

The South East Plan – Proposed Changes  
 Schedule of Proposed Borough Council Responses

Number	Policy/paragraph	Summary of Proposed Change	Proposed Borough Council Response
1	Regional Policy H1 – Regional Housing Provision 2006 - 2026	Policy revised to refer to housing requirements as minimum figures without any phasing policies and with an apparent expectation that unspecified higher numbers should be planned for.	Object – This proposal would create uncertainty and conflicts with the principle of plan-led development. It would question the validity of sustainability appraisal of the Plan and would create difficulties for those planning the provision of infrastructure and services.
2	Regional Policy CC5 – Infrastructure and Implementation	Renumbered CC7. Reference to meeting current infrastructure needs is omitted and the conditionality of new development upon the availability of infrastructure is deleted. Additions note that the scale and pace of new development may be dependent on additional infrastructure capacity being made available. Establishes a proactive approach to the identification and programming of infrastructure needs.	Object – Reference to meeting current and future infrastructure needs should be retained in order to encourage efforts to address current deficits.
3	Regional Policy CC10b –	Policy relating to the identification of strategic gaps deleted as an additional unnecessary	Object – The identification of strategic gaps has been an important tool in shaping sub-

	Strategic Gaps	negative policy tool.	regional development, particularly in south Hampshire, and should be retained in those areas where green belt policy does not apply.
4	Regional Policy CC4 – Sustainable Design and Construction	Reference to exceeding Building Regulations standards for energy and water efficiency deleted on the basis that the Government has a national programme for addressing the issues. The supporting text is to be amended to refer to allowing lpas to identify site specific opportunities to exceed these standards where circumstances allow and where set out in development plan documents.	Object – The PUSH authorities have been seeking an accelerated and strengthened timetable for the introduction of measures to secure more environmentally sustainable construction and the changes to policy CC4 in addition to the changes to the south Hampshire policy SH14 will severely limit the opportunities to address these issues. There is, however, some compensation in the positive changes proposed to the supporting text.
5	Regional Policy CC8b – Regional Hubs	In the supporting text to Transport policy T9 Southampton Airport is identified as a regional hub in its own right. Regional Hubs policy renumbered Spatial Strategy policy SP2 and reference added to focussing new housing development and economic activity close to or accessible from hubs. New supporting text identifies hubs as the location of major employment and retail development and of new health, education and social infrastructure.	Object - The regional hubs are identified as locations for significant public transport interchange, but they are not necessarily suitable or sustainable locations for housing or commercial development. Southampton Airport, in the gap between Eastleigh and Southampton, is a wholly inappropriate location for significant development which would be contrary to the strategy for south Hampshire and would jeopardise the success of established centres.
6	Regional Policy CC8 – Green	New policy on the provision of green infrastructure requiring planning for multifunctional greenspace,	Support – the new policy is helpful in giving this issue more weight, particularly in the growth

	Infrastructure	particularly in the growth areas.	areas
7	Regional Policy RE2 – Employment and Land Provision	Renumbered RE3 and amended to strengthen references to joint employment land reviews, to amend the locational criteria for new employment land, to safeguard marine employment sites and support the proactive identification of new employment land.	Support – useful clarification and strengthening of employment land policies.
8	South Hampshire Introductory text - paragraphs 1.1 – 1.4	Replacement text to slim down to essentials, remove duplication with regionwide chapters, refer to South Hampshire’s New Growth Point status and clearly identify the challenges facing the sub-region. Specific reference to the importance of infrastructure is lost.	No comment
9	South Hampshire Core strategy - paragraphs 2.1 – 2.3	<p>Revised text omits reference to the strategy being based on ‘conditional managed growth’ and to the pace of development being conditional on infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Reference added on the need to start work on the SDAs prior to 2016 to ensure timely delivery.</p> <p>Addition of a new paragraph which recognises south Hampshire’s dense, complex and populous settlement pattern and states that local authorities may wish to designate local gaps which could be</p>	<p>Object – The concept of conditional managed growth is key to the PUSH approach to the growth of the sub-region and fundamental to the acceptability of significant new development.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>Support - But this is not an acceptable substitute for the deletion of policy SH3 (below)</p>

		tested through Development Plan Documents.	
10	South Hampshire Policy SH1: Overall Strategy	To be renamed 'Core Policy'. Deletion of the clause relating land releases for development to the rate of economic growth and to infrastructure provision. Note – region-wide policy picks up some of these concerns	Object – The concept of relating the pace of new development to the rate of economic growth and to the provision of infrastructure is fundamental to the PUSH vision. The proposed new reference in the supporting text (paragraphs 2.4 – 2.6 below) to development being 'coordinated' with infrastructure provision is weaker and is not a satisfactory substitute.
11	South Hampshire Policy SH2: SDAs	<p>Addition of a clause that development at the SDAs should not result in national air quality standards being breached and of a statement that assessment of the impact of the SDAs should have regard to their landscape impact.</p> <p>Addition of a requirement that open land surrounding the SDAs should be selected to respect the identity of existing settlements while ensuring that opportunities for sustainable access to services and facilities in the SDA and the adjacent urban areas are not prejudiced.</p> <p>Addition of suggestion that Ipas should work together to bring forward the SDAs by means of Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>	<p>No comment</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>No comment</p>

12	South Hampshire Paragraphs 2.4 – 2.6	<p>Deletion of original text describing the SDAs results in the loss of the dependency between the development of the SDAs and the rate of development on brownfield land and the rate of infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Replacement text lists ‘critical success factors’ for the SDAs that are fundamental to their delivery. For the N/NE Hedge End SDA these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attractive, high quality public transport connections to the main urban centres, particularly Southampton</li> <li>• maximise opportunities to improve services via Hedge End rail station</li> <li>• maximise accessibility to the station from within the SDA</li> <li>• careful balance between maintaining the identity of the existing settlements while ensuring that the opportunities for sustainable access to services and facilities in the SDA and the adjacent urban areas is not prejudiced</li> <li>• protection and enhancement of landscape quality will be particularly important in the north/north eastern parts of the area</li> <li>• close working, and possibly a joint Area Action Plan, between Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council</li> </ul>	<p>Object – The PUSH vision and strategy is based on releasing greenfield development sites only when brownfield development is insufficient to meet the strategic housing requirement and is conditional on the provision of adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>Support – The clarity of these requirements will be helpful in planning for the development.</p>
----	--------------------------------------	---	--

		<p>The new text seeks ‘coordination’ between the pace of housing development, transport management and infrastructure provision. A proposed implementation agency (policy SH4 below) will have a monitoring role on strategic allocations.</p> <p>Delivery by means of the Core Strategy and a Supplementary Planning Document rather than an Area Action Plan is suggested.</p>	<p>Object – This is an inadequate substitute for the formal link between development and the provision of infrastructure</p> <p>No comment, although this may not be the Council’s preferred approach.</p>
13	South Hampshire Policy SH3 - Sub-regional gaps - and paragraphs 2.7 – 2.10	Policy and supporting text referring to gaps in the sub-region are deleted. A new paragraph in the introductory text (paragraphs 2.1 – 2.3 above) suggests that the lpas may wish to designate local gaps that could be tested through Development Plan Documents.	Object – The strategic gaps concept is a well-established tool of planning policy in south Hampshire and is important at a strategic level in maintaining the separate identity of settlements in the sub-region. The PUSH Joint Committee has agreed a detailed response on this issue (appendix 6 to this report) and it is suggested that this be supported by the Council.
15	South Hampshire Policy SH5 - Plan Monitor Manage - and paragraphs 2.12 – 2.14	Deleted. Reference to the rate of release of land for new development being determined through the monitoring of a range of indicators is thereby lost.	Object - Deletion of the policy undermines the brownfield/urban regeneration and ‘cities first’ themes of the strategy and the link between economic growth and new development is lost.

16	South Hampshire Policy SH6 – Scale, Location and Type of Employment Development	<p>Renumbered SH3. Addition of a requirement that the Borough Council prepares a Core Strategy or Area Action Plan for a mixed use development of employment and other appropriate uses plus necessary transport interventions on the South Hampshire Strategic Employment Area.</p> <p>Transfer from Policy SH7 (deleted) the requirement that land in employment use should be safeguarded for that purpose. Promotion to the status of policy the statement in the supporting text about giving priority to the release of new sites which will contribute to GVA growth and/or urban regeneration.</p>	<p>Support – It is helpful that reference in the Plan to the Employment Zone (referred to as the employment area) is strengthened.</p> <p>Support</p>
17	South Hampshire Paragraphs 2.15 – 2.25	Redrafting of supporting text to reduce length and add new elements. These are: amplification of the importance of the South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone, the importance of promoting smart growth and skills enhancement, a mention that additional land, both on the waterfront and elsewhere, may be required to support the port of Southampton, plus a cross reference to the regionwide policies which safeguard sites important to the marine industry.	Support
18	South Hampshire Policy SH7 – Allocation of	Deletion of material which now duplicates a revised regionwide policy (RE3).	No comment

	Employment Sites		
19	South Hampshire Policy SH8 - Office Development	Policy deleted and replaced by a revised policy SH4 - Strategy for Main Town Centre Uses as tabled by PUSH at the EiP (with some minor redrafting by Government). In particular, it is stated that the SDAs should develop district centre (not full town centre) status, with office development fulfilling a wider employment role subject to the requirements of PPS6. Reference to a proactive approach to change in Eastleigh town centre replaces the proposal for an Area Action Plan.	Support
20	South Hampshire Paragraph 2.26	Replaced by the revised text submitted by PUSH to the EiP (with some minor redrafting by Government, particularly cross-referencing the hierarchy of centres to policy TC1 of the Plan). The paragraph sets out the clear intention to focus office, leisure and retail development in existing city and town centres.	Support. The text reflects the Borough Council's approach to office, leisure and retail development.
21	South Hampshire Policy SH9 – Skills - and paragraph 2.27	Deleted as not significantly different to regional policy RE3	No comment
22	South Hampshire Policy SH10 -	Renumber as SH7. Deletion of list of types of transport scheme which will be implemented - this	No comment

	Transport Strategy and SH11 - Transport Management	now appears in the supporting text. Addition of reference to the purpose of new schemes being to manage demand and provide additional transport capacity and to the creation of a transport delivery agency (from deleted policy SH11).	
23	South Hampshire Paragraphs 2.28 – 2.30	Replacement paragraphs add cross reference to the regional transport policies. Committed transport schemes are set out in an Appendix to the Transport chapter. Reference to addressing the infrastructure deficit is deleted. A long list of transport issues to be addressed, including the capacity of the strategic road network, access to the SDAs, access to Southampton Airport and access to town centres is added.	No comment
24	South Hampshire Policy SH12 – Scale and Location of Housing Development	Renumbered SH5. Deletion of phasing of housebuilding: totals for the 2006 – 2026 period only, with no separate figures for each 5 year period. Figures rounded to the nearest 10.	No comment – reasoning set out in the report
25	South Hampshire Paragraph 2.31	Deletion of reference to the types of properties to be built being informed by Housing Market Assessments. Addition of text to clarify those authorities in which no new greenfield housing development is expected (does not include Eastleigh) and that Habitats Regulations	No comment

		<p>Assessments should inform decisions on phasing and distribution.</p> <p>Comments are invited by the Government on the housing distribution proposed in the light of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p>	<p>The results of the SFRA do not identify any flood risk arising in relation to the number of dwellings proposed in Eastleigh.</p>
26	South Hampshire Policy SH14 - Environmental Sustainability	<p>Renumbered SH8. Deletion of all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the Ecohomes/BREEAM targets for residential and non-residential development (without any substitute reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes),</li> <li>* the encouragement of the use of recycled materials in construction,</li> <li>* the requirement for buildings to be energy efficient and to use 10% renewable energy,</li> <li>* and the sub-regional renewable energy generation target.</li> </ul> <p>Some of these issues are addressed in regional policy CC4.</p> <p>Addition of a requirement to ensure wastewater discharges into marine waters accord with the Habitats Directive constraints.</p> <p>Inclusion of a new proposal requiring decisions on waste water infrastructure to be based on environmental sustainability and cost. Also authorities to work with EA and water companies to ensure that discharges from waste water</p>	<p>Object. The deletion of these requirements from SH14 is a critical issue for PUSH. SH14 proposed an accelerated approach towards Zero Carbon Development compared with national policy, justified by the environmental sensitivity of south Hampshire and its greater exposure to the effects of climate change due to geography and its coastal location. The changes to the regional policy CC4 provide some compensation for these deletions but fail to satisfactorily address the PUSH objectives.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>The inclusion of this requirement is welcomed as it underpins the need to improve waste water treatment infrastructure that is critical to PUSH growth proposals and will be essential in mitigating the impact of growth on biodiversity.</p>

		treatment works are compliant with Habitats Directive constraints.	
27	South Hampshire Paragraphs 2.34 and 2.35	Supporting text to the former policy SH14 deleted and replaced by new paragraphs omitting requirements for good design and the protection of the environmental quality of the sub-region (reducing duplication) and adding requirements to work together on flood risk management, adequate water supplies, enhanced waste water treatment and green infrastructure requirements.	No comment

This page is intentionally left blank