

Havant Borough Council

Havant Borough Local Plan

Self assessment checklist for conformity with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

November 2012



Introduction

This document assesses Havant Borough's existing and emerging local plan policies in order to determine the degree to which they are compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The checklist was produced by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in order to help local planning authorities get up-to-date plans in place. The Borough Council has used the checklist for the following reasons:

- Assess adopted and emerging Local Plan policies against national policy set in the NPPF
- Identify policy gaps between the Local Plan and the NPPF
- Understand risks and start to plan to manage these risks

The following development plan documents are assessed:

- Local Plan (Core Strategy) adopted March 2011 and for ease of reference called the Core Strategy in this document
- Draft Local Plan (Allocations) published for Regulation 18 consultation on 9th November 2012 and for ease of reference called the Allocations Plan in this document

An initial self-assessment was made of the Core Strategy using the PAS checklist after the publication of the NPPF in March 2012. This identified actions for the preparation of the Allocations Plan to ensure that the Local Plan as a whole conformed with the NPPF. This document includes comments from the original assessment along with comments on the draft Allocations Plan.

As a result of the assessment it is concluded that there are no significant conflicts between the Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF.

This assessment is based on the full compatibility self-assessment checklist published by PAS in July 2012.

1A: A checklist covering the key elements of the NPPF

Achieving Sustainable Development

| The presumption in favour of sustainable development and Core Planning principles (paras 6-17) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| <i>Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).</i> | <i>Does the plan positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Ambitious development requirements are set out for housing (CS9), employment (CS2) and town centre uses (CS4).</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The Allocations Plan allocates the specific sites necessary to meet the development requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| <i>Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).</i> | <i>Does the plan meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, (subject to the caveats set out in para 14)?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy is considered to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change in circumstances. The Council has sought to prepare policies that balance the twin requirements of certainty and flexibility to acknowledge changing circumstances. For example, policy CS9 (2) deals with affordable housing provision. The supporting text identifies the circumstances under which it would be reviewed namely if further viability work identifies that a higher level of affordable housing could be sought. The policy also allows for flexibility which is likely to be necessary in a poor housing market.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u></p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u></p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | The introductory chapter of the Allocations Plan deals with flexibility and viability. It refers back to Core Strategy policies CS9 and CS21 which provide flexibility for planning applicants to negotiate the cost of developer contributions. | No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. |
| <i>Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).</i> | <i>Do you have a policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development? A model policy is provided on the Planning Portal in the Local Plans section, as a suggestion (but this isn't prescriptive)</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy is based on the principle of sustainable development but as it pre-dates the publication of the NPPF does not include the model policy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The draft Allocations Plan follows the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy AL1 is based on the model policy. The reasoned justification states that the Council is 'open for business' and that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the Allocations Plan.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Action arising to include model policy in Allocations Plan.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17) | Does the plan meet up-to-date, objectively assessed development needs based on evidence? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy is based on 6 key priorities set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy. A number of objectives have been derived from these priorities, which underpin plan-making and decision-making at HBC.</p> <p>The development requirements set out in the Core Strategy meet the development needs identified in the main evidence based studies namely the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (update published 2012), Employment Land Review (ELR) (update published 2012) and Town Centre, Retail and Leisure Study published in 2009.</p> <p>The Core Strategy was prepared in partnership with adjoining authorities particularly those authorities forming the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH). A number of key evidence based studies were produced sub-regionally such as the Strategic Flood</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Risk Assessment (SFRA). The preparation of the Core Strategy was also guided by a number of PUSH planning policy frameworks.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The Allocations Plan allocates the specific sites necessary to meet the development requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p> | <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17) | Does it make effective use of land and specifically promote mixed use development? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS17 on the concentration and distribution of development within the urban area requires the effective use of land and prioritises development on previously developed land. Policy CS4 encourages high quality, mixed-use development in designated centres.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The Allocations Plan prioritises the development of PDL sites within the urban area in line with the Core Strategy. However, in order to meet the development requirements it is necessary to allocate a number of greenfield urban extensions. Several mixed use sites are allocated across the Borough particularly in designated centres.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17) | Does it take account of wider geographic areas e.g. cross boundary and strategic issues? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy was prepared in partnership with adjoining authorities particularly those authorities in PUSH. A number of key evidence based studies were produced sub-regionally such as the SFRA. The preparation of the Core Strategy was also guided by a number of PUSH planning policy frameworks.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities both at the sub-regional level with PUSH and the local planning authorities in West Sussex has informed the preparation of the Allocations Plan.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

1B: Delivering sustainable development

| 1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| Set out a clear economic vision for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21) | How far does the plan articulate a clear economic vision for the area? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The vision set out in the Core Strategy is that Havant Borough will be a more prosperous place to live in 2026. It will seek to develop a dynamic, knowledge-based economy and raise the local skills base. The main objective for promoting the Borough's economy is to achieve GVA growth by 3.5% per annum. This is in line with the PUSH economy-led strategy to bring South Hampshire's economic performance in line with the south east regional average.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The Allocations Plan allocates the specific sites necessary to meet the employment development requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| Set out a clear economic vision for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21) | Are the policies flexible enough to accommodate requirements not anticipated in the plan and allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances? (21) | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS2 takes a flexible approach to the allocation and approval of land for employment. The reasoned justification also recognises that significant numbers of jobs are provided by use classes other than the traditional B uses.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> In order to promote flexible commercial use of the allocated sites the draft plan states that there will be no prescriptive use class designations. Instead, guidance on the suitability of potential uses will be set out for the</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | individual sites along with the approximate number of jobs that could be created. | |
| Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21) | In supporting economic development to what extent does it take into account the matters raised in paragraph 21 of the NPPF? <i>This includes local and inward investment; supporting existing business sectors and new / emerging sectors; clusters and networks of knowledge / creative/high technology industries; economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement; new working practices.</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS2 promotes and protects the existing business clusters of marine businesses and advanced manufacturing. Policy CS6 identifies areas in need of regeneration in the Borough. Policy CS2 encourages smart economic growth and policy CS18 allocates Havant Public Service Village as a strategic site where smart growth will be championed.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The draft plan allocates employment sites, but does not duplicate the strategic policy set out in the Core Strategy.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21) | <i>Is there an up to date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, to justify their long-term protection (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22)</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The 2010 ELR assessed the deliverability of all proposed and potential employment sites. The only employment site allocated in the Core Strategy is Dunsbury Hill Farm where detailed work has been done on the feasibility of the development.</p> <p>All employment sites that are fit for purpose are safeguarded in policies CS2 and DM3. Requirements for a robust marketing campaign are set out in DM2 for developers to demonstrate that the site is no longer fit for purpose.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> An update of the ELR was published with a base date of 2012 to provide up-to-date evidence on employment sites. All sites that were allocated in saved Local Plan policies were appraised and a number discarded for deliverability reasons.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

| 2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-27) | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23) | To what extent does the plan and its policies have regard to the criteria set out in paragraph 23 of the NPPF for the management and growth of town centres over the plan period? <i>This includes such matters as definition of networks and hierarchies; defining town centres; encouragement of residential development on appropriate sites; allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available; consideration of retail and leisure proposals which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres.</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS4 identifies the hierarchy of town, district and local centres. It sets a requirement for new retail floorspace, but does not allocate sites or review the boundaries of the centres. It encourages mixed use development in centres that retain active ground floor frontages.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL3 proposes boundaries and primary shopping areas for the hierarchy of centres identified in the Core Strategy. This policy builds on an informal consultation document published in December 2011 'What do you want from your town, district and local centres?' A number of mixed use sites are also allocated in town centres such as Market Parade and East Street.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23) | <i>Have you undertaken an assessment of the need to expand your town centre, considering the needs of town centre uses?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Town Centre, Retail and Leisure Study prepared by NLP for the Borough Council assesses the need for town centre uses. This provided the evidence for policy CS4, which sets out the need for new retail floorspace.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL3 proposes new boundaries for the identified centres to accommodate the retail requirements.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| Allocate a range of suitable | <i>Have you identified primary and</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> | <u>Core Strategy</u> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23)</p> | <p><i>secondary shopping frontages?</i></p> | <p>Policy CS3 establishes the hierarchy of centres but does not identify revised boundaries or frontages.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL3 identifies primary and secondary frontages and sets out new policy requirements for their development that reflect the changing nature of our town centres and how we use them. A commentary is set out in each of the five areas of the borough that explains the role and function of the individual town, district and local centres and proposed changes to the boundaries and primary shopping area.</p> | <p>Action arising to identify revised frontages in the Allocations Plan.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>Assess the impact of retail and leisure and office proposals (26)</p> | <p>Has it assessed the impact of the policy on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area?</p> <p><i>This is an assessment for planning applications</i></p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> This is primarily a matter for planning applications. A local threshold is not set for impact assessments.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> This is primarily a matter for planning applications. A local threshold is not set for impact assessments.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

| 3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28) | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to new development. Planning strategies should maintain a prosperous rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28) | <i>Do your policies align with the objectives of para 28? These include policies to support sustainable growth of rural businesses; promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. Development outside the urban area boundary is addressed in policy CS17.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. In addition to Policy CS17 and CS11.9 development in undeveloped gaps between settlements is addressed in policy AL2.</p> | n/a |

| 4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29) | <i>Have you worked with adjoining authorities and transport providers on the provision of viable infrastructure?</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Havant forms part of Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH), which undertakes strategic transport planning across South Hampshire. The TfSH strategy of 'reduce, manage and invest' is embedded in policy CS20 of the Core Strategy.' | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. |
| Balance the transport system in favour of | This is necessary to support sustainable economic growth with particular regard to the facilities referred to in paragraph | The Borough Council along with Fareham, Gosport, | |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion by supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.(30)</p> | <p>31 of the NPPF.</p> <p>To what extent do the policies consider the matters set out in paragraph 32 of the NPPF. <i>These include opportunities for sustainable transport modes; safe and suitable access; cost-effective improvements to the transport network.</i></p> <p>Does it have any policies which plan for ports, airports or airfields which are not subject to a separate national policy statement in accordance with the considerations set out in paragraph 33 of the NPPF?</p> | <p>Portsmouth, Hampshire councils and the Highways Agency (HA) commissioned Peter Brett Associates to assess the impact of development on the strategic road network. This also informed the formulation of policy CS20.</p> <p>There are no ports, airports or airfields in Havant Borough. Bedhampton Wharf is safeguarded under the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> TfSH commissioned the Sub-Regional Transport Model (SRTM) to test different development scenarios. All the housing and employment sites in the draft Allocations Plan were tested against the SRTM and no major new congestion impacts were identified on either the strategic or local road networks.</p> | <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p> | <p>To what extent do policies ensure that developments are located where the need to travel will be minimised and use of sustainable transport modes maximised - taking into account policies set out elsewhere in the NPPF, <i>particularly in rural areas</i>. (34)</p> <p>To what extent does the strategy</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS20 requires development to be consistent with and contribute to the implementation of the 'reduce, manage and invest' strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Minimising the need to travel and maximizing the use of sustainable transport modes were key criteria in the process of selecting sites for the Allocations Plan.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | <p>protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods and people? To what extent are developments located taking into account the criteria set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF?</p> <p><i>These include the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and access to high quality public transport; safe and secure layouts; facilities for ultra-low emission vehicles; consider the needs of disabled people.</i></p> | | |
| <p>To what extent do the policies aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities? (37)</p> | <p>To what extent do the policies aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities? (37)</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS4 encourages high quality, mixed use development in designated centres. People who live in town centres tend to use the town centre uses on their doorstep and can access sustainable travel modes.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> There are a number of mixed use allocations particularly in the town centres.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |
| <p>To what extent do the policies aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities? (37)</p> | <p>In relation to larger scale residential developments in particular, to what extent do the policies promote a mix of uses to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site? (38)</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The largest residential development allocated in the Core Strategy is the West of Waterlooville MDA. This sets a development requirement of 25 to 40% of people who live in the MDA or within 1.5 km of its boundary to work within this area and not commute out to work.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> There are a number of mixed use allocations particularly in the town centres.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| To what extent do the policies aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities? (37) | <i>If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) (The cancellation of PPG13 removes the maximum standards for major non-residential development set out in Annex D. PPS4 allowed for non-residential standards to be set locally with Annex D being the default position. There is no longer a requirement to set non-residential parking standards as a maximum but that does not preclude lpas from doing so if justified by local circumstances).</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Non-residential parking standards are set out in policy DM14 and appendix 5 of the Core Strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Issue dealt with in Core Strategy. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. |
| To what extent do the policies aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities? (37) | Does the plan identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice? (41) | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy DM15 safeguards transport infrastructure that will be identified in the Allocations Plan. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL5 safeguards the cross-borough bus rapid transport route and the Havant Thicket Reservoir Pipeline route. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. |

5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|---|---|---|
| Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications' masts | To what extent has a ban been imposed on new telecommunications' development in certain areas or restrictions place? (44) | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS2 promotes advances in information and communications technologies. <u>Allocations Plan</u> | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| and high speed broadband (43) Aim to keep the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and the sites to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used, unless the need for a new site has been justified. Where new sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where possible.(43) | Do policies identify the need for communications infrastructure not to cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest? (44) Does it have policies to ensure that the construction of new buildings or other structures do not cause interference with broadcast and telecommunications services? (44) | No reference to communications infrastructure. | No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
|--|--|--|--|

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|--|---|--|
| Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of <i>5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land (47).</i> | <i>What is your record of housing delivery?</i> <i>Have you identified:</i> a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites; <i>b) an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period), or</i> <i>c) If there has been a record of persistent under delivery have you identified a buffer of 20%</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 sets out a housing requirement of 6,300 new homes to be completed in the Borough between 2006 and 2026. Table 6.1 sets out the potential supply with a base date of 2009. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Table 1 sets out how the housing requirement will be met in the five areas of the Borough with a base date of 2012. <u>Annual Monitoring Report</u> | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <i>(moved forward from later in the plan period)? [Para 47].</i> | <p>The Borough's record on housing delivery is recorded in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The 2012 AMR due to be published in December includes an up-to-date housing trajectory. This shows that there have been 1,422 new homes completed 2006-2012, which is less than the requirement for 1,890 new homes over this six year period. However, housing delivery has been reduced across the country due to the recession.</p> <p>a) There is a five year supply of specific deliverable sites with a number of large sites under construction such as the West of Waterlooville MDA, Hampshire Farm and Purbrook Park.</p> <p>b) An additional buffer of at least 5% has been identified for deliverable sites</p> <p>c) As there has not been a record of persistent under delivery it has not been considered necessary to identify a further buffer of 20%. When issues have been identified with housing supply the Council has responded positively and pro-actively. In the recent past this has included supporting the release of Hampshire Farm, which is a reserve housing site allocated under saved Local Plan policy.</p> | |
| | <i>Does this element of housing supply include windfall sites; if so, to what extent is there 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48)?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The issue of windfall was not addressed in the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> There is no allowance for windfall in the first five years of the housing trajectory.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 | Does the plan identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for: a) years 6-10; b) | <p><u>Annual Monitoring Report</u> The 2012 AMR will set out a supply of developable housing sites for years 6 to 15.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| and, where possible, years 11-15 (47). | years 11-15 (47)? | | strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47). | <i>Does supply for years 6-10 include windfall sites; if so, to what extent is there "compelling evidence" to justify their inclusion (48)?</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> The issue of windfall was not addressed in the Core Strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> An allowance is made for windfall for the last seven years of the plan period. Robust and transparent evidence justifies this source of supply is set out in a background paper Windfall/Unidentified Housing Development: Analysis and Justification. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained (47). | Is there an up-to-date housing trajectory that illustrates progress with delivering the strategy in the plan (47)? | <u>Annual Monitoring Report</u> An up-to-date housing trajectory will be set out in the 2012 AMR that illustrates progress on delivering the housing requirement set out in policy CS9 of the Core Strategy. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained (47). | Is there a housing implementation strategy describing how delivery of a five year supply of housing will be maintained to meet the housing target (47)? | <u>Housing Implementation Strategy</u> A housing implementation strategy is set out in the 2012 SHLAA. It explains how the five year supply demonstrated in the housing trajectory will be delivered in the five areas of the Borough. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; | <i>To what extent does the removal of national and regional brownfield targets have an</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 requires housing development to be delivered in a phased manner with an appropriate | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained (47). | <i>impact on housing land supply?</i> | <p>proportion of previously developed land (PDL) so as to avoid unnecessary development on greenfield urban extension sites. The plan notes that the 60% national target is unlikely to be met in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Brownfield sites were prioritized in the selection of sites in the Allocations Plan. A number of greenfield urban extension sites are included in order to meet the housing requirement in line with the Core Strategy.</p> | <p>strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47). | Does the plan include policies on density of development To what extent do these reflect local circumstances? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 requires development to achieve a suitable density taking into account accessibility to public transport and proximity to employment, shops and services. The reasoned justification sets out minimum density thresholds as a guide, but states that density requirements should not be prescriptive.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Indicative housing numbers are set out for the sites allocated for housing in the draft plan. These take into account local circumstances, for example, Land South of Lower Road (UE30) is considered suitable for low density housing and the former Scottish and Southern Electricity offices (L145) are considered suitable for high density development.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand (para 159) | <p>To what extent have you planned for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as families with children, the elderly and people with disabilities?)</p> <p>To what extent have you identified the size, type, tenure</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 requires housing proposals to provide a mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures which help to meet identified local housing need and contribute to the development of mixed and sustainable communities. A target of 450 extra care dwellings is set in order to meet the needs of the ageing population.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Development requirements have been set out for all the allocated sites. In some cases the type and size of</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | and range of housing required in particular locations, reflecting local demand (50)? | housing is specified, for example, flatted development is considered suitable at Market Parade (H10). | strategy |
| Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand (para 159) | <p><i>Does the plan include policies requiring affordable housing? Do these need to be reviewed in the light of removal of the national minimum threshold? Is your evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs (50)?</i></p> <p>Do these require on-site provision or if off-site provision or financial contributions are sought, to what extent can these be robustly justified and to what extent do they contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities (50)?</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 sets out the a affordable housing requirements. The Havant Viability Assessment produced by DTZ for the Council suggests that a 30% affordable housing requirement across the Borough is achievable. The Housing SPD published shortly after the adoption of the Core Strategy provides further evidence to support the affordable housing requirement and information on how CS9 will be implemented.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The affordable housing requirements set out in policy CS9 will apply to all the housing sites in the Allocations Plan. Viability is addressed in the introduction of the plan and states that the Council will be flexible in negotiating the cost of developer contributions when viability is an issue.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54). | <i>Have you considered whether your plan needs a policy which allows some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. Development outside the urban area boundary is addressed in policy CS17.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. Development in undeveloped gaps between settlements is addressed in policy AL2.</p> | n/a |
| | <i>Have you considered the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens? (This is discretionary)(para 53)</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS9 does not specifically address the issue of garden land development. However, policy CS16 on high quality design provides a policy framework for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens. | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u></p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <u>Allocations Plan</u> The sites allocated for housing do not include any inappropriate garden development. | No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. | <i>Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55 (note, previous requirement about requiring economic use first has gone).</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. Development outside the urban area boundary is addressed in policy CS17. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Havant Borough does not include rural areas. Development in undeveloped gaps between settlements is addressed in policy AL2. | n/a |

7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|--|--|--|
| Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58). | Does the plan include a policy or policies that reflect this objective? To what extent do design policies encompass the principles at paragraph 58 of the NPPF? | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS16 is a strategic policy on high quality design. The Borough Design Guide SPD published shortly after the adoption of the Core Strategy supplements CS16 and sets out the Council's design expectations with regard to new development. <u>Allocations Plan</u> All the development on sites allocated in this plan will need to be designed to a high standard and comply with policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |

8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your |
|--|---|---|---|
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | overall strategy? |
|---|--|--|--|
| Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69). | Does the plan include a policy or policies on inclusive communities? To what extent do these promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity; safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas (69)? | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS7 deals with community support and inclusion and focuses particularly on the young and the old. Policy CS8 deals with community safety and requires it to be engrained into the development process from the beginning. Policy CS4 promotes high quality mixed use development in designated centres. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Access to services and community safety were key criteria in the process of selecting sites for the Allocations Plan. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| <i>Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).</i> | <i>Does the plan include a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local services? To what extent do policies plan positively for the provision and integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS1 is a strategic policy on health and wellbeing that deals with community facilities and local services. Policy CS21 on development requirements includes social infrastructure for which the council can seek on-site provision or financial contribution. Policy DM2 is a detailed development management policy that protects existing community facilities and shops. <u>Allocations Plan</u> The Allocations Plan includes a number of mixed use | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | <i>the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure?</i> | sites that include community provision such as Former Oak Park School (H69). | No effect on overall strategy |
| Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73). | To what extent do policies identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area (74)? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS1 address the Borough's needs and surplus of open space. The policy protects open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area, allows the creation of new spaces. This policy is informed by the Open Space and PPG17 Assessment, 2006, which undertook a quantitative and qualitative assessment. An up-date was carried out, as part of the Allocations Plan.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> This is covered in the Core Strategy.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73). | Does the plan include locally derived standards for provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS19 and CS21 ensure that provision is made for open space, sports and recreational facilities. The plan does not include locally derived standards for provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities. The Havant Borough Open Spaces Plan, 2006 and Draft Havant Borough Developer Contributions SPD, 2011 include local standards. These are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> The plan does not include locally derived standards for provision of open space, sports and recreational</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | facilities. The Havant Borough Open Spaces Plan, 2006 and Draft Havant Borough Developer Contributions SPD, 2011 include local standards. These are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. | |
| Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73). | To what extent do policies protect and enhance rights of way and access (75)? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS1 supports increased footpath and cycle use particularly along stream corridors and along the coast. Cycleways and rights of way are identified as a type of green infrastructure in policy CS13. This policy seeks to manage and improve local and regional green infrastructure networks.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Rights of way run adjacent to and / or across a number of site allocated in this draft plan. This is addressed in the development requirements for the relevant sites.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| <i>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’ (76-78).</i> | <i>Do you have a policy which would enable the protection of Local Green Spaces and manage any development within it in a manner consistent with policy for Green Belts? (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77).</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy pre-dates the publication of the NPPF and so does not include a policy on local green spaces.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL8 allocates six local green spaces across the Borough. The questionnaire published as part of the consultation on the draft plan asks people to propose additional local green spaces.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Action arising for Allocations Plan</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver | Questions to help understand whether your local plan | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|

| its objectives | includes what NPPF expects | | Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances (82)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy (83).</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)</p> | <p>If you are including Green Belt policies in your plan, do they accurately reflect the NPPF policy? For example:</p> <p>Lpas should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. <i>Beneficial uses are listed in para 81.</i> PPG2 set out that 'Green Belts have a positive role to play in fulfilling objectives. Para 1.6 of PPG2 set out the objectives – some of these have been rephrased/ amended and 'to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses' has been omitted.</p> <p>Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development (85).</p> <p>Does it allow for the extension or alteration of a <i>building</i>, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building? (89). <i>PPG2 previously referred to dwelling. Original building is defined in the Glossary.</i></p> <p>Does it allow for the replacement</p> | <p>There is no green belt land in Havant Borough.</p> | <p>n/a</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>of a <i>building</i>, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces? (89) PPG2 did not have a separate bullet point – replacement related to dwellings rather than buildings.</p> <p><i>Does it allow for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development? (89)</i> (PPG2 referred to ‘major existing developed sites’)</p> <p>Change from ‘Park and Ride’ in PPG2 to <i>local transport infrastructure</i> and the inclusion of ‘<i>development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order</i>’ in relation to other forms of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. (90).</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| 10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108) | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
| <i>Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations (94).</i> | <i>Have you planned new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS17 concentrates all new development within the five urban areas of the Borough and policy CS20 requires development to implement the 'reduce, manage and invest' transport and access strategy. This two pronged approach seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by building in sustainable locations.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Minimising the need to travel and maximising the use of sustainable transport modes were key criteria in the process of selecting sites for the Allocations Plan.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| <i>Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations (94).</i> | <p><i>When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, have you done so in a way that is consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards? (95)</i></p> <p><i>Does your plan actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings?</i></p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS14 requires all new homes to achieve level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and all non-residential buildings to achieve BREEAM 'very good.' A more challenging stepped approach based on the PUSH Policy Framework on sustainable construction was deleted by the Inspector.</p> <p>The Council supports energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings, but there is no specific Local Plan policy addressing the issue.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> All development on sites allocated in this draft plan will need to comply with policy CS14.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Help increase the use and | <i>Do you have a positive strategy</i> | <u>Core Strategy</u> | <u>Core Strategy</u> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| supply of renewable and low carbon energy (97) | <p><i>to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources?</i></p> <p><i>Have you considered identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17)</i></p> <p>Does it identify where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers (97)?</p> | <p>Policy CS14 encourages development to contribute to the PUSH target of 100MW of renewable energy by 2020. Sites are not identified but major development of 250 homes or 5,000 m2 of non-residential floorspace are required to produce on-site renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> All development on sites allocated in this draft plan above the threshold set in policy CS14 will need to produce on-site renewable energy</p> | <p>No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99) | <p>Does the plan allocate, and where necessary re-locate, development away from flood risk areas (100)?</p> <p>Was the location of development informed by flood risk assessment and sequential test?</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS15 states that development in areas at risk of flooding now as defined by the Environment Agency flood risk maps and in the future as defined by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will only be permitted when they have passes the sequential and exception tests.</p> <p>The PUSH SFRA is the main evidence based study on flooding for the Borough and has informed the selection of sites throughout the local plan process.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> A sequential approach has been taken throughout the allocation process to the selection of sites. The primary area of search has been flood zone 1. However, a small number of sites in flood zones 2 and 3 that are within the urban area and are considered critical to the</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | regeneration of the Borough are allocated in the draft plan. The final allocation of these sites will be subject to exception and sequential tests. There are also a number of sites which include a small area at risk of flooding. This is addressed in the development requirements set out for each site. | |
| Manage risk from coastal change (106) | <p>Does the plan identify where the coast is likely to experience physical changes and identify Coastal Change Management Areas?</p> <p>Is it clear what development will be allowed in such areas?</p> <p>Does it make provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be re-located from such areas? (106)</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy pre-dates the requirement for Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA). Policy DM9 deals with the coastal zone.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy AL4 identifies two CCMA's at West Hayling and Hayling Beachfront. Residential development will not be permitted in these areas. Other forms of development will only be permitted when supported by a coastal change vulnerability assessment that demonstrates that the development will not result in increased risk to life or significant increase in risk to property. The areas identified as Coastal Change Management Area are free from development and infrastructure and therefore the re-provision is not necessary.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Action arising for the Allocations Plan</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|--|---|---|
| Protect valued landscapes (109) | Does the plan contain a strategy to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure? | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS11 protects and where possible enhances the Borough's statutory and non-statutory designated landscape, habitats and features of biological, hydrological or geological interest. Policy CS13 deals with green infrastructure.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | <u>Allocations Plan</u> All development on sites allocated in this draft plan will need to comply with policy CS11 and CS13 as appropriate. | <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Protect valued landscapes (109) | Does it minimize the loss of higher quality agricultural land? | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS11 protects the best and most versatile agricultural land that has the greatest potential for local food security. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land was a key criterion in the process of selecting sites for the Allocations Plan. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Protect valued landscapes (109) | Does it give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, the Broads and AONBs? | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS12 seeks to conserve and enhance the Chichester Harbour AONB. <u>Allocations Plan</u> All development on sites allocated in this draft plan will need to comply with policy CS12 as appropriate. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109) | Does it ensure development is appropriate for its location having regard to the effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, taking account of the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution? Are sites suitable for the proposed use taking account of ground conditions, pollution from previous uses and any proposals for land remediation? | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy DM10 deals with pollution and sets out criteria that need to be met before permission is granted for a development that result in pollutants. <u>Allocations Plan</u> Minimising risk from pollution was a key criterion in the process of selecting sites for the Allocations Plan. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Does it identify areas of tranquility and protect them from noise? (109) | | |
| Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117) | <i>If you have identified Nature Improvement Areas, have you considered specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these areas (para 117)?</i> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> The Core Strategy pre-dates the introduction of Nature Improvement Areas.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> Local authorities are working in partnership with the Local Nature Partnership (LNP) to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity. The LNP has not identified any Nature Improvement Areas in Havant and therefore a policy is not necessary.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Action arising for the Allocations Plan</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |
| Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117). | Does the plan identify and map local ecological networks? Does it include policies to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species? Does it prevent harm to geological conservation interests? (117) | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> A lot of work has been at a sub-regional level by PUSH on mapping green infrastructure networks. This sub-regional approach is carried through to policy CS13 on green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> All development on sites allocated in this draft plan will need to comply with policy CS13 as appropriate.</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Action arising for the Allocations Plan</p> <p><u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy</p> |

12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|---|---|--|
| Include a positive strategy the conservation and enjoyment of the historic | Does the plan identify heritage assets (buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS11 is a strategic policy that protects and where appropriate enhances the Borough's statutory and non-</p> | <p><u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall</p> |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126) | landscapes)? Does it identify heritage assets most at risk? | statutory heritage designations. These are not shown on the Proposals Map. There are no specific development management policies on built heritage but comprehensive lists of hyperlinks are set out so that heritage assets can be identified. Policy CS12 identifies Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). <u>Allocations Plan</u> Policy DM21 deals with buildings of local interest. | strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |
| Include a positive strategy the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126) | Does it promote new development in ways that will make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness? (126) | <u>Core Strategy</u> Policy CS16 requires all development in the Borough to be designed to a high standard. The Borough Design Guide SPD published shortly after the adoption of the Core Strategy supplements CS16. It sets out the council's design expectations with regard to new development and helps to identify and define the distinctive character and qualities of the Borough that should be respectfully improved and enhanced through development. <u>Allocations Plan</u> All the development on sites allocated in this plan will need to be designed to a high standard and comply with policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide. | <u>Core Strategy</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy. <u>Allocations Plan</u> No significant differences. No effect on overall strategy |

13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)

| What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives | Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects | Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations? | How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy? |
|--|---|---|--|
| It is important that there is a | <i>Does the plan have policies for the selection of</i> | Havant Borough Council is not | n/a |

Havant Borough Local Plan and the NPPF: Self Assessment

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142).</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146)</p> | <p><i>sites for future peat extraction? (143) (NPPF removes the requirement to have a criteria based policy as peat extraction is not supported nationally over the longer term).</i></p> <p>To what extent does the plan take into account the matters raised in relation to paragraph 143 and 145 of the NPPF. <i>This includes matters in relation to land in national / international designations; landbanks; the defining of Minerals Safeguarding Areas; wider matters relating to safeguarding; approaches if non-mineral development is necessary within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; the setting of environmental criteria; development of noise limits; reclamation of land; plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates.</i></p> <p>To what extent have you co-operated with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals to ensure adequate provision is made to support their likely use in industrial and manufacturing processes? (146)</p> <p>In order to facilitate the sustainable use of energy minerals to what extent do your policies take into account the matters raised in paragraph 147 of the NPPF?</p> | <p>the minerals and waste authority.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|