

**East Hampshire District Local Plan:
Joint Core Strategy**

INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

**Interim Statement and Infrastructure
Schedule**

October 2014

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose and Scope	2
2.0	Planning and Delivery	2
2.1	Partnership	2
2.11	Priorities	5
2.21	Funding	7
3.0	Evidence	8
3.1	Introduction	8
3.3	EHDC and SDNPA	8
3.15	Partners	12
3.21	Secondary Sources	13

Appendices

1	IDP Interim Statement – Schedule of Identified Requirements (as at October 2014)	
2	Whitehill & Bordon Eco-town Infrastructure and Delivery Plan	<i>To be added and updated prior to submission of CIL Charging Schedule</i>
3	Coverage of Parish Plans (as at July 2013)	

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Scope

- 1.1 An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared by East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), in conjunction with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), to set out the infrastructure requirements of East Hampshire over the period of the Local Plan to 2028. This Interim Statement and Infrastructure Schedule provided evidence for the Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy examination, not least in identifying how planned infrastructure can be deliverable in a timely fashion, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). East Hampshire District Council is, however, pursuing its own Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations document and the South Downs National Park its own Local Plan. It would therefore now seem opportune to split the infrastructure requirements of the two planning authorities. To ensure a comprehensive approach continues to be taken to any strategic measures, any items that are either cross-boundary or have an impact on either authority area will be referenced in both East Hampshire District Council's and the South Downs National Park's IDPs as relevant.
- 1.2 The NPPF requires East Hampshire District Council and the SDNPA, as the Local Planning Authorities, to set out in their Local Plan the strategic priorities for the area. Accordingly, the Joint Core Strategy includes strategic policies relating to the provision of a wide range of infrastructure, including telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk, health, community and culture. Policy CP32 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the key principles relating to the provision of infrastructure, in tandem with development-led growth, throughout the plan period.
- 1.3 The format and content of this Interim Statement reflects the advice of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and the Planning Advisory Service (PAS); the focus is on the critical infrastructure items required to deliver the Joint Core Strategy, and, as evidence, on 'quality over quantity' (PAS). The Statement provides a commentary on the attached schedule of infrastructure requirements (**Appendix 1**), as identified at October 2014 (and as updated from the version submitted to the Joint Core Examination in July 2013).
- 1.4 The contents of Appendix 1 will continue to evolve and be refined as more detailed site-specific work is undertaken by the District Council in preparing its Part 2 of the Local Plan: Allocations and by the SDNPA in its preparation of its own Local Plan documents.
- 1.5 This updated version of the schedule (as part of the IDP) will also provide the evidence required by the District Council and the SDNPA as they move towards adopting their respective proposals for the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), both in terms of demonstrating the 'funding gap' and in providing the basis for the 'Draft List' of infrastructure (and S106 strategy) as required by the CIL Regulations (as amended) and revised CLG CIL Guidance.

2.0 PLANNING AND DELIVERY

Partnership

- 2.1 The Local Plan process has provided the District Council and the SDNPA with the opportunity to plan positively for infrastructure to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF, including by working with other authorities and providers to assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands. Working collaboratively with other bodies is also important in order to ensure that strategic priorities across administrative boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in respective Local Plans and any sub-regional strategies.
- 2.2 The preparation of a formal IDP, if the document is to remain realistic and relevant throughout the plan period, is an iterative process and the IDP will need to be monitored and updated on a regular basis. The essential element will be the schedule of identified infrastructure requirements, and the evidence that underlies it. The version in **Appendix 1**, which sets out the position as at October 2014, comprises three distinct elements (the Eco-town is the fourth constituent part of the district), reflecting the relatively complex spatial arrangements within East Hampshire. These are described below, and illustrated on the attached plan.

South Downs National Park

- 2.3 The distinction between East Hampshire District Council and the SDNPA as two separate local planning authorities has previously been reflected within the schedule. The identification of infrastructure requirements within the National Park has been undertaken jointly, building on the substantial evidence base (see Section 3.0) underpinning the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy, and subsequently refined by work undertaken by the SDNPA since it came into effect on 1 April 2011, notably through a community-based approach. However, as the SDNPA is currently preparing its own Park-wide IDP in consultation with parish, district and county councils, and other stakeholders, and East Hampshire District Council is pursuing its own Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations document, it would seem opportune to now split the infrastructure requirements of the two planning authorities. To ensure a comprehensive approach remains to be taken to any strategic measures, any items that are either cross-boundary or have an impact on either authority area will be referenced in both East Hampshire District Council's and the South Downs National Park's IDPs as relevant.

Whitehill and Bordon Eco-town

- 2.4 The schedule does not set out the specific requirements of the proposed Eco-town at Whitehill and Bordon, where significant investment in infrastructure will be necessary to deliver 4,000 new dwellings, a new town centre, employment areas, green spaces and community facilities. The current intention is for the infrastructure to support this substantial 'free-standing' development to be delivered through a comprehensive package of S106 contributions and direct investment, without the need for CIL expenditure. There may, however, be certain circumstances where key strategic infrastructure requirements for this development are required outside the Strategic Allocation. The Council has commissioned consultants to prepare a stand-alone IDP for the Eco-town Strategic Allocation, and the updated report, along with any other

requirements identified, will be included in the next version of the IDP (prior to the submission of the CIL Charging Schedule) as **Appendix 2**.

Partnership for Urban South Hampshire

- 2.5 The three southern parishes of East Hampshire straddle the SDNPA boundary; to the north of the line is the National Park, whilst the area to the south lies within the coastal sub-region covered by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH). East Hampshire District Council is one of eleven authorities engaged in this collaborative partnership striving for sustainable economic growth. PUSH recognises that development plans of the respective local planning authorities will identify their own infrastructure needs, and that subsequent provision in South Hampshire will be funded by a range of public, private and third sector organisations.
- 2.6 Throughout 2013, PUSH reviewed its role in the light of changes to the planning landscape, in particular with the establishment of the Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP), with a revised focus on development and infrastructure. PUSH is currently working on a strategy to provide a framework to guide sustainable development and change to 2036. The intention is for PUSH to prepare a South Hampshire Infrastructure Plan to identify and cost the strategic infrastructure projects needed to deliver economic growth, new homes, improved quality of life and more sustainable communities. The principle of a sub-regional element of CIL is being considered by PUSH and work is underway to examine the merits.

Neighbourhoods

- 2.7 The Government has stressed that local planning authorities should work closely with neighbourhoods to decide what infrastructure they require, and that the wide definition of infrastructure gives communities flexibility to choose what they need to deliver the development plan. This approach has been strengthened by the Localism Act 2011, and it is one fully embraced by the District Council that has a strong record of engagement at the parish level.
- 2.8 This includes a positive long-term record of securing S106 funding in response to identified community-needs has been supplemented in recent years by the active engagement of the Community team and the introduction of Community Forums (covering all parish and town councils within four geographical areas – see attached plan) to filter and refine infrastructure priorities, often those emerging from a ‘grass-roots’ level. The Community Forums also provided a focus for consultation on the Council’s Leisure Built Facilities Strategy (see paragraph 3.7) in late 2011, and in early 2012 for briefings on the proposed transition from a S106 to a CIL funding regime, and on the implications of the Localism Act in terms of neighbourhood and infrastructure planning.
- 2.9 The SDPNA has succeeded in securing ‘Front-runner’ funding from CLG for a neighbourhood development plan in Petersfield, and engages directly with communities across the National Park through specialist community facilitators and neighbourhood planners.
- 2.10 The provision of infrastructure, be it through S106 or CIL (including through the ‘meaningful proportion’ set out in amended CIL Regulations), at the community level will be a key determinant in the sustainable development of East Hampshire **Priorities**

- 2.11 The inter-relationships described above are reflected in the attached schedule and plan; the table also distinguishes between the relative priority of identified infrastructure, as defined below.
- 2.12 'Critical' infrastructure is that essential to the delivery to the proposals and policies of the Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy, and without which sustainable development can not satisfactorily take place. Some of these requirements will be addressed through the investment programmes of utility and infrastructure providers and delivered directly, but otherwise will need to be met by developer contributions, be it S106 or CIL as appropriate.
- 2.13 'Priority' infrastructure is that required to meet a need in those neighbourhoods where development is planned or anticipated, but where it is not considered essential to the delivery of specific development. The infrastructure items listed in this category have been identified by the District Council in conjunction with local communities and in partnership with Hampshire County Council, and/or with, in many instances, evidence of need established by specialist reports commissioned by the District Council, County Council or PUSH (as described in Section 3.0). Funding would be secured (where justified) through site-specific developer contributions; otherwise these infrastructure schemes will be strong candidates to remain a priority for CIL expenditure, as the levy is introduced by the District Council.
- 2.14 The schedule in **Appendix 1** does not currently reveal the full extent of the required infrastructure (or of the subsequent 'funding gap'). Beyond the current list of infrastructure that the District Council regards as necessary to deliver the Local Plan policies, there are many other potential schemes important to the long-term sustainable development of East Hampshire. The remaining two categories comprise infrastructure schemes that are neither critical nor priority (as defined above) but that have been identified as important by or within communities, as follows:
- 'Community Plan' schemes are those that have secured formal ratification, through current community planning processes culminating in an 'endorsed' (ie. approved by the Council) parish plans. The preparation of such plans has been a long-standing priority of the District Council, and over thirty five of the forty or so parishes have either completed a parish plan or are in the process of doing so (as listed in **Appendix 3**). The adoption of infrastructure proposals through this route demonstrates that specific items (and often details on timing and costs) have wider community support. This definition will also apply in due course to any future adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. Implementation may be secured, in due course, through the spending of the particular community's 'meaningful contribution' CIL funds, provided at either the lower rate (15%), or the higher rate (25%) where a Neighbourhood Development Plan has been adopted.
 - 'Community Key' schemes are those that have been identified through other means, particularly through the work of the District Council's Community team and the Community Forums serviced by the Council.
- 2.15 As the District Council moves towards the introduction of a CIL regime, procedures will be put in place that ensure that the community continues to contribute to infrastructure planning. The District Council recognises, however, that not every parish and town

council will need or desire to prepare a parish plan (let alone a Neighbourhood Development Plan).

- 2.16 In such areas, as elsewhere, under current Council funding arrangements, infrastructure schemes identified at the neighbourhood level can be candidates for S106 funding. In the future, such projects will need to be prioritised by the District Council, through their respective Infrastructure Delivery Plans, for the purposes of spending CIL funds (via the refined Regulation 123 List) and/or seeking alternative means of funding. As required by the amended CIL Regulations and revised CIL Guidance, the two authorities will set out their 'Draft List' infrastructure priorities and S106 strategy at their respective CIL examinations.
- 2.17 The District Council recognises that there will be circumstances in those areas where parish plans have not been endorsed (or even prepared), that the community may be able to identify infrastructure that can contribute to the creation and maintenance of sustainable neighbourhoods, and have a realistic prospect of implementation should development occur in the vicinity. In these instances, in order to establish relative priorities within the IDP and 'Draft List', the District Council will use a criteria-based approach to assess such proposals and rank them as 'Community Plan' or 'Community Key' schemes on a consistent and transparent basis. The criteria cover a number of key issues, including:
- Value for money (including potential for match funding)
 - Future liability (management and maintenance implications)
 - Contribution towards the delivery of Local Plan policies and objectives
 - Contribution towards the delivery of sustainable development
 - Contribution towards the delivery of the Council's Community and Corporate Strategy.
- 2.18 This distinction also recognises that funding for Community Plan projects is more likely than for those categorised as Community Key, as they may be secured via developer contributions, either through site-specific S106 payments, or more likely (after the introduction of CIL), through the distribution of levy funds as resources and spending priorities allow. Community Key infrastructure, even as a valid reflection of needs or aspirations, will mostly be found within those neighbourhoods where development on any significant scale is not considered likely during the Local Plan period. In these circumstances, delivery through S106 contributions or CIL funding is not a realistic short or medium term prospect.
- 2.19 The District Council will include both categories of community schemes within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (to be submitted as CIL evidence) as they represent a legitimate articulation of community wishes, and on that basis they will form part of the overall infrastructure 'funding gap' required to justify the need for CIL, and on the 'Draft List' where considered appropriate. As part of the current work on the IDP, the District Council is reviewing the details of infrastructure requirements identified at the community level and such schemes have been omitted from the schedule within **Appendix 1**.
- 2.20 Finally, it should be noted that the emerging IDP does not deal with 'nationally significant infrastructure projects'. None have been identified within the District, and are not currently anticipated as required within the Local Plan period.

2.21 Funding

- 2.22 The attached infrastructure schedule sets out a cost for each item. In some cases the figures are relatively firm, reflecting detailed assessments as part of the work on the evidence base. In other instances, the numbers are more indicative, based on estimates informed by relevant studies or discussions with stake-holders. In all cases, the costs are included within the schedule on a non-prejudicial basis; they are presented here primarily to demonstrate that the evidence base is comprehensive and detailed.
- 2.23 In addition to illustrating how the provision of infrastructure supports the delivery of the proposed growth set out within the Local Plan, the finalised schedule (with community schemes added) will also confirm the existence and scale of the total infrastructure 'funding gap' - having taken account of other sources of available funding - that the District Council and the SDNPA (as respective charging authorities) intend CIL to contribute towards filling.
- 2.24 The District Council is consulting local communities and stakeholders in 2014 on its proposed rates for the levy in a Preliminary Draft of the CIL Charging Schedule. The IDP will form part of the published evidence, alongside the critical economic viability assessments, and an updated version will be prepared for submission with the Draft Charging Schedule in anticipation of the CIL examination. These processes provide an opportunity for the public and stakeholders to scrutinise the IDP and its schedule of prioritised infrastructure schemes.
- 2.25 The IDP evidence does not, in its current form, provide a clear steer as to how the authority intends to spend CIL. The Government recognises that priorities can change over time and these will need to be reflected in the Council's 'Draft List' (to be submitted to the CIL examination) and subsequent Regulation 123 list on adoption of CIL (currently anticipated for late 2014/early 2015).
- 2.26 The IDP will continue to evolve through 2014 and 2015 (and the District Council's introduction of CIL) and thereafter through the plan period. The SDNPA's CIL timetable (for the introduction of a CIL regime across the entire National Park) has yet to be finalised, and from the District Council's perspective, the schedule of infrastructure schemes to be submitted alongside its own Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule will need to reflect three important considerations:
- (i) Schemes within the National Park will be omitted to reflect the status of the SDNPA as both a local planning authority and a CIL charging authority; and
 - (ii) Schemes within the Whitehill and Bordon Eco-town will continue be omitted to reflect the current intention to fund the substantial and phased infrastructure requirements through a S106 regime.
 - (iii) Other schemes to be funded through S106 funding (both prior and post adoption of CIL) will be omitted; these will include site specific works provided through 'enabling development'.

(iv) As described above, those infrastructure schemes defined as Community Plan and Community Key will be added to the schedule.

2.27 In some instances, the required infrastructure (whether Critical, Priority, Community Plan or Community Key) will be delivered directly by providers, be they public bodies and agencies, utility companies (for example in relation to water, waste and drainage), or service providers (for example in relation to improved telecommunication and broadband networks). Such delivery takes place year-in, year-out, often unrelated to proposals for new built development. The IDP for East Hampshire will need to reflect the more significant of such schemes or programmes, although the required level of information (in terms of timing and investment) is not always readily available.

3.0 EVIDENCE

Introduction

- 3.1 It is essential that the IDP is based on sound and robust evidence. The schedule sets out those infrastructure schemes that have been identified through a variety of sources in recent years. In addition to internal studies and on-going discussions with infrastructure providers (including utility companies and the National Health Service), substantial evidence has been secured through the commissioning of bespoke reports and in collaborative engagement between the District Council and the SDNPA, and key partners in Hampshire County Council and PUSH. The key source documents have assisted in the identification of schemes as 'critical' or 'priority' within the infrastructure schedule, and are summarised briefly below.
- 3.2 In addition, as noted above, it is important for local planning authorities to work closely with local communities in the identification of required infrastructure, and the District Council has fully embraced this approach. The IDP and its revised schedule will reflect the priority afforded to schemes identified at the community level through the parish plan and Neighbourhood Development Plan processes.
- 3.3 The commentary below reflects updated information provided through consultation with partners during Autumn 2014.

EHDC and SDNPA

Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study

- 3.4 In 2008, East Hampshire District Council jointly commissioned with Winchester City Council a study of open space, sport and recreation facilities (in line with PPG17 guidance), with the specific objective of providing a comprehensive and robust evidence base for their respective development plans, including the parts of the district within the National Park. The study comprised four parts as set out below; each were written as 'stand alone' documents, although all were intended to be considered together.
- 3.5 Part 1: Main Report (prepared by Inspace Planning Limited) was published in October 2008, and set out the methodology and background information. Part 2: Area Profiles, published in June 2008, gives details in relation to the provision of open space and recreational facilities at the local level, by four sub areas, each of which was analysed using the (as then proposed) East Hampshire standards for open space, outlined in Part 1.
- 3.6 Part 3: Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) was also published in 2008. It had several stated objectives, including the provision of evidence to assist with funding bids and to allow providers to co-ordinate their priorities and investment programmes. The PPS forms an an over-arching assessment of need and supply for all types of open space, with the intention of providing a robust planning context for future proposals, and a strategy consistent with Sport England national policy and guidance and with PPG17.

- 3.7 Part 4: Built Sports Facilities Study was commissioned jointly by East Hampshire District Council and Winchester City Council, with the support of Sport England, in order to provide a comprehensive assessment of the current quality, quantity and access to recreational built facilities. The report by RQA Limited in June 2008 was based on information provided by sports clubs and agencies, the assessment identified future needs for facilities and sets out a strategic framework for future provision. The study considered leisure centres, sports halls, gymnasiums, tennis courts and bowling facilities and swimming pools.

Leisure Built Facilities Strategy 2012 - 2026

- 3.8 Building on the evidence base from 2008, and reflecting the increased national focus on improving health and reducing obesity (through London 2012 and Government initiatives), the District Council sought to develop a strategy for safeguarding and enhancing the provision of built leisure facilities throughout the whole district. A report prepared by RPT Consulting Limited (May 2012) deals with the assets owned by the Council and operated through a management contract: Alton Sports Centre, Taro Leisure Centre (Petersfield), and Mill Chase Leisure Centre (Bordon), together with the grant funded community schools (Bohunt School, Horndean Technology College, and Mill Chase Community Technology College) and other school provision throughout the district. Playing pitches and other community provision lie outside the scope of the strategy. The report has informed the Council's strategy, and, in turn, the IDP.

North East Area Study 2011

- 3.9 The study was commissioned to support the proposed Eco-town at Whitehill and Bordon, through an updated assessment of open space, sports and recreational needs undertaken in 2008. The study found that the area has a considerable amount of sport facilities under private ownership, particularly by the Ministry of Defence, and that the Eco-town Masterplan should include the retention or replacement of certain key sites in order to maintain a suitable level of formal sports provision. The study also used demand models to set out specific sports facilities requirements for the Eco-town.

East Hampshire Local Development Framework Transport Study (2011)

- 3.10 The study was commissioned to support the Joint Core Strategy. It built on earlier work carried out in 2008 and included use of the latest traffic growth estimates (DfT); updated housing allocation numbers; inclusion of arrival trips; improved estimates of ward distribution; changes to the number of homes proposed in each development cluster; and inclusion of employment and retail development locations. Assessment of Whitehill & Bordon was excluded as this is now the subject of separate work (although results from those studies were included).

Generally the impact of development proposals had a very small effect in terms of the changes to the capacity of the routes. The largest increases in traffic levels caused by development at Horndean are on the A3 and B2149. However, by 2026 the A3 would still remain under-capacity in 2026. Issues relating to the A325, already in excess of capacity by 2026, will be addressed through on-going work and studies on development at Whitehill & Bordon. Overall the strategy found that much of the proposed development could be implemented without significant impact. Where negative traffic impact was forecast as series of mitigation measures were available to negate this

impact. Further feasibility work, using more rigorous junction assessments, will need to be undertaken to substantiate the findings and help inform any measures required to manage and support the operation of the strategic road network junctions where development proposals are likely to have a significant impact.

Green Infrastructure Study for East Hampshire

- 3.10 The study report by UE Associates was published in August 2011, with the expressed intent of providing evidence to support the Joint Core Strategy. The aim of the study was to identify opportunities for strengthening the green infrastructure network and to mitigate any potential adverse effects that may be affecting the way in which the network functions. The study concentrated on the settlements identified in the Preferred Policies Core Strategy (November 2009), and drew on a range of secondary information. Consultees included stakeholder groups, environmental professionals, parish and town councils, and other local authorities. The authors suggested that the Council's Community Forums verify and ratify the proposals; 78 projects were recommended at the settlement level, and 17 at the district scale.
- 3.11 In 2013, to compliment this study, the District Council commissioned consultants Environment X to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011-28. This builds on the previous work by setting out ten district-wide strategic priorities for green infrastructure to match the broad strategy for growth.

Whitehill and Bordon Eco-town Masterplan (Revised May 2012)

- 3.12 The Council is one of the lead partners in the delivery of the proposed Eco-town, through the project's Delivery Board. The first Masterplan was published in June 2010 and was revised in May 2012 following the completion of the extensive community engagement and evidence base studies. The Masterplan is adopted by the Council and supported by all the project partners.
- 3.13 The establishment of the appropriate delivery vehicle is still at an early stage and will need to address a series of development challenges. It is envisaged that the Eco-town will require a delivery vehicle to structure private sector investment in a way that secures the necessary resources and development expertise to deliver the Masterplan.

Viability Assessment of Whitehill and Bordon Eco-town Masterplan

- 3.14 Assessment of the revised Masterplan was undertaken in June 2012 by property consultants GVA, building upon the knowledge and findings of previous development viability work. Development appraisals of emerging options for the Masterplan were completed by GVA in 2009, updated in July 2011, and further refreshed in June 2012 for the revised Masterplan adopted by the Council in May 2012. This assessment takes into account the entire evidence base prepared for the Masterplan, including the detailed Water Cycle Study, Energy Feasibility Study, Green Infrastructure Strategy, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Transport Studies.

Partners

Hampshire County Council – Strategic Infrastructure Statement

- 3.15 To support the planning of new development in Hampshire the County Council prepared a series of Hampshire Community Infrastructure Studies, the most recent of which was published in November 2009. These set out the best available evidence of the non-transport infrastructure required within the county to support the planned housing growth to 2026. Supplements were published in 2010 and 2011 setting out the investments identified in the County's Capital Programme. The purpose of those documents was to inform the production of the then South East Plan, and to assist Hampshire authorities and other stakeholders in planning for the delivery of infrastructure in their areas.
- 3.16 Since that time, the focus has shifted towards enabling a collaborative approach to infrastructure delivery, not least because the County Council has recognised that the introduction of CIL has emphasised the need for coordination between service providers and planning authorities, and the Localism Act 2011 introduced a new role for parish councils. The County Council has therefore worked with East Hampshire and all other local planning authorities in determining what infrastructure requirements need to be taken into account in their emerging development Plans and IDPs. The County Council has now published county-wide Strategic Infrastructure Statement (Version 1, February 2013) to set out what the infrastructure requirements are across Hampshire, to inform all stakeholders in considering suitable funding arrangements and potentially the coordination of investments across administrative district boundaries. The Statement is available at <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/infrastructure.htm>
- 3.17 Whilst the Statement focuses on the County Council's own services (education, transport, libraries, and so on), it is intended to be a first step towards agreeing a Joint Strategic Infrastructure Plan for Hampshire to cover all strategic needs, including emergency services, health, utilities and telecommunications, up to 2031. The County Council has also prepared a Memorandum of Understanding, approved by all Hampshire authorities in early 2013, setting out broad aims and principles for collaboration and cross-boundary working in respect of the planning, funding and delivery of infrastructure.

Hampshire County Council - District Transport Statements

- 3.18 In March 2012 the County Council published a draft District Transport Statement for East Hampshire, and each of the other Hampshire districts. The Statement sets out the County Council's transport objectives and sets out a district-wide transport policy framework, to prioritise transport investment and provide a basis for land-use and development planning. It is also intended to assist East Hampshire in its preparation of CIL and with its interim Transport Contributions Policy, adopted by the District Council from April 2012 until the adoption of a CIL charging regime. The County Council is also employing this transport evidence as a basis for priority setting in the progression of the LEP initiatives.

The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit

- 3.19 In order to develop an evidence base for cultural infrastructure planning in Hampshire, an audit of local authority owned, managed or supported cultural facilities was undertaken in early 2010. The original focus of the research was the area covered by

PUSH, but this was widened to cover the rest of the county through additional funding from Hampshire County Council. The study builds on the culture mapping project carried out by Audiences South in 2008, which located all the major cultural facilities in the South Hampshire area and was funded by the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA). It relates to the current physical state of buildings, access issues, capacity and broad usage patterns, and the comprehensive audit of cultural facilities, and presents a base line intended to support a dialogue between planners and cultural officers about provision in their area. Specific planning recommendations within the September 2010 report, however, only relate to the PUSH area.

PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy

- 3.20 In October 2006, the Government identified PUSH as one of twenty nine New Growth Points, with a requirement for its development being the production and adoption of a Green Infrastructure Strategy. Background evidence was collected by TEP consultants in 2007, and this informed a GI Strategy, prepared by UE Associates, and adopted by PUSH in 2010. This area of work is co-ordinated and delivered through the Sustainability and Community Infrastructure Development Panel, one of five PUSH delivery panels. The objective is to deliver “new and improved” GI to support the sustainable development of South Hampshire, by providing guidance and support to LPAs in the production of their development plans. A PUSH GI Implementation Framework was published in October 2011.

Secondary Sources

Southern Water - Final Water Resources Plan 2010-35

- 3.21 Southern Water provides wastewater services to a number of settlements across central and southern East Hampshire. Its Resources Plan (October 2009) states that investment in infrastructure to provide additional capacity will be required in parallel with new development. Recent improvement schemes have been undertaken in plant at Budds Farm (serving Horndean, Clanfield and Rowlands Castle), Petersfield and Liss. The company confirmed (June 2013) that no additional specific schemes have been identified at its wastewater treatment works, and that investment will be planned to meet demand from new development in parallel with it. The adopted Joint Core Strategy will inform this investment planning, with adoption providing the certainty to support proposals to Ofwat through the five yearly price review process. The next price review is in 2014, with Ofwat’s price determination funding the investment programme up to 2020 (another price review in 2019 will cover the investment period 2020-25).
- 3.22 Investment to the local sewerage infrastructure is funded differently to wastewater. Ofwat takes the view that enhancements required to the local infrastructure sewerage system as a result of new development should be paid for by the developer. Off-site infrastructure may be required if capacity of the system immediately adjacent to the site is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand. The precise investment required to provide new or improved local infrastructure can only be assessed on a site-by-site basis when proposed development sites come forward.
- 3.23 In summary, Southern Water confirmed (June 2013) that there was no fundamental reason why the level of development proposed within the Joint Core Strategy should not

be progressed unless “the Environment Agency identifies constraints in relation to water quality objectives.”

South East Water - Water Resources Management Plan 2010-40

- 3.24 South East Water is a ‘water only’ supply company (as opposed to a water and sewerage company) serving much of northern East Hampshire, as well as parts of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Berkshire. The company’s Water Resources Management Plan (June 2014) sets out how it plans to ensure appropriate security of water supply up to 2040, in the face of increased pressures from housing and population growth, climate change and environmental protection obligations. The Plan relates to different resource zones and aligns to five year ‘asset management plan’ (AMP) periods. On the demand side, the Plan entails significant reduction of individual consumption, whilst on the supply side, two impounding reservoirs are proposed, one in Kent and one in Sussex. Within East Hampshire (Resource Zones 4 and 5), ‘output enhancement’ is proposed post-2021 at Lasham, Greatham and East Meon (details are not included within Table 1).

East Hampshire, excluding an area south of Petersfield, lies within South East Water’s resource zones 4 and 5. Our WRMP indicates that, with planned reductions in demand from the customer metering programme and enhanced water efficiency, for the plan period these resource zones should remain in surplus for average demands. However, for peak demands a deficit is forecast from 2020 onwards, at which time additional schemes are scheduled to be delivered which will satisfy demand, in addition to regional transfers from neighbouring companies.

- 3.25 East Hampshire, excluding an area south of Petersfield, lies within South East Water’s resource zones 4 and 5. The WRMP indicates that, with planned reductions in demand from the customer metering programme and enhanced water efficiency, for the plan period these resource zones should remain in surplus for average demands. However, for peak demands a deficit is forecast from 2020 onwards, at which time additional schemes are scheduled to be delivered that will satisfy demand, in addition to regional transfers from neighbouring companies.
- 3.25 In May 2013, the company published its draft Water Resources Management Plan which advises that an additional 145 million litres of water will be needed by 2040. A number of major proposals are set out in the Plan, including the development of six transfer schemes to share water with Thames Water, Southern Water and Portsmouth Water (and other companies), although no specific schemes are identified in East Hampshire.

Portsmouth Water - Final Water Resources Management Plan 2010-35

- 3.26 Portsmouth Water provides water to 300,000 homes and businesses, including across part of southern East Hampshire. A new winter storage reservoir at Havant Thicket within the district has been identified as a feasible and sustainable option for meeting future water demand. While not included in the company Water Resources management Plan 2014, modelling work by the Water Resources in the South East (WRSE), which includes the Environment Agency, indicates that the reservoir could have a significant part to play in finding a long term solution to water resource shortfalls in South East England. The importance of this facility is recognised within the Joint Core Strategy (CP24: Water Resources/Water Quality) which seeks to safeguard the reservoir site from development. The timescale for the provision of the Havant Thicket Winter

Storage reservoir is uncertain and will depend on future regional forecasts of demand for water and the feasibility of other WRSE schemes. The timescales will be reviewed in 2020.

- 3.27 In 2014 Portsmouth water published its final Water Resource Management Plan, in line with the five year rolling programme and national guidance. It has not identified a supply demand deficit in the 25 year period to 2040, although reference is made to a new transfer pipeline to provide bulk supplies to South East Water. The new pipeline would run from Clanfield to Tilmore with a provisional construction date of 2039.
- 3.28 Thames Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for the majority of East Hampshire, and has recently (June 2014) advised the District Council on the possible implications of the proposed increase in housing growth as set out in the Joint Core Strategy. There are issues of capacity that will need to be resolved through the development process, and the advice can be summarised as follows;
- There is spare network capacity at Alton, although the exact location and scale of any upgrade can only be determined once certainty of development, location, size and phasing are known; Although significant sewage works upgrade may not be required, small improvements may be needed to accommodate an increase in load to the treatment.;
 - Appropriate phasing of development in the Liphook area will be vital to ensure upgrades are in place ahead of occupation, and further investigations should be carried out into the capacity of the sewers;
 - Upgrades to the network should be anticipated at Grayshott, Bentley, Four Marks/Medstead, and Whitehill and Bordon, and investigations will be required into the impact of development at Headley; and
 - In all cases, “developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new uses.”

National Health Service

- 3.29 Early work on infrastructure provision included liaison with the appropriate bodies within the National Health Service. The need for additional capacity to match population growth (for example at Alton, Petersfield, Whitehill and Bordon, and Horndean) was recognised, with delivery of expanded or new facilities related, in some instances, to specific developments or proposals. The intense level of internal NHS reorganisation since 2011 has not assisted clarification of long-term investment plans, and the District Council has continued discussions with the two clinical commissioning groups (CCG) established on 1 April 2013 ; the South Eastern Hampshire CCG and the North Hampshire CCG. Details will, where possible, be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Plan 1: IDP Interim Statement - Spatial Context

