

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**



**SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY**

**PUBLIC EXAMINATION  
HEARING SESSION 1  
7 SEPTEMBER 2010**

**STATEMENT 1**

- a Spatial Vision**
- b Sustainable Development**
- c Social Cohesion**

## **Core Strategy Justification**

### **a Spatial Vision**

#### **Question 1**

**Does the Havant Borough Core Strategy present a clear spatial vision for the borough, recognising its distinct qualities?**

#### **Overall Council Response**

1. The council believes that the Havant Borough Core Strategy (HBCS) presents a clear spatial vision for the borough that pays particular attention to recognising the distinct characteristics of the borough.
2. The borough is split into five distinct areas. For each area a succinct profile has been produced giving a general description, comments on the population, economy, other characteristics, challenges and opportunities and how the Core Strategy seeks to address them. These succinct overviews are easily accessible and lead into the overall vision. By their nature the area profiles do not go into great detail, much of which is covered in other council or locally produced documents which are signposted throughout the core strategy.
3. The creation of a vision that is succinct, easily readable and specific to the borough can be difficult and could lead to generic statements. This has been a criticism of some core strategies. The corporate vision (Havant Corporate Strategy SC09/33) headline of 'working towards a cleaner, safer, more prosperous borough' is very succinct although similar to some other councils. The vision in the Havant Local Strategic Partnership's sustainable community strategy 'Forward Together' (Core Document SD09/33) is confirmed in paragraph 1.37 of the submitted Core Strategy.
4. Care has been taken to bring together all these strands of local vision to produce a core strategy vision that builds on the characteristics of the five distinct areas of the borough to create a relatively succinct and borough specific vision on page 25 of the submitted Core Strategy. The vision sets out what the whole Core Strategy seeks to achieve, whilst the policies are the implementation tool for the vision.
5. Within the vision there are clear borough specific spatial statements, such as the Solent coastline (including Hayling Islands association with windsurfing), the impact of the Hindhead Tunnel, the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), adapting to climate change, the challenges of increasing skills levels, the benefits of the Public Service Village and the impact of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA). These references are specific and distinct to the borough. Most importantly, the objectives and policies that support the achievement of the vision demonstrate the spatial nature of the Core Strategy.
6. Objection has been raised that the vision could be 'anywhere' and it is lacking as a guide to 'place making', provides no guidance for the delivery of the vision, policies contradict the vision, the Core Strategy is too long and is not a management tool. That the area profiles lack detail on the MDA, development opportunities in Emsworth, the need to protect environmentally sensitive historic areas such as old Bedhampton and does not explain why Hayling Island is not suitable for a larger

share of housing and employment growth.

7. The council believes that it has produced a spatially relevant vision of what it is intended that the Core Strategy will help deliver as the future shape of the borough. The HBCS should be read as a whole and the merits of policies relative to each other balanced in terms of the merits of the particular case being assessed. The inclusion of the development management policies complement the strategic policies and provide the users of the plan, be it developers, development management officers or the local community clear guidance on how a planning application will be determined. The area profiles are not meant to replicate the detail found elsewhere in the plan but give a simple and accessible picture of the five areas.
8. A significant effort has been put into minimising length of the HBCS. Signposting of evidence and related documentation has been used extensively and whilst the HBCS exceeds the 50 page guideline it remains succinct. Brevity also has to be balanced against the objectors who want more and more detail regarding their own sphere of interest. A large number of respondents have made objections to promote their own development sites or object to development sites that they disagree with. These site specifics will largely be dealt with in the Development Delivery (Allocations) Plan. Strategic Sites were identified in terms of their strategic qualities not on an area basis.

## **b Sustainable Development**

### **Question 2**

**Is the Havant Borough Core Strategy (HBCS) broadly compliant with national policy? Will the HBCS deliver sustainable development?**

9. The council believes that the Havant Borough Core Strategy (HBCS) is broadly compliant with national policy and will deliver sustainable development. HBCS was written to comply with national policy in place prior to publication in March 2010. New planning policy statements have been published since the publication of the HBCS. The new policy statements are PPS1 Supplement: Planning for a Low Carbon Future - Consultation Document; a consultation PPS on Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment; PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment (23 March 2010); PPS25: March 2010 Review; PPS25 Supplement: Development and Coastal Change and PPS3: Housing (June 2010). An analysis of the impact of these new national policy statements is set out at Appendix 1 – PPS Update Implications.
10. Since the submission of the HBCS, the new coalition government has revoked the regional spatial strategy, the South East Plan (SEP). This change in government policy has some impact on the HBCS; however, an initial analysis of this is that the majority of the issues in the SEP are covered in existing national policy. The only areas where further policy may be required are in terms of the former SEP Policy C3 on the AONB and the determination of the right level of provision for gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites. These are issues that are dealt with in Session 3 (Statement 3) and later in this statement respectively.
11. The HBCS puts sustainable development at its heart. Extensive community involvement in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement has gone into the HBCS creation, with six separate community engagement periods

where the alternative development options have been discussed at great length. These events and their outcomes are detailed in the council's Statement of Consultation (SD06/06). The HBCS has been closely aligned with the work on the Havant Sustainable Community Strategy–Forward Together (SD09/30). The HBCS vision sets out what a sustainable borough will look like in 2026. All the policies of the HBCS must be seen as a whole and together they aim to ensure that all new development will be sustainable.

12. The HBCS will deliver sustainable communities because the borough is physically compact, there is good accessibility by car, bus, and rail into and out of the borough; good buses and walking within the borough, (albeit a need for some improvement to cycling); a good range and spread of existing facilities that have capacity. The policies of the HBCS work together for sustainability and the new development is locationally planned to maximise the effectiveness of this.

### **Questions 3**

#### **Does the HBCS address cross boundary issues, including transportation, effectively?**

13. Administrative boundaries mean little to how most people live their lives. Havant Borough Council (HBC) covers a defined administrative area and as a relatively small borough has recognised the benefits of partnership and cross boundary working in order to maximise the effective use of resources. The council takes a leading role in PUSH, leading the sustainable development work stream at chief executive and director level. The council has led the work on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and has been involved in all the various sub-regional evidence base studies e.g. Harbour Authority Transport Impact Study. For some time the council has been working with Winchester City Council on a joint approach to bringing forward the cross boundary development at West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA). We continue working with Chichester on the Shoreline Management Plan; whilst the Chichester Harbour AONB involves cross borough work. The most recent example of cross borough working is the current sharing of a Chief Executive with East Hampshire DC and a joint management team structure across both authorities to be operational in October 2010..
14. There are inevitably issues with increased joint/cross boundary working as different organisations have different timescales and programmes. As the HBCS is the most advanced core strategy in the area, the alignment of our work with Winchester, East Hampshire and Chichester councils remains an ongoing challenge. However, we have a sound relationship that will continue to develop positively to overcome areas of mutual concern.
15. Transport is a major area of cross boundary work. Hampshire County Council (HCC) is the Highway Authority, working with Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH). HBC has an agency agreement to deal with smaller planning applications but no strategic policy resource. The council started working with Portsmouth City Council in 2007 to develop a cross boundary transport evidence base. This quickly expanded to include Gosport, Fareham and Hampshire County Councils. The Highways Agency was also involved from the start. Gosport had the resource to lead the work and Peter Brett Associates were commissioned to produce the Transport Impact Evaluation (SD09/27) using the best transport data available. As the four planning authorities

were at different stages in the LDF process, with Gosport and Fareham having specific issues with the Strategic Development Area and HBC needing to produce a mitigation report for the HBCS (SD09/28) the formal partnership ceased. Nevertheless, HCC pulls everything together, ensuring consistency and sharing of evidence. HBC is directly involved with HCC/TfSH in developing the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) proposals and in data provision for the updating of the overall county traffic model. Therefore the objection by the Highways Agency that HBC is not directly involved in the latest evidence studies is not correct and HBC's intra and inter borough transport evidence remains sound.

#### **Question 4**

##### **Does the HBCS address issues of climate change satisfactorily?**

16. The borough's location on the south coast, in an area of water stress, in the area projected to be the most affected by the extremes of climate change in the UK Climate Impact Projections 2009 (UKCIP09 [http://www.ukcip.org.uk/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=254&Itemid=287](http://www.ukcip.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=254&Itemid=287) ) means that climate change has been a critical issue for the HBCS. We must adapt to these predicted climate changes as well as mitigating the impacts. The council takes its responsibility to climate change very seriously. Risk assessment and monitoring of National Indicator 188: Planning to adapt to climate change is ongoing and actions being taken including the council recently signing the Nottingham Declaration.
17. The importance of the HBCS in addressing climate change is corporately recognised; as such the council has led on the PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SD01/12). This has been an important tool in the HBLDF. The climate change maps that predict the flood zones in 2115 have been used as the basis for potential development decisions. No potential sites in the SHLAA have been identified in flood zone 2 or 3 in 2115. Flood erosion is also an issue and this has been part of the decision away from coastal location developments (together with the nature conservation constraints). Council officers have taken a lead at the PUSH level developing the sustainability policy framework: <http://www.push.gov.uk/work/sustainability-and-social-infrastructure.htm> . This work has been taken forward into the HBCS in Policy CS12, which seeks the application of the sustainable construction targets ahead of the national timeframe. The application of this policy position on construction methods and water reduction is justified because Havant is part of the Solent coastal plain, the area most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.

#### **c Social Cohesion**

#### **Question 5**

##### **Will the HBCS provide effectively for inclusive communities?**

18. Inclusive communities are fundamental to sustainable communities. As a spatial plan, the HBCS seeks to join up with the plans of agencies and organisations providing social and other services to all kinds of people and their communities. The Havant Local Strategic Partnership and the alignment of the HBCS with 'Forward Together' provide the mechanism to provide a more effective means of delivering inclusive communities. The HBCS is the product of extensive community

engagement, which has sought to include a wide range of people. It is recognised that many people have found it difficult to engage in strategic policy work and tend to only be concerned about their immediate area of interest.

19. The HBCS gives particular focus to the physical regeneration of the borough as a means of creating more inclusive communities. The social profile of the borough is one of contrasts; relatively wealthy areas and poorer areas, sometimes physically next to each other. Policy CS6 seeks the physical regeneration of key areas that will deliver greater inclusiveness, whilst CS7 identifies the local poor educational theme and older and vulnerable groups of local people who need support. Policies CS6 and CS7 must be seen in conjunction with CS10, which protects the environmental assets, CS8 and CS14 seeking safe and well designed environments and CS19 that can deliver supporting resources. The HBCS policies must be seen as a whole and as such social benefits and inclusiveness are effectively addressed. The HBCS has been the subject of an Equalities Impact Assessment, this shows that equalities have been addressed in the production of the HBCS.

### **Question 6**

**Will the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople be met satisfactorily, in accordance with government guidance?**

20. Current government guidance in relation to the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling Showpeople is contained within various pieces of legislation and guidance including:  
Section 225 Housing Act 2004  
Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites  
Circular 04/2007 Planning for Travelling Showpeople  
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2006  
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Travelling Show People Accommodation Assessment 2008.
21. More recently there have been several announcements by the Government on the changes that will be made to this guidance including the further guidance offered by Steve Quartermain the government's Chief Planner on 6 July (Core Document SD11/20a):  
**“14. How do we determine the level of provision for travellers' sites?**  
Local councils are best placed to assess the needs of travellers. The abolition of Regional Strategies means that local authorities will be responsible for determining the right level of site provision, reflecting local need and historic demand and for bringing forward land in DPDs. They should continue to do this in line with current policy. Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) have been undertaken by all local authorities and if local authorities decide to review the levels of provision these assessments will form a good starting point. However, local authorities are not bound by them. We will review relevant regulations and guidance on this matter in due course.”
22. Further to this there was a further announcement on the Communities website on 30 July that stated that they would be replacing Planning Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites with “New light touch guidance” whilst at the same time “encouraging local authorities to provide, in consultation with the local community, an appropriate number of traveller sites that reflect local and historic demand.”

(see <http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/travellers/>)

23. The Core Strategy makes reference to the provision of accommodation for gypsies and travellers in Policy CS9 Housing where it states under the list of criteria that sites for housing will have to comply with:  
“9 Ensure suitable provision and protection of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.”
24. Prior to the revocation of the South East Plan a single issue partial review was undertaken that dealt with the issue of provision of accommodation for gypsies and travellers and travelling show people. A public consultation took place in autumn 2008 by the then South East Regional Assembly (SEERA) on options for the allocation of new Gypsy and traveller accommodation. An Examination In Public was held in February 2010 and subsequently the Inspector’s report was due to be published around April 1 2010. This has yet to be published and there is a great deal of uncertainty as to whether it will ever be published. HBC will continue to work within a sub regional group in consultation and partnership with other local authorities surrounding the district in South Hampshire.
25. It should be noted that the options that were considered as part of the Partial Review of the South East Plan could have resulted in a maximum level of provision of 5 residential pitches, represented by Option D, although Option A allowed for 2 pitches and Option C allowed for 3 pitches.
26. It is proposed as part of the process of developing the Development Delivery (Allocations) Plan that a thorough consultation exercise is carried out with the travelling as well as the settled community to determine provision on a local basis in line with recent and emerging government guidance. This means of determining the level of provision will be inline with Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 concerned with Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Planning for Travelling Showpeople until such time as this guidance is superseded. As emerging guidance is pointing planning authorities towards GTAAs as a starting point it should be noted that the need for additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople is identified in the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2006) and the Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (2008) for the same area.
27. In the light of the changes and further proposed changes to come it is proposed that an additional criterion based policy dealing with the specific issue of the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people be included in the HBCS to ensure that the needs are properly met. This is also required as a result of the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East, The South East Plan which occurred on 6 July.