

## Matter 8

Action 8.1 Reconsider the wording of policy S8 (countryside gaps) with reference to the suggested policy in the countryside gap background paper and para 7 of the Council's hearing statement.  
In addition, ensure wording recognises the gap is between all the relevant settlements.  
(Also a number of terms used in policy or supporting text for policy S8 need careful definition in the Glossary).

1. The Glossary includes definitions for Settlement gaps. It will be added in the Local Plan after Appendix C, MM122.
2. Policy S8 and supporting text are rewritten in modification MM27.

Action 8.2 Illustrative map should show all countryside gaps.

3. Figure 5 will be updated to reflect changes agreed during the hearing sessions and the changes proposed following the Settlement Gaps study, MM27.

Action 8.3 Policy S7 – reconsider “presumption against”.

4. The first paragraph in Policy S7 referring to the presumption against development is proposed to be deleted in MM26.

Action 8.4 Re-wording from “countryside gap” to “settlement gap” – ensure this is applied consistently in policy and supporting text.

5. Change made throughout the Local Plan.

Action 8.5 Botley Parish Council to provide maps for 3 areas they consider should be in countryside gaps (DM24 housing site Sovereign Drive; east of Brook Lane and east of site Bo1, Maddoxford Lane). Botley Parish Council to confirm this was raised in their ‘regulation 19’ representation (Summer 2018).  
EBC to consider further.

6. The Council appointed Deacon Design Ltd to evaluate the appropriateness of the gaps identified in the Local Plan, excluding gaps connected with the Strategic Growth Option. The land east of Sovereign Drive was only excluded previously from a gap designation as a result of permission for development being granted on appeal at a time when the Council had not met its 5-year land requirement. This permission has now lapsed and the area was considered afresh in the study. Following this assessment, it is proposed to be reinstated in the gap between Hedge End and Botley.
7. The Council has reconsidered the sites east of BO1 and Land east of Brook Lane. The Council does not consider that the site east of BO1 should be designated a gap as the

BO1 allocation does not create a risk of coalescence between Boorley Green and Curdridge, given the distance between the settlements and the woodland belt along the river valley. In addition, this site extends to the boundary with Winchester district and Winchester City Council have not designated a gap on their side of this boundary.

8. The Council's original settlement gaps study (ENV002) concluded that Land east of Brook Lane should be taken out of the gap as it is not required to maintain the separation of Hedge End and Botley and this is reflected in the submission Local Plan. There is no change in the Council's position.
9. The Council considers that these decisions are consistent with the methodology established in the Settlement Gaps Study which is in line with the PUSH criteria for the designation of gaps.