
Eastleigh Borough Council

Examination of the Eastleigh Local Plan

Additional Matter and Issues for the Examination

Inspector: Christa Masters MA (Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Louise St John Howe PO Services, PO Box 10965,
Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 3BF
[Email: louise@poservices.co.uk](mailto:louise@poservices.co.uk)
Phone: 07789-486419

Where respondents answering the following questions identify a deficiency in the Plan they should make clear how it should be changed.

Matter 1 – Policy HA2: Mercury Marina and Riverside Camping and Caravan Park

Background

A hearing has already been held in connection with this policy which took place on 16 January 2020. At the hearing, it was established that the policy as currently worded is not justified or effective as the hotel element of the policy was not deliverable. This is a position which remains accepted by the Council. The Council subsequently requested that the policy is deleted from the plan. The Inspector's letter of 13 May 2020 (ED73) sets out in detail the reasons why modifications to the policy would be the most appropriate course of action.

General context questions

1. Paragraph 6.2.53 of the Plan outlines the most 'pressing issues' facing the Hamble. These include the potential to exploit the marine and aviation heritage of the area. In addition, in terms of the 'context and key issues' facing Hamble, paragraph 6.2.43 notes that boat building, repair and considerable sailing activity remain major influences in the local economy and a valued part of local heritage. Are these still correct? If these remain correct, how can the policy wording ensure that these 'pressing/key issues' are addressed?
2. As the Council have acknowledged that a hotel led allocation would not present a sound policy, the only other option presented to the examination in terms of modifications remains as set out in the representation by Marina Development Ltd (MDL). If an element of residential development on the site is not appropriate, what other mechanisms are there within the Plan to achieve the objectives of the policy?

Policy specific questions

The following questions have regard to the wording of policy HA2 as it appears in the Regulation 19 Consultation version of the plan.

3. In the first instance, the Council and landowner are requested to prepare a detailed statement of common ground (SOCG) which should set out clearly the areas of agreement and disagreement. This should also include agreed modifications to the policy which could potentially address the soundness issues with the existing policy wording.
4. The Council have raised specific concerns regarding the potential impact of the development on Badnam Copse SINC and that there are 'missed opportunities' to maximise the ecological benefits of the sites redevelopment. In what way would criteria (vi) and paragraph 6.2.58 fail to adequately address any ecology issues arising from the sites redevelopment? In responding to this question, the Council is requested to identify precisely whether modifications to the policy could address these concerns.
5. The Council have raised a number of highways and traffic generation concerns. As a result of these concerns, a statement from Hampshire County Council (HCC) as the highways authority is requested in relation to the implications of the policy as drafted in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan as well as a consideration of other uses in place of the hotel provision. This statement should

be informed by the SOCG requested at question 3 above. Accordingly, the Council is requested to liaise with HCC on the provision of this statement.

6. The policy as it appears in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan advised that development of the site would be subject to the approval of a development brief and masterplan for the site which would include, amongst other things:

- (ii) the site retains the marina and related uses including sail and canoe facilities;
- (iii) a public slipway to the River Hamble will be provided within the site for the use of the general public;
- (iv) the site retains and where feasible enhances the existing amount and mix of holiday accommodation within the site;
- (v) the northernmost shores of the site are restored for nature conservation purposes, commensurate with the proximity of national and international nature conservation designations;
- (vi) the Mound adjoining the site is retained and managed to maintain and enhance its nature conservation interest, including the possibility of public access.

To what extent are each of the above criteria justified, deliverable and effective?

7. In light of the representations from both the Hamble Sea Scout Group, the 31st Itchen North Amazon Sea Scout Group as well as the Royal Yachting Association, how would the long term protection and enhancement of this existing facility (criterion ii) as well as a public slipway for use of the general public (criterion iii) be achieved on the site? What effect would the deletion of these criteria and supporting text at paragraph 6.2.57 as suggested by the Council have on the long term provision of these facilities in the area?

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR