

## EHDC Comments on Reg 16 Version of Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Plan

Abbreviations used:

EHDC – East Hampshire District Council local planning authority

JCS – Joint Core Strategy adopted 2014

NP – Neighbourhood Plan

SINC – Site of Nature Conservation Importance

<b>Policy/ Section Reference</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
<p>At Reg 14 stage EHDC suggested that paragraphs, tables and maps should be numbered consistently throughout the document.</p> <p>Whilst this has been implemented to some extent, the supporting text to the various policies is in some places difficult to distinguish from the policy objectives as the text does not have paragraph numbers. The only section of the plan to include paragraph numbers is the introduction.</p>	<p>Suggest the supporting text is preceded by paragraph numbers to aid interpretation and application.</p> <p>Under Policy 1 in particular, it is assumed the policy objectives are the bullet points, but there are non-bulleted paragraphs between these – so do these form part of the objective or are they supporting text/commentary?</p>
<p>Vision and Objectives 7 objectives are expressed under this section, then under each policy there are a series of policy objectives. How do the policy objectives relate to the overall objectives for the NP?</p>	<p>Clarify the relationship of the Plans objectives with individual policy objectives.</p>
<p>Settlement Policy Boundary</p> <p>Map 15 differs to the adopted development plan policies map. Whilst there is no objection to the NP amending the settlement boundary to take account of recent developments etc. An explanation should be included as justification for making the changes.</p> <p>At present Map 15 differs and this could cause confusion when the NP is used in deciding planning applications.</p> <p>Also see comments below on Policy 6.</p>	<p>Clarify and justify the proposed changes to the settlement policy boundary.</p>

Policy/ Section Reference	Suggested Action
<p>Policy I Gaps Between Settlements.</p> <p>Policy C11 of the East Hampshire Local Plan second review 2006 which originally defined the gaps was deleted and a commitment made under Policy CP23 of the Joint Core Strategy adopted 2014 to define the boundaries in future local plans (para 7.33), this however, has not yet been actioned.</p> <p>Therefore the extent of the gaps shown under Policy CP23 on the online mapping system are those originally adopted but have not been reassessed as acknowledge under Policy CP23 para 7.33.</p>	<p>The response to our Reg 14 comments on this matter are noted however, we consider our comments on the extent of the gap are still valid.</p>
<p>Policy 3 Local Green Spaces and Protected Open Spaces <i>The wooded area along the western and eastern sides of Shipwrights Way/Staunton Way</i> – this is a designated SINCC and is therefore already protected under Policy CP21 JCS.</p> <p>Protected open space appears to cover a range of parcels of land, some of them very small and which most likely originated from the original planning permission for the developments and are unlikely to be considered suitable for development in the future. Some of these also have protected trees on them, which would also restrict any development potential.</p>	<p>Reconsider the parcels of land identified as Local Green Space and Protected Open Spaces.</p>
<p>Policy 6 – Over 55's Housing The policy refers to the settlement boundary as established by the East Hampshire Local Plan – Second Review 2006 – this is incorrect the most recent local plan which defines settlement boundaries is the Housing and Employment Allocations Local Plan adopted in 2016 - <a href="http://easthants.gov.uk">download (easthants.gov.uk)</a></p>	<p>Suggest reference is removed to the local plan, to simply refer to .....”the Rowlands Castle Settlement Policy Boundary as shown on Map 15....”</p> <p>See comments above on settlement policy boundary and the need to justify the changes proposed through the NP.</p>

Policy/ Section Reference	Suggested Action
<p>Policy 7 Rowlands Castle Village Centre</p> <p>The JCS identified Rowlands Castle as a small local service centre under the settlement hierarchy (para 4.11 of JCS).</p> <p>More specifically under policy CP8 of the JCS Rowlands Castle is not identified as falling into the categories of town centre; district centre or local centre.</p> <p>Therefore, at present there is no adopted defined centre boundary. The evidence listed for this Policy does not include an explanation as to how the extent of the village centre under Policy 7 has been defined.</p>	<p>Clarify how the village centre has been defined.</p>
<p>Policy 8 Parking</p> <p>Each policy appears to list a set of policy objectives, it is unclear if this is the case for parking?</p> <p>Reference to the Hampshire Local Transport Plan – LTP4 <a href="http://hants.gov.uk">Local Transport Plan   Hampshire County Council (hants.gov.uk)</a> is in progress and is quite different to earlier versions, with a shift away from planning for vehicles to planning for people and places.</p> <p>Also the local transport plan does not form part of the development plan as it is not a spatial planning document, so there is no compliance issue with regard to the basic conditions.</p> <p>Previous comments on the detail of the policy still stand – if the purpose of the policy is to retain existing parking provision within the village centre then the title could be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Clarify policy objectives</p> <p>Consider revising the title of the policy to refer to retention of existing parking within the village centre.</p> <p>If the policy is to only apply to the village centre then this needs to be referred to in the policy – suggested amendment :-</p> <p>Criterion 1 'Development proposing the change of use or loss of off-street parking <i>within the defined Village Centre (see Map 16)</i> will only be supported.....'</p>
<p>Policy 10 Community and Sports Facilities – this policy refers to the Recreation Ground which is also</p>	<p>Consider cross referring to Policy 3 to ensure the end user is aware of both.</p>

<b>Policy/ Section Reference</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
defined as Local Green Space under Policy 3.	
<p>Policy 11 – Walking, cycling and horse riding access</p> <p>See previous comments on Hants Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>Refer to maps 17 and 18?</p>	Refer to maps 17 and 18 in the Policy
Appendices – these should be separate documents – to include these would increase the length of the plan by another 100 plus pages from 59 pages without the appendices.	