 and the search sequence in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.222 The Latest Proposed Change goes some way towards meeting the **Defence Estates** concern about the Council's consideration of proposals that *go toward satisfying the lack of facilities in the town*. As the Objector implies, any benefits sought must meet the tests of reasonableness in Circular 1/97 that, with SDDP Policy GS4, would be material considerations in the matter of planning obligations/contributions. The Latest Proposed Change was discussed at the Inquiry, and the Council and the Defence Estates accepted my suggested re-draft of it. In essence, it is now recommended.
- 6.223 **English Nature** objects to the consideration of the Defence Estates' redundant lands in advance of the release of Reserve Sites. I cannot prejudge the issue, but in principle I would prefer to see previously-developed land at Whitehill/Bordon released for redevelopment before any greenfield Reserve Site in accordance with the search sequence advised in PPG 3. Choice should be made on the basis of a comparative exercise of particular sites, taking account of all relevant aspects of sustainability.
- 6.224 The **Whitehill Town Council** requests the inclusion in SD6.168 of *and if the necessary facilities, services and infrastructure have been provided in Whitehill/Bordon*. I would expect the Council to ensure that all reasonable provision was, or would be made, available to support a development. That should apply throughout the District, and there is no need to distinguish this particular part of it. For any release of a substantial amount of land, reference to the Masterplan would no doubt be relevant.

Recommendation

- 6.225 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by replacing the second part of the Latest Proposed Change (PIC013.6) at the end of Paragraph 6.70 with:

In its determination of applications for planning permission for the re-use or re-development of land adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) at Whitehill/Bordon, the Council will adopt the same approach as it does to proposals within the SPB in so far as seeking to enter into agreements with developers for the reasonable provision of new or improved retail, commercial, leisure and local facilities. It will also have regard to the stage reached, and contents of, the Whitehill/Bordon Masterplan and, in furtherance of my recommendation at paragraph 2.76 of my Report, delete the first sentence of SD6.168 and replace it with the first paragraph of my recommended modification of SD2.066.

POLICY MOD2

Objections

First Deposit

1272/7708 East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
622/8270 Cllr Mrs T M Jamieson
1620/8325 Whitehill Town Council
1622/8466 English Nature

Second Deposit SD6.173

1864/13440 Defence Estates

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC014.6 (page 157).

Main Issue

Whether the Policy should be made more certain and precise.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.226 At the time of the Inquiry, the **Defence Estates** had not formally declared surplus any of its land at Whitehill/Bordon and it was not requesting the allocation of any particular site. In that context, I suggested a re-draft of the Policy to take account of valid points in the representations. The 2 main parties accepted it, and now I recommend it formally. My recommended redraft supersedes the Latest Proposed Change.

-0-

6.227 There are other matters. I agree with the **East Hampshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry**'s comments about present uncertainties and the need for a future vision. Hence the need for a speedy adoption of the Masterplan. **Cllr Mrs T M Jamieson** makes the point that the wholesale demolition of buildings for housing is not sustainable. It may be possible to re-use some buildings for the uses that she suggests, but demolition and rebuilding in some cases should not be precluded on principle. On the **Whitehill Town Council**'s comments, I can add nothing to my conclusion above about the vital importance of reasonableness in the seeking of benefits.

Recommendation

6.228 I recommend that the SDDP be modified as follows:

POLICY MOD2

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE RE-USE AND/OR REDEVELOPMENT OF LAND OUTSIDE SETTLEMENT POLICY BOUNDARIES WHICH HAS BEEN DECLARED SURPLUS TO MINISTRY OF DEFENCE REQUIREMENTS, PROVIDED THAT THE SCHEME WOULD BE:

A) LIMITED TO THE AREA(S) COVERED BY BUILDINGS, ACCESSES, HARDSTANDINGS AND SIMILAR HARD SURFACES;

- B) IN KEEPING WITH THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA; AND*
- C) ACCESSIBLE WITH A CHOICE IN MODE OF TRANSPORT, EITHER EXISTING OR AS SUITABLY PROPOSED TO BE ENHANCED.*

For proposals with the potential for a significant generation of traffic, the Council will expect the application(s) to be accompanied by a green transport plan. For some proposals, paragraph SD2.066 may be particularly relevant.

PARAGRAPH 6.71

Objections

Second Deposit SD6.176

1864/13441 Defence Estates

Pre Inquiry Change PIC015.6

1622/14986 English Nature
1289/13781 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1620/15249 Whitehill Town Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC015.6 (page 157 and 158).

Main Issue

Whether the text should be modified to ensure that previously-developed land will take precedence over greenfield land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.229 The **Defence Estates** requests the modification of the extended paragraph 6.71, but I see no need to do so. Previously-developed land will, in the light of the search sequence, usually be re-used before greenfield land although this depends upon how well the former performs against the criteria set out in PPG 3 paragraph 31.

-0-

6.230 There are other matters. I see no problem with the general statement that the potential to re-use or redevelop previously-developed land outside SPBs will be more limited if the overall aim of sustainability is to be achieved. Policy MOD2 provides a suitable context for the determination of planning applications for development in these rural areas. The **Defence Estates'** point about the need to avoid impact upon the countryside is accommodated in Criterion B of my recommended Policy MOD2.

6.231 Other Objectors oppose the deletion of text by the Latest Proposed Change. Their valid points are met, however, in my recommendation concerning Paragraph SD2.066 which clarifies this deleted text.

Recommendation

6.232 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC015.6).

PARAGRAPH 6.72

Objection

Second Deposit SD6.179

1864/13444 Defence Estates

Main Issue

Whether the paragraph should place a greater emphasis on improving public transport.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.233 I am all in favour of improvements to public transport to enhance sustainability. But where land is remote from main urban areas and accessibility by means other than the private car is poor, there is likely to be little prospect of improving public transport to such an extent that it becomes an effective alternative. My recommended modification of Policy MOD2, especially its Criterion C, may be a relevant consideration.

6.234 A judgement would have to be made, however, on the extent to which a proposed enhancement of public transport met the objectives of that Policy. Neither that Policy, nor Paragraph 6.72, preclude the serving of remote land by better public transport, but the Council's approach in this paragraph is more realistic than is suggested.

Recommendation

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

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE SITES

PARAGRAPH 6.74

Objection

First Deposit

1864/10296 Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD6.181

1864/13447 Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD6.182

1864/13451 Defence Estates

Pre Inquiry Change PIC016.6

1620/15250 Whitehill Town Council
1864/15402 Defence Estates

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC016.6 (page 158).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Local Plan should refer to the Safeguarding Map for RAF Oakhanger Technical Site and the need to consult the Ministry of Defence when appropriate;
- 2) Whether more guidance is required concerning development briefs and other measures.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.236 The Council has this Map and will consult the Ministry and others as appropriate as a usual part of its development control responsibilities. The SDDP rightly acknowledges the point at SD6.186.

*

6.237 On the second issue, the Latest Proposed Change suitably accepts the substance of the **Defence Estates'** suggested substitution. The emphasis should be on the Council's *preparation* of these briefs rather than their being *agreed* by the various parties. Hopefully both will be achieved, but PIC016.6 is better because the initiative and adoption remains with the Council, the local planning authority. There is no need to repeat that proposals would be considered against Policies MOD1 and MOD2. The Policies are there for that purpose.

6.238 My recommended modification to paragraph 2.066 is relevant in the context of paragraph 6.74. I consider that it goes as far as it can in meeting the **Whitehill Town Council's** point about the need for a set of criteria to distinguish the circumstances calling for development brief, alteration or review of the Local Plan.

6.239 The **Defence Estates** is correct about the omission of a comma between *process* and *via* in the Latest Proposed Change. Not every proposal is likely to be so substantial that a development brief will be necessary.

Recommendation

6.240 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC016.6) apart from:

Paragraph SD6.182

.....they will be dealt with through the normal development control process, via development briefs to be prepared by the Council in conjunction with the MoD and the community or via an early review or alteration of the development plan,....

LONGMOOR AND BORDON

PARAGRAPHS 6.75 AND 6.76

Objections

First Deposit

1620/8327 Whitehill Town Council
1622/8467 English Nature
2027/8949 RSPB

Second Deposit SD6.184

1864/13460 Defence Estates
1620/13628 Whitehill Town Council
1620/13640 Whitehill Town Council

Pre Inquiry Change PIC017.6

1620/15251 Whitehill Town Council

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC51, PIC017.6 and FPC52 (pages 158 and 159).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether there is sufficient attention to the protection of playing pitches;
- 2) Whether FPC51 that refers to the Woolmer Forest cSAC should be included in the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.241 The **Whitehill Town Council** is rightly concerned about the possible loss of playing pitches. The Latest Proposed Change suitably acknowledges the point, providing for their protection until their future use is determined. There is little to choose between *must therefore* and *should therefore*. *Must* would not significantly improve the Local Plan, so I keep with the Council's stance. I would expect the Masterplan to assess the extent of any deficiency, and to put forward relevant proposals for the needs of existing and future residents.

*

6.242 On the second issue, the Latest Proposed Change meets the reasonable points that the **RSPB** makes about the importance of the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA). I agree that it is a very important consideration in assessing both the direct and indirect effects of development upon it. No allocations of land are either sought or made at these Ministry of Defence sites, and so none can be made the subject of Policy H1, as is suggested. Residential and/or industrial development at Longmoor is at present no more than a possibility that should be noted. Should firm proposals for a particular site or sites be made, an appropriate assessment would have to be undertaken in

accordance with relevant regulations concerning the SPA and cSAC, as FPC51 rightly indicates.

- 6.243 The Latest Proposed Change suitably outlines as far as is possible at present the possibilities for Longmoor and Bordon, and Policy MOD2 provides the main context for the determination of any planning application. I have taken account of other suggested amendments to this, and to other parts of the text concerning **Defence Estates** land, but I see no need for more elaboration. The **Whitehill Town Council** makes other points about land at the Phoenix Centre and north west of the Fire Station cross-roads. I deal with them in Chapter 7 of my Report.

Recommendation

- 6.244 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (FPC51, PIC017.6 and FPC52).

SCU LEYDENE

PARAGRAPH 6.78

Objections

First Deposit

1278/7358 CPRE
1864/10295 Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD6.185

1864/13453 Defence Estates

Inspector's Note

6.231 I deal with these representations in Chapter 5.3 of my Report.

MINERALS

PARAGRAPH 6.82

Objection

First Deposit

1278/7359 CPRE

Main Issue

Whether the restoration of mineral works should be of the highest quality.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.232 The CPRE makes valid points about the importance of mineral workings for wildlife and that their restoration should anticipate and provide for this undoubted benefit. No doubt if it thinks it necessary, the District Council will pursue the point with the competent authority, the Hampshire County Council. I suspect, however, that this would be preaching to the converted.

Recommendation

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