

Eastleigh Borough Council

Local Plan 2016 – 2036

Main Modifications Consultation 2021



July 2021

Page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Context	2
1.2	Local Plan Review	2
2	Conclusions	3

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

1.1.1 This submission is provided by Gladman in response to the Proposed Main Modifications to the Eastleigh Local Plan 2016-2036. This submission is made following all previous representations and Gladman's previous involvement in the Local Plan Examination in Public (EiP).

1.1.2 By way of context, an outcome of an examination could be that an Inspector finds that a plan is unsound as submitted, but that it is possible to make it sound and legally compliant by making main modifications to it. In these circumstances the Inspector must recommend the necessary main modifications, if requested to do so by the local planning authority. The main modifications must relate directly to the reasons why the Inspector has found the plan unsound.

1.1.3 As set out in in the National Planning Policy Framework, to be sound a Local Plan must be:

- **Positively Prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with National Policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

1.1.4 Having reviewed the proposed modifications, our comments relate solely to the requirement to undertake an early review of the Local Plan.

1.2 Local Plan Review

1.2.1 Gladman welcome the requirement for the Local Plan to be subject to an early review.

-
- 1.2.2 However, as this is only referenced within supporting text of Policies SS2 and SS3 in paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 respectively, given this requirement is necessary to make the plan sound it should be sufficiently binding and included within policy text.
- 1.2.3 Deletion of the Strategic Growth Option means that there will be a significant shortfall at the end of the plan period, a shortfall that should rightly be addressed through an early review of the Local Plan but as Gladman set out at the hearing sessions there is a wider housing need also currently not being addressed, namely unmet needs arising out of Southampton. Over 18 months have now passed since the initial hearings of the Local Plan and the PfSH (Partnership for South Hampshire) authorities are still no nearer a resolution to tackling the unmet needs of the wider PfSH area. Gladman contend that the early review should therefore commence immediately so that work is not delayed in seeking to plan for homes for people in real need right now.
- 1.2.4 More importantly it is vital that the commitment to review the plan is inserted into policy wording with binding timescales so that time does not slip in progression of dealing with housing need. Gladman refer to our Matter 14 hearing statement in relation to this issue. There are a number of instances where local authorities who have included a commitment to commence an early review have not met the proposed timescales yet there has been no consequence. Failing to make sure the issue on housing delivery is addressed in a timely manner does not represent positive plan making.

2 CONCLUSIONS

- 2.1.1 Gladman welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed main modifications and hope this response is found to be constructive.