

PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

PARAGRAPH 1.1

Objection

First Deposit

1772/7809 Mr F Philpot

Main Issue

Whether the price of the SDDP is too high and whether it should be available on a website.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.1 The price of the Local Plan at all its stages is a matter for the Council and I make no comment on it. As they have been produced, an increasing number of SDDP documents have been put on a website. They include the Inquiry Programme and the list of Core Documents. The SDDP itself is already on it, and I urge the Council to rely on this means of communication as much as possible.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 1.2

Objections

First Deposit

1039/6696 Ms P Cullen
1039/9931 Ms P Cullen

Main Issue

Whether too much land is being allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.3 This is a matter that I consider in some detail in my examination of the objections lodged to the various contents of Chapter 5. There I conclude that the Council, owing to certain unrealistic assumptions, has not allocated quite enough land for residential development.
- 1.4 **Ms P Cullen** sets out her wide-ranging views on the relationship between the District and County Councils and the Government. It is not my remit, however, to consider these administrative arrangements and the implications for town and country planning that flow from them.
- 1.5 My conclusions and recommendations throughout this Report are drafted within the context of the present planning system in this country, including the present importance of the adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review). I make no comment on any suggested improvements. That is the task of Parliament, as has been the case with the coming into operation of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 1.3

Objection

First Deposit

1521/7330 Professor M.J Withers

Main Issue

Whether too much land is being allocated for various uses, to the detriment of other parts of the country where regional development initiatives that include better transport links should be promoted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.7 Similar considerations apply as above. My conclusions and recommendations take account of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) for the South East and other regional and national guidance. As the Council says, it can comment on draft national and regional policies, but it cannot dictate their final content. Again, however, it is not my task to seek to overturn RPG policies for this or any other part of the country.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 1.6

Objection

First Deposit

1976/8259 The Environmental Project Consulting Group

Second Deposit SD1.002

1622/12319 English Nature, Hampshire & Isle of Wight
1289/12597 Hampshire Wildlife Trust

Main Issue

Whether more attention should be paid to planning for the environment, sustainability and biodiversity.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.9 These are matters of fundamental importance. In particular, the Government is committed to the principles of sustainable development as set out in *Sustainable Development: The UK Strategy*. I examine the extent to which the Council has followed this strategy in my examination of, for example, the extent and distribution of land allocated for residential and other development. I consider that Policy GS1, as recommended to be modified, would be a useful start in the determination of applications for planning permission for a wide range of proposals.
- 1.10 **English Nature** and the **Hampshire Wildlife Trust** consider that the Local Plan should accommodate development that achieves a sustainable outcome for the environment as well as for communities. It should be demonstrated, they say, that particular proposals are part of an overall sustainability strategy. I agree that the suggested change would make this intention even clearer, and I recommend accordingly.
- 1.11 I have much sympathy for the view that the Local Plan should aim not only to minimise the impact of development but also to enhance the environment and biodiversity of the District. But that cannot always be a relevant test in the determination of a planning application, in that those deciding applications or appeals should always take into account whether the proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance.
- 1.12 The SDDP, with the minor modification that I recommend, will go as far as it should do in this respect.

Recommendation

- 1.13 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of the last sentence its Paragraph 1.6 and its replacement as follows:

Paragraph 1.6

The Local Plan aims to accommodate new development in a way that accords with long term objectives and achieves a sustainable outcome for our communities by minimising its impact on the environment and on the biodiversity of the District.

PLANNING CONTEXT

PARAGRAPH 1.9

Objections

First Deposit

1724/8575 Dr J Chatfield

Second Deposit SD1.003

511/11569 Headley Parish Council
910/11894 Headley Residents' Association
1620/13194 Whitehill Town Council
1278/14473 CPRE

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC001.1 (page 9).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether “Urban Capacity Study” is the correct term for a mainly rural area;
- 2) Whether paragraph SD1.003 should include a reference to “balanced communities”;
- 3) Whether the paragraph should include *and thereby reducing the need for greenfield allocations*.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.14 The term should be retained, although to be consistent with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3 it would be better to call it the “Urban Housing Capacity Study”. It is generic in type, and its use in the SDDP indicates that the Council has rightly taken into account an important policy in that Guidance. The supporting text clearly explains that urban areas are reasonably regarded as settlements with policy boundaries. This accords with the advice in Tapping the Potential (December 2000) that, in considering the areas in which to search for housing capacity, local authorities could assume that “urban” embraces all settlements that can contribute to sustainable patterns of development. Whether all the settlements that the Council has identified could so contribute is, however, a matter that I deal with in Chapter 5.
- 1.15 Where any particular site is allocated for residential development, the appropriate form and density for it will need to be examined. A likely consideration will be the Government’s policy of generally increasing the density of development, but I would be surprised if this were the only relevant factor in all cases. Other matters, as the **Headley Residents’ Association** suggests, may well be pertinent.

*

1.16 On the second issue, the Council’s commitment to sustainable development implies the need to create, or contribute to, balanced communities. Again, the proposals should flow from this strategy. National policy in PPG 3, for example, will remain a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, especially its advice on the location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car and the potential for improving such accessibility. In this context, and in view of my recommendation, there is little need to specify *the requirement to create balance communities*, as the **Whitehill Town Council** suggests. It is clear from the SDDP that that is the Council’s strategy.

*

1.17 Thirdly, I agree that the suggested addition should be included. It would make clear one of the reasons for giving priority to the re-use of previously-developed land provided, of course, that it was suitably located and performed well in other respects. The Latest Proposed Change suitably covers the point.

-0-

1.18 There are other matters. **Dr Chatfield** refers to Government decisions that she says may need to be challenged. Local planning authorities can make representations on draft national and regional policies. But again, it is not for me to comment on, or recommend changes to, the present system in the administration of town and country planning.

1.19 I consider later the extent to which the Local Plan should take account of proposals for a South Downs National Park in my examination of paragraphs SD1.009 and PIC002.1.

1.20 I recommend a few minor modifications to emphasise some of my Conclusions.

Recommendation

1.21 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the replacement of Paragraph SD1.003 including PIC001.1 with:

After the First Deposit Plan was prepared, the Government published PPG 3 – Housing (March 2000). This aims to promote sustainable patterns of development and to maximise the use of previously developed land, provided that it is suitably located, thereby reducing the need for the development of greenfield land. Local planning authorities are advised to assess the capacity of urban areas (settlements with policy boundaries) so as to accommodate more housing. National planning policy encourages the creation of balanced communities and higher density housing development where sites have good access to local facilities, although it recognises that good design is crucial to creating attractive, high quality living environments. Plans should adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of land for housing development. This Plan is revised to take account of these national policies.

PARAGRAPH 1.10

Objection

First Deposit

1772/8919 Mr F Philpot

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC3 (page 9).

Main Issue

Whether the Local Plan should be based upon the Hampshire Structure Plan 1994 or the adopted Hampshire Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.22 The former was repealed and the latter adopted on 27 March 2000. The Local Plan must be in general conformity with the Hampshire Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review), a matter that I have kept in mind throughout my conclusions and recommendations concerning the Objections to the SDDP. The Latest Proposed Change makes this clear. It also usefully refers to those documents that, at the time of writing, comprise the development plan for East Hampshire.

Recommendation

1.23 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (FPC3).

PARAGRAPH 1.13

Objections

First Deposit

1591/9017 Rowlands Castle Parish Council
1622/7588 English Nature

Second Deposit SD1.007

3820/11560 Dalton Warner Davis
511/11570 Headley Parish Council
1278/14474 CPRE (East Hampshire Branch)

Second Deposit SD1.008

511/11571 Headley Parish Council
910/14345 Headley Residents Association
1278/14475 CPRE (East Hampshire Branch)

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the number of proposed dwellings should be increased or decreased, and whether, in view of such considerations as the high quality natural environment, it has been demonstrated that the amount of development envisaged in the SDDP is justified;
- 2) Whether the statement that *the reserve housing sites will be released only if there is a compelling need* is consistent with the comment that *access to a decent home and a choice of housing are fundamental to the quality of life for people in East Hampshire*.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.24 I examine the first issue in my consideration of the actual proposals for residential development. This includes an examination of the omission sites that are put forward by those Objectors who consider that insufficient land is being allocated for housing.

*

1.25 On the second, related issue, I do not see any material conflict between the 2 statements. Matters to be taken into account in the release of a Reserve Site or sites would no doubt include the considerations to which **Dalton Warner Davis** refers. I see no reason for the Local Plan to state that these sites will be released subject to evidence of need during the plan period, because the usual practice of monitoring should include it, as paragraph SD5.063 makes clear. Other considerations are likely to include the results of urban housing capacity studies and the rate at which housing is being provided throughout the Structure Plan area and particularly on suitably located previously-developed land within its built-up parts.

Chapter 1 – Planning Background

- 1.26 National guidance in, for example, PPG 3 will continue to be an important consideration as will the County Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Structure Plan Policy H4. For these reasons, the last sentence of Paragraph SD1.007 should stay. I give detailed consideration of particular sites, including the Reserve Sites, in my examination of the objections to them.
- 1.27 Paragraphs SD1.007 and SD1.008 provide a useful explanation of the implications of the crucially important adopted Structure Plan in the allocation of land for housing in East Hampshire. The paragraphs also accord with national policy in PPG 3 concerning the approach of “plan, monitor and manage”. I endorse it.

Recommendation

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

SECOND DEPOSIT PARAGRAPH SD1.009

Objections

Second Deposit SD1.009

511/11572	Headley Parish Council
1645/13719	Mr N.D. Paren
1646/11928	Mrs M.A. Paren
1960/11937	Liss Village Design Group
1279/12453	Liss Parish Council
1639/12920	East Hampshire AONB Officer
68/14178	Environment Agency
3962/14222	The Petersfield Society
781/14231	Liss Conservation Volunteers
1278/14476	CPRE (East Hampshire Branch)

Pre-Inquiry Change PIC002.1

1279/15068	Liss Parish Council
3046/15122	Rotherlands Conservation Group
853/15190	Greatham Parish Council
1960/15220	Liss Village Design Group
733/15357	Liss Forest Residents Association
781/15350	Liss Conservation Volunteers
4233/15181	Mrs M Palmer
4233/15441	Mrs M Palmer

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at PIC002.1 and FPC1 (page 10).

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the SDDP suitably acknowledges the materiality of the designated National Park and the proposed National Park Authority;
- 2) Whether towns and parishes beyond the proposed South Downs National Park and without designation as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) would have sufficient protection from development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.29 The crucial consideration in my examination of these objections is that, at the time of writing, neither the principle of the National Park nor its boundaries have been confirmed. The South Downs National Park (Designation) Order was signed on 18 December 2002; it is the subject of a Public Inquiry and the Secretary of State will decide whether to confirm it, with or without modifications. Although less than 5% of the responses at the consultation stage opposed the setting up in principle of a National Park, 15 local authorities are affected by this Order and it is significant that 11 of them object to it. Seven of them object to the principle of a National Park or a National Park Authority and others object to the proposed boundary. In particular, the Council objects to the proposed

- boundary at Liphook and makes a technical objection to the principle of the National Park. These are good grounds for accepting the Council's point that it would be wrong for it or me to pre-judge the outcome by including policies in the Local Plan for the control of development in whichever area might be included within the Park, should it be established.
- 1.30 The Council is taking all reasonable steps in anticipation of the possible outcome. It estimates that it could be 2007 or 2008 before a National Park Authority (NPA) could be established. Its suggested timetable for the establishment of a National Park Authority is, on the evidence available, convincing and I accept it. The Council will publish, consult on and adopt interim planning guidance that would update the relevant development plan policies as soon as possible after any decision by the Secretary of State to confirm the Order. This interim planning guidance would not come far too late in the process, as **Councillor Mrs Palmer** maintains, because the materiality of the National Park and national policies for it would by then have substantially increased in importance.
- 1.31 This approach accords with the advice in PPG 1 paragraph 48 concerning the increasing weight to be attached to policies as they progress through statutory procedures. The Council expects that this interim planning guidance would remain in force until the setting up of a NPA. It might then be several years before that Authority could prepare and adopt a Park-wide Unitary Development Plan or Local Development Framework, during which time the East Hampshire District Local Plan Second Review, together with the interim guidance and national policies, would be the basis for development control.
- 1.32 The Designation Order together with the possibility of the establishment of a National Park and NPA is a material consideration, as the Council acknowledges. As the Guidance Note to the 15 authorities states, from now on it has to ensure that none of its planning documents or planning decisions will seriously prejudice the designated National Park and its purposes. Policies to protect the landscape of AONBs and National Parks are essentially the same. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 states *nationally designated areas comprising National Parks, the Broads, the New Forest Heritage Area and AONBs, have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas.* Thus the AONBs in East Hampshire will continue to enjoy this same status as the National Park that might follow them.
- 1.33 The now largely superseded Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 7 paragraph 4.2 refers to the Environment Act 1995 and explains that the twin purposes of the proposed NPA would be to:
- a) *conserve and enhance the Park's natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage, and*
 - b) *promote opportunities for public understanding and enjoyment of the Park's special qualities.*
- 1.34 Where it appears that there is a conflict between the 2 purposes, a NPA has a duty to give greater weight to the former. Additionally, NPAs have a statutory duty in pursuing their primary purposes to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of their local communities. There is no doubt in my mind that the Council would bear that duty in mind, where necessary, in the determination of planning applications.

- 1.35 The relatively early stage in the process at the time of my Inquiry and the doubts about the eventual decision mean that limited weight should be accorded to the Designation Order. Should the Designation Order be confirmed, however, the Council’s proposed interim planning guidance should be accorded considerable importance in the determination of planning applications for land, undefined at present, that would be included in the National Park. I agree with the Council that it would not therefore be appropriate to rely upon doubtful outcomes as the basis for reviewing the allocations and the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. For the same reasons of prematurity, the Council would be wrong to accept an immediate duty of having regard to national park purposes that guide NPAs. I note the Objectors’ enthusiasm for the National Park, but I consider that the Council’s approach is the more appropriate.
- 1.36 The SDDP does suitably acknowledge the possibility of the establishment of a National Park and its implications. My recommendation, based upon the Latest Proposed Change, should be a useful start for updating the position as it is at the time of writing.

*

- 1.37 On the second issue, it is expected that the Secretary of State will revoke the East Hampshire and Sussex Downs AONBs on the same day that the National Park came into existence. This is likely to leave small areas of de-designated AONBs outside the National Park. The Council states that these areas, as well as other mainly open areas outside the National Park, would be subject to the general countryside policies of the Local Plan. **Mrs Paren** says that *the parts outside the AONB are subject only to the general countryside policies*, but I do not agree that they should be so lightly dismissed. In my judgement and experience, these policies which have been based upon national policy in Planning Policy Guidance 7 for the safeguarding of the countryside for its own sake, are of considerable force.
- 1.38 That approach continues in PPS 7 that urges *the continued protection of the open countryside for the benefit of all*. The Guidance Note (Document CD13/6 SDNP Appendix 4) refers to the possibility of a “buffer strip” of protection for the National Park boundary, and I agree that proximity to the Park could be another reason to protect the area(s) concerned from development prejudicial to it.
- 1.39 I agree with the Council that the creation of a National Park and its Authority would not lead to a fundamental change in the spatial strategy of the SDDP. Subject to my recommendations elsewhere, this strategy is already based upon the high environmental quality of the whole District and the underlying principles of sustainability. Indeed, I recommend that less land be allocated for baseline housing in the AONBs than would be the case with the Council proposals. Planning policies for a National Park are much more likely to complement this strategy than conflict with it.

-0-

- 1.40 On another matter, the correct title of this proposed park is the South Downs National Park, as the **Environment Agency** states.

Recommendation

- 1.41 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the deletion of SD1.009, as amended by PIC002.1 and FPC1 and its replacement as follows:

At this stage in the preparation of the Local Plan, good progress has been made towards the decision by the Secretary of State on the Designation Order for the South Downs National Park. The Countryside Agency carried out wide informal public consultation in late 2001 and early 2002. Statutory consultations took place during the summer of 2002 with the relevant Councils. They were asked for their views about the proposed boundary, proposals for setting up and administering a National Park Authority (NPA) and the options for forward planning and development control. They were invited to comment on the Agency's proposed advice to the Secretary of State.

The Designation Order was signed on 18 December 2002. On 9 April 2003 it was announced that a Public Inquiry would be held to consider the objections and other representations made to it, as well as to the consequent Revocation Orders for the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Sussex Downs AONB. The Inquiry is due to close at the end of 2004. Objections have been made to the Order, mainly from the local authorities, and at this stage the outcome is unknown. This means that it may not be until 2007 or 2008 that final decisions can be made and a NPA established. These include those on any confirmation of the Order, the determination of boundaries of the Park and the establishment of a NPA. As progress is made towards the establishment of a National Park, however, so the materiality of the prospect for it will increase in importance.

The basis of planning policies for the National Park would include that which applies to AONBs. But these policies would have to take account of the statutory purposes of a National Park and the duties of a NPA, as laid down in the Environment Act 1995. Whilst the possibility of National Park designation is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, it can carry only limited weight at this stage in the Council's current planning functions. Should the Order be confirmed, however, the Council would immediately consult on, then as soon as possible adopt, interim planning guidance for the Park to augment the Local Plan's AONB policies. This guidance would apply National Park purposes to the designated area. In the meantime, the Council will not grant planning permission for any development that would prejudice the proposed National Park and its purposes.

In any event, the Council will be starting work on a Local Development Framework (LDF) in 2004/5. This must conform with a Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for South East England which, when approved, is expected to provide figures for the amount of housing and employment development for each local planning authority area. If the RSS identifies additional pressures for development in those parts of the District not within any established National Park, the LDF could review the Local Plan policies. Special emphasis could be given to policies to safeguard these other parts of the countryside for its own sake and to protect its landscape, character, appearance and any other relevant matters.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

PARAGRAPH 1.14

Objection

First Deposit

1379/9435 Holybourne Village Association

Main Issue

Whether the Local Plan will have sufficient credibility.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.42 There is no reason why it should fail on this count. The paragraph reasonably sets out its main functions, and I regard its provision of a detailed land use policy framework for the determination of planning applications as especially important. This should ensure consistency in decision-making. Nevertheless, material considerations of sufficient force can outweigh the provisions of a development plan. This conclusion accords with the Government's commitment to a plan-led system and the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38(6). This does not mean, of course, that everybody will agree with the Council's determination of every planning application.

Recommendation

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

HOW TO USE THE PLAN

PARAGRAPH 1.15

Objections

First Deposit

1666/9907 Councillor Mr D Clegg
1289/7942 Hampshire Wildlife Trust
1953/8113 Hawthorne Kamm Ltd
1666/9909 Councillor Mr D Clegg

Main Issues

- 1) Whether the Proposals Map should show the names of settlements;
- 2) Whether it should indicate designations, existing, proposed or candidate, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).
- 3) Whether Conservation Areas should be identified and a policy applied to them that allows for very small scale or frontage development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.44 As the Council agrees, Proposals Map 1 should be modified by including a list of those settlements for which Inset Maps have been prepared. This list should be placed in the grey area towards the bottom right hand (south-east) corner of the map, again as the Council intends.

*

1.45 On the second issue, these various designations are likely to be material considerations in the determination of planning applications for development that is judged to affect them. They should be clearly shown on the Proposals Map to provide useful guidance in the preparation and determination of applications for planning permission.

*

1.46 Similarly, Conservation Areas should be clearly indicated either on the District-wide Proposals Map and/or on the Inset Maps. The latter would be better, owing to their larger scale and hence better opportunity to identify particular sites. I deal later with policies for the control of development in Conservation Areas, but note here that the scale and siting of a proposal are not the only considerations in deciding upon its acceptability. A Policy along the lines sought would be too much of a hostage to fortune. The statutory requirement is that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that Area. Local Plan policies should reflect that requirement.

-0-

Chapter 1 – Planning Background

- 1.47 The Council accepts the thrust of these objections. I think that the best way forward is for me to ask its officers to bear these points in mind when they revise the Proposals Map in accordance with my recommended modifications.
- 1.48 I recommend later that open spaces subject to Policy R4 should be identified on the Proposals Map.

Recommendation

- 1.49 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the clear indication on the Proposals Map of the names of settlements, the above mentioned designated areas, of whichever status, as SSSIs, SPAs, SACs, and Conservation Areas.

PARAGRAPH 1.18

Objection

First Deposit

1926/9167 Squires Bridge Homes Ltd

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Document CD11/12 at FPC2 (page 11).

Main Issue

Whether all Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) should be the subject of public consultation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.50 Yes, it should. It should not, however, form part of the Local Plan. There is nothing that I can add to the advice in PPG 12 paragraphs 3.15 – 3.18 which should guide the Council in its deliberations. I have no doubt that the Council will take this advice into account as it prepares and revises SPG, following the procedure set out in PPS 12 paragraphs 5.22 – 5.24. I agree that consultation on any minor amendments to SPG would probably not be necessary, but I am concerned about the possible implications of not undertaking it on the basis of *unavoidable time pressures*. That appears to me to smack of expediency and I have serious doubts about it.

Recommendation

1.51 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (FPC2) apart from the deletion of *and unavoidable time pressures*.

PARAGRAPH 1.19

Objection

First Deposit

1660/9812 Voluntary Action for East Hampshire

Main Issue

Whether the SDDP is satisfactorily drafted in “every-day” English.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.52 I consider that the Council has done an excellent job in this respect. Jargon is frustrating and confusing. But sometimes the use of technical terms is unavoidable and the Council includes them where unavoidable. The Glossary at Appendix A is most useful. All I can do is to ask the Council to bear this comment in mind as it takes the Local Plan through the various stages to adoption, and to make the finished article as concise and readable as possible.
- 1.53 I note in SD6.101 that the 2 centres of Whitehill/Bordon have been combined and designated a town centre in order to allow for, and to encourage the provision of, much needed facilities. It is, however, a matter that I examine in Chapter 6 of my Report.

Recommendation

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

THE PROCESS AND LOCAL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

PARAGRAPH 1.20

Objection

First Deposit

1660/7687 Voluntary Action for East Hampshire

Main Issue

Whether the consultation process has been adequate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.55 I think it inevitable that some parties will call for yet more consultation, whatever has been done and whatever the statutory requirements. I am assured that the Council has complied with all the statutory formalities, and I do not doubt it. The large number of objections, and the representations in support of the SDDP, suggests to me that public consultation has been effective.

Recommendation

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

PARAGRAPH 1.25

Objection

First Deposit

1874/8044 House Builders Federation

Main Issue

Whether the Council has carried out sufficient formal negotiations between the First and Second Deposit Draft stages of the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.57 These comments have been overtaken by events in that the Local Plan at the time of writing has passed the inquiry stage. I have no reason to doubt that the Council has undertaken all reasonable negotiations with those parties that objected to the First Deposit Draft Plan (FDDP). The SDDP updates the local plan process in so far as this Local Plan is concerned. Further updating will be required, noting that an inquiry into objections has taken place and that the Council has had regard to my recommendations. Presumably there will be a signed Chairman's Introduction to the adopted Local Plan that will state the date of its adoption.

1.58 I deal with the Objector's comments concerning Policies GS1-4 in Chapter 2 of my Report.

Recommendation

1.59 I recommend that the SDDP be modified at Table PB1 and elsewhere as appropriate to update the stages in the preparation of the Local Plan.

PARAGRAPH 1.26

Objection

First Deposit

1660/9815 Voluntary Action for East Hampshire

Main Issue

Whether sufficient emphasis has been placed upon community development.

Inspector’s Conclusions and Recommendation

1.60 The main purpose of a Local Plan is to set out the local planning authority’s detailed policies and specific proposals for the development and use of land that will guide its day-to-day planning decisions. This is a matter that I have kept in mind throughout the preparation of this Report. I consider that the SDDP, modified as I recommend, will fulfil this purpose in so far as community development and all other relevant aspects are concerned.

Recommendation

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