



Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

EASTLEIGH
BOROUGH COUNCIL



Local Plan consultation response form - Additional Consultation on site allocations May-June 2019

Name

Age

Address

Postcode

Email

Organisation

Policy/paragraph number you are commenting on:

(please provide a separate response for each policy you wish to comment on)

Please note that this consultation is limited to site allocations not publicised in the previous consultation in June-August 2018 (see site notices for policy numbers and site names).

Do you support or object to this policy / paragraph:

Support **OBJECT** Neutral

Please provide a summary of any comments:

CPRE Hampshire would like to express our concerns over the inclusion of Pembers Hill Farm in the Eastleigh Local Plan and the premature granting of permission for this site in January 2017. This permission pre-dated any opportunity for comments on the Local Plan and was therefore premature since the Plan had not at that date been subject to independent scrutiny by an Inspector during an Examination in Public.

Please see our letter of January 2017 which refers to this point (letter is attached). But in summary it said *“We believe that a decision on this site at this stage is premature and would prejudice any objective assessment of the strategic options that are being considered as part of the Local Plan process.*

An approval at Pembers Hill Farm would essentially give implicit acceptance by EBC that Options B and C are the chosen strategy and would therefore pre-empt any possibility for interested parties to comment and challenge these options through the examination in public. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. With the Local Plan process still underway, approving Pembers Hill may be contrary to this principle and to the NPPF inter alia; evaluating all available options, empowering local people, encouraging the use of brownfield land, conserving heritage assets and promoting sustainable transport.”

Since permission was granted the Court of Justice of European Union has issued judgment on Cooperation Mobilisation for the Environment v Verenigin Leefmilieu (Dutch Nitrogen). If Pembers Hill Farm had been considered after the Local Plan process - as it should have been, it would have needed to prove that the site’s nitrogen neutrality, which is important in view of its location adjacent to headwaters of local watercourses.

Please provide any further comments and/or suggested wording changes to support your answer:

The problem is that Permission has now been granted, but theoretically the Pembers Hill Farm site should be deleted from the Local Plan and the process should be followed in a proper and legal fashion. The site should demonstrate its nitrogen neutrality.

Overall assessment of the Local Plan

Shortly after this consultation the additional comments on these sites will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate. The appointed Inspector will need to ensure that the Plan complies with all the necessary legal requirements before conducting a test for soundness. We would like to know your views on whether you believe the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound. You may answer as many of the following questions as you wish.

Legal compliance and soundness

Do you consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant?

<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	unsure
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	--------

Do you consider the Local Plan to be sound?

<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	unsure
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	--------

Please provide further details to support your answers. Please try to ensure that your response is as precise as possible and includes reference to any specific policies, paragraphs and/or documents that your comments relate to. Please also include any changes that you believe would make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why.

Policy DM24 (25) should never have been included in the Local Plan as it already had permission so legally could not be commented on, challenged or examined under the Local Plan process. Its inclusion is contrary to the Statement of Community Involvement as no consultation was actually possible on this site. This makes its inclusion unsound. The same is probably true of all the sites listed under Policy DM24, but the impact of Pembers Hill Farm on the Strategic Growth Options makes it more important. The site should be nitrogen neutral.

If your representation is seeking a modification to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes, I want to take part at the oral examination

If you wish to participate at the oral examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

It is better to discuss in person to evaluate the issues surrounding the impact of permitting this particular site on the Councils choices for the Strategic Growth Option (or lack of them).

Letter from CPRE Hampshire dated January 2017 in response to Planning Application O/15/77190 - text only:

Eastleigh Borough Councillors
Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Local Area Committee

20th January 2017

Dear Councillors,

Outline Application for 250 Dwellings at Pembers Hill Farm, Mortimers Lane, SO50 7EA
Ref. O/15/77190

Please find below the comments of CPRE Hampshire on the Outline Application for 250 Dwellings at Pembers Hill Farm. We believe that a decision on this site at this stage is premature and would prejudice any objective assessment of the strategic options that are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. An approval at Pembers Hill Farm would essentially give implicit acceptance by EBC that Options B and C are the chosen strategy, and would therefore pre-empt any possibility for interested parties to comment and challenge these options through the examination in public. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. With the Local Plan process still underway, approving Pembers Hill may be contrary to this principle and to the NPPF inter alia; evaluating all available options, empowering local people, encouraging the use of brownfield land, conserving heritage assets and promoting sustainable transport.

Crucially the NPPF states that a Local Plan must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence. After appraising all the documents, CPRE concludes that EBC have not updated their housing needs to take account of the newest projections available from DCLG, and are not therefore in accordance with current government guidance. The input numbers to the PUSH SHMA of June 2016 have also now been superseded.

Specifically, the latest available figures from DCLG released in July 2016 show that Eastleigh had 54,650 dwellings in its stock supply and 54,365 households. This is a surplus of 285 dwellings over households. Now this does not mean that everyone has the right size, tenure or price of dwelling, but it does show that there is no evidence of a substantial shortfall in supply.

Looking forward to 2036, DCLG has projected that Eastleigh will have 60,120 households, which is 5,755 more than currently, and would equate to a requirement of some 274 dwellings per annum (dpa). However, EBC are working with a number considerably higher than this figure, and even accounting for an uplift for affordability, this would appear excessive. It is important to note that the methodology for assessing the full OAN in the Boorley Green Inquiry (APP/W1715/W/15/3130073) was agreed with a starting point of 523 dpa from the 2012-based household projections, and that this was not significantly altered by the 2014 population projections. However, this number has now been superseded (and decreased) by the data released in July 2016.

One further argument is that Eastleigh needs to take 2,000 dwellings from Southampton over the plan period, but again the DCLG figures show that Southampton will have 4,000 fewer households by 2036 than had been predicted at the time of the PUSH report. Predictions are always guaranteed to be wrong, but projections to date have always over-estimated household formation, and there is recent expert opinion (Oxford Economics January 2017) that across the UK there are 1.2 million fewer households today than were anticipated in 2008, even accounting for a period of considerable migration.

Government guidelines state that the OAN housing numbers must be based on the most up-to-date housing projections. If an unrealistic estimate is chosen as an input figure to the OAN it explains why EBC are finding that the 5-year land supply is unachievable and under constant challenge.

For your information, CPRE has evaluated the alternative strategic options in terms of their impact on the countryside. This process has confirmed that Options B and C are the most damaging to the finest landscape in the Borough, and the least acceptable in environmental terms, leading to an unnecessary new road across fine countryside, and probable adverse impacts on the River Itchen SAC and the South Downs National Park. These sites are also the furthest geographically from Southampton, the railway and the transport links to the M27, connections to which the Corporate Strategy seeks to promote. To that end, CPRE Hampshire will be firmly objecting to Options B and C, throughout the Local Plan process.

In summary, CPRE Hampshire is a registered charity and its objects are to promote and encourage for the benefit of the public the improvement, protection and preservation of the countryside of Hampshire and its towns and villages, and for better development of the rural environment.

Yours faithfully

CPRE Hampshire

cc: Mims Davies MP
cc: Cllr Keith House
cc: CEO Nick Tustain
cc: WCC
cc: SDNP

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/dwelling-stock-estimates-in-england-2015>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-household-projections>