

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN (2016 – 2036)

Report of the Local Plans Advisor

June 2018

Recommendation

- (1) Following consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Chief Executive is recommended, with respect to the Eastleigh Local Plan, to:
 - (a) Note that the evidence base is sufficiently complete;
 - (b) Note that the evidence base does not require a significantly different approach to be taken by the Local Plan or its contents to be significantly changed;
 - (c) Approve the final wording and content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) for 'Regulation 19' consultation, as set out in Appendix 1, including the update to the Policies Map (Appendix 2);
 - (d) Approve the commencement of the 'Regulation 19' consultation on the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) to take place from 25 June to 6 August 2018.
 - (e) Notwithstanding the decision made by Council on 11 December 2017, in the interests of public transparency, the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) will be submitted to Cabinet with a summary of the Regulation 19 consultation, prior to the submission of the Plan to the Planning Inspectorate.

Summary

At the meeting on 11 December 2017 the Council approved in principle the 'pre-submission' Local Plan and gave delegated authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to:

- (a) Finalise the wording and content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) following the completion of technical studies (subject to the results of these not significantly changing the content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan);
- (b) To complete and update the evidence base prior to submission provided this does not alter the overall direction of the Local Plan;
- (c) Upon completion of (a) undertake a Regulation 19 consultation.

Since then, officers have commissioned the necessary external specialists to complete technical studies, completed and updated the evidence base sufficient to progress to Regulation 19 consultation and finalised the wording and content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

The technical studies that have been completed since 11 December 2017 have involved undertaking a large amount of complex work, including the following:

- An updated and revised Transport Assessment
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- Viability Study
- Strategic Growth Option (SGO) Background Papers (significantly updated in parts, primarily to reflect other evidence)

- Draft Masterplan for Strategic Growth Option
- Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Ecology Air Quality Assessment
- Sustainability Appraisal (significant updates to reflect other evidence / latest position)

Now that the technical studies have been completed, they can be published. These technical studies support the content of the Local Plan as considered in December 2017, and accordingly, the criteria in recommendation 1(a) are met and it is recommended that Regulation 19 Consultation can commence under delegated powers without reference back to Council or Cabinet.

Whilst the technical studies have not significantly changed the content of the Local Plan, it is important to note that two of the main areas of clarity provided by the studies since December 2017 are: (1) there is no adverse effect on the integrity of any European Sites; and (2) the evidence continues to indicate that Strategic Growth Option B/C (see Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposals Map) performs best in transport and accessibility terms.

There are two outstanding background studies that are in the process of being undertaken. These are Air Quality Local Modelling and an M3 Junction 12 microsim traffic model (as requested by Highways England). Neither of these is considered necessary to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation. They will both be completed prior to submission of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) to the Secretary of State.

There are other documents that form part of the evidence base, but which are not reports that Eastleigh Borough Council has had any involvement in commissioning, production or editing. These are, principally, documents commissioned by the landowners of the proposed SGO, undertaken by their advisors White Young Green.

Other than the documents referred to above, Eastleigh Borough Council's technical planning team have overseen the commissioning and signing off all the technical reports that underpin the Local Plan (see Appendix 5). Our external legal advisors (Paul Stinchcombe QC and Ned Helme) from 39 Essex Chambers have advised on these documents at draft stage, and on those reports that they have commented on, their comments have been taken on board and incorporated where appropriate into the final versions of these reports.

My team having reviewed all of the documentation listed in Appendix 6, I have concluded that the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and its background evidence, are sufficiently complete for me to recommend the Chief Executive to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation pursuant to the 11 December 2017 Council decision.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Council considered the report on the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) at its meeting on 11 December 2017. The report to Council is reproduced in Appendix 3. It approved the recommendations, including recommendation 1, which was:

“To approve in principle (subject to the caveats hereafter set out in (a) and (b) below) the ‘pre-submission’ Local Plan and update to the policies map and gives delegated authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to:

- (a) finalise the wording and content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (including updating the maps), following the completion of technical studies (subject to the results of these not significantly changing the content of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan);
- (b) to complete and update the evidence base prior to submission provided this does not lead to a significantly different approach needing to be taken in the Local Plan;
- (c) upon completion of (a) undertake a Regulation 19 consultation on the final Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036); and
- (d) following (a), (b) and (c) above, submit the final Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 20”.

(The remaining recommendations (2-5) did not provide delegated powers and considered the Local Development Scheme timetable; and engagement with local communities and other interested parties).

- 1.2 This report (and appendices) provides an update on the technical work that has been undertaken since the 11 December 2017 Council decision and sets out the position as to whether consultation on the Local Plan can commence under delegated powers. To this end, the report confirms whether or not the completion of technical studies has, or should, lead to a significant change in the content of the Plan.
- 1.3 This report sets out recommended minor changes to the Local Plan which was approved in principle in December 2017. It also provides an update on each section of the December 2017 Council report (where needed), informed by the results of the evidence which has since been completed. This is not intended to be a detailed technical update, or to repeat that report where there is no change, but to identify any change which could have a bearing on the overall policy approach set out in the December 2017 report.
- 1.4 The report makes numerous references to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In March 2018 the Government published a draft revised NPPF for consultation. This states (at paragraph 209) that Local Plans submitted within 6 months of the publication of the final NPPF will still be examined against the existing NPPF (2012). The Council currently remains on track to submit the Local Plan by the end of October 2018. On this basis it is anticipated that it will be examined against the existing NPPF.

2. Updates to Local Plan Document and Policies Map

- 2.1 It is proposed to make some changes to the Local Plan document. The changes made since December 2017 are set out in full in Appendices 1 and 2 and are summarised in the following paragraphs.

2.2 These changes do not introduce new policies or new sites. Rather, they are detailed changes to policies or supporting text to add clarity, make corrections, and provide more or less detail as appropriate. One site boundary is amended (see 2.4 below). The changes also reflect the outcomes of the latest technical studies, strategies and further discussions both internally within the Council and with statutory agencies / other Councils – including, for example, Natural England, the Environment Agency, Historic England, the Highways Agency, Winchester City Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.

2.3 The proposed changes to the Local Plan document include the following:

- Text to explain that site policies provide an indicative number of dwellings only and that higher dwelling numbers will be considered where justified.
- Additions to the SGO policy requirements to refer to providing serviced land and buildings at nil cost available for community use; the nature of the link road; the timing and the financial contributions required; management of lighting (e.g. regarding 'dark skies and ecology'); a cross reference to policy requiring strategic mitigation measures in relation to the southern damselfly; reference to suitable alternative natural green space; and reference to archaeology.
- Further detail to recognise links to wider policy areas (e.g. physical and mental health).
- Emphasising the reasons for policies and referencing specific requirements, for example: the submission of an Infrastructure Delivery and Phasing Plan; a Construction Environmental Management Plan; and detailed ecological mitigation measures.
- Clarifying that the scope of 'residential amenities' covers new residents, garden space and parking in addition to existing residents and internal areas.
- A table to clearly show the developer contributions required from site allocations.
- Adding reference to the supporting infrastructure and other uses required on sites with planning permission if new proposals come forward (Policy DM24).
- Clarifying where precise requirements will be determined at the planning application stage. For example, the Local Plan sets approximate buffer widths, and the exact buffer will be determined at the planning application stage in the light of a detailed design and any further surveys.
- Removing unnecessary detail. For example, the nature conservation (Policy DM11) and affordable housing (Policy DM30) policies are redrafted to combine points, avoid repetition and make the policies clearer.
- Providing some limited flexibility to the water management policy (Policy DM6) with regard to implementation of the policy.
- Updates to reflect changes since December 2017. These include further findings from the Local Plan evidence base, including for example the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Transport Assessment, and references to published strategies such as the PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy and Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership final strategy. It also includes updates to reflect the Habitat Regulations Assessment, and the

Transport Assessment with respect to the road junction improvements required.

- Incorporating the findings of the community engagement.
- Grammar and typographical errors have been corrected and text reinstated that was deleted in error from previous versions. Cross references have been added and acronyms clarified.

- 2.4 A Local Plan policies map has also been prepared. This carries forward the designations and sites in the policies map for the previous emerging Local Plan to 2029, as amended by the changes approved and set out in the Appendices to the December 2017 Council report (for example to add a range of new sites, including the Strategic Growth Option, and amend designations including in relation to countryside gaps). The only further change proposed at this stage is the extension of site FO2 (land north of Mortimers Lane) to reflect a planning permission on the site and its relationship with the SGO. For information the resulting full policies map is set out in Appendix 2.

3. Update to 11 December 2017 Council Report

Summary

- 3.1 This provided a brief general summary of what the Local Plan does (e.g. setting out the development needed and the Strategic Growth Option concept); and the process and timetable for preparing the Plan and undertaking community engagement. It is considered that, for the reasons set out below and in the Summary above, the outstanding evidence which has since been completed supports the Local Plan approved in principle in December 2017. Appendix 6 sets out the full list of evidence which will be available as part of the formal consultation on the Local Plan.

Strategic Implications / Background

- 3.2 This summarised already published strategies, reports or previous / emerging versions of the Local Plan. Further evidence regarding some of the issues referred to has emerged, which is reported below. Regarding paragraph 30, the Secretary of State confirmed in March 2018 that he does not currently wish to intervene in the preparation of the Local Plan but will continue to monitor progress against our latest timetable¹. This report marks that progress, and subject to the recommendations being agreed to, will enable the Council to keep to this timetable. We are continuing to work closely with the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to ensure they are kept up to date on progress in meeting our Local Development Scheme (LDS).

Community Engagement

- 3.3 Since December 2017 continued engagement and planning of the Regulation 19 consultation has been underway, in line with recommendations. The following has taken place:

¹ Local Development Scheme, December 2017

- Detailed analysis of 'Shaping Your Community' completed and published in January 2018, followed by '*you said, we did*' published in Borough News, February 2018. (A summary was reported in the December 2017 Council report).
- Outcomes of 'Shaping Your Community' have influenced engagement with businesses, including meeting with larger businesses individually to understand their needs and a business conference scheduled on June 27 2018.
- Outcomes of 'Shaping Your Community' were shared with consultants working on the Masterplan for the SGO. This has helped shape the emerging Masterplan.
- Meetings with Parish Councils where the proposed SGO is located, to share outcomes of 'Shaping Your Community' and commence dialogue on producing a Masterplan. Feedback from these meetings has helped shape how we take forward engagement on the Masterplan with local communities and shape arrangements for the Regulation 19 consultation.
- Planning for the Regulation 19 consultation is underway. A digital platform has been purchased and will capture all comments and responses in line with requirements of the Planning Inspectorate.
- 'Drop-in' sessions have been planned across the Borough as part of the consultation processes. The aims are to ensure that residents have the opportunity to speak to officers and that we provide advice and support on how they can have their say on the Plan.
- Engagement with neighbouring Councils and statutory agencies has continued in line with the 'duty to co-operate', and with developers.
- Writing to every householder in the Borough to advise them of the Local Plan consultation.

The Local Plan Vision and Strategy

- 3.4 There is no change to the Local Plan's Vision. There are, however, some adjustments to the Plan's objectives to add reference to water efficiency, the historic environment and health and wellbeing. Changes to strategic policies (e.g. in relation to the Strategic Growth Option) are outlined in section 2 above.

Housing

- 3.5 There has been no significant change to the policy approach.
- 3.6 There has been no update to the objectively assessed need for housing since December 2017 but it is anticipated that this may be updated later in 2018 once the Government's standard methodology for assessing need is finalised and the latest demographic data is released.
- 3.7 An update of the housing trajectory to reflect more recent permissions / resolutions to grant permission improves the housing supply situation compared to the December 2017 position.

- 3.8 New Forest District Council and New Forest National Park Authority wrote to all local Councils in December 2017 explaining they have, or may have, an unmet need and asking whether nearby Councils could meet that need. Staff at Eastleigh Borough Council have responded that the Borough does not have the environmental capacity for further growth.

Employment Needs and Sites

- 3.9 There has been no significant change to the policy approach. The Council has completed a commercial appraisal of the viability of existing employment sites, which generally concludes they are viable (with specific assessments for each site).
- 3.10 The Council has commissioned a brief review of the overall need for employment land taking account of the latest data, and this will be completed by the submission of the Plan.

Transport / Accessibility

- 3.11 At the time of the December 2017 report, the Council had undertaken an assessment of transport and accessibility based on the location of existing (and the potential to provide new) facilities and public transport services, reflecting current travel data. It has now refined and completed this assessment, and the effects of this are reported in the Strategic Growth Option: Update Summary (Appendix 5).
- 3.12 At December 2017 the Council had also undertaken initial runs of the sub regional transport model (SRTM) for the Local Plan development proposals, based on some of the alternative locations (SGOs B/C and E). It has now completed the full SRTM runs, including for all alternative locations. A summary of this work is provided in Appendix 4.
- 3.13 Using the data from the additional SRTM work, the Transport Assessment concludes that Borough wide delays are slightly greater than reported in December 2017 (although at least some of this increase will relate to a methodological change). However, the latest assessment still indicates that the overall increase in delays is slight. This is particularly so when considering the scale of development proposed. Therefore, the additional strategic and other transport improvements continue to be effective in helping to deliver major new development. Nevertheless, there should be a slight change in the emphasis to that reported at paragraph 63 of the December 2017 to Council:

“The ~~interim~~ results show that the total Borough-wide delays across the South Hampshire area at 2036, with the major new Local Plan development, the link road and other ~~preliminary~~ highway enhancements, is ~~about the same as~~ only marginally more than at the baseline at 2036 without the new development or highway enhancements. Under the ‘Do More’ scenario, total network delays in the morning peak are 4% lower and in the afternoon peak are 1% higher morning and afternoon peaks are only 1% higher than in the 2036 baseline. This rises to 3% in the Eastleigh / Winchester / Southampton area, and 6% - 8% in Eastleigh Borough alone. This suggests that the major new Local Plan development with the link road and highway enhancements will not add significantly to the extra delays which will have arisen by

2036 from current developments and background growth. For example: this is the position predicted along Bishopstoke Road, with the model predicting no material change in ~~queue lengths or delays~~ in the interim Local Plan compared to the baseline”.

- 3.14 Highways England have identified that congestion at the M3 junction 12 (which SGO B/C's link road connects to) could be an issue, if traffic queues on the slip roads were to back on to the motorway. A 'micro-simulation' model has been commissioned to assess this and potential solutions in more detail, and this will be ready for when the Plan is submitted.

Countryside Gaps and Landscape Sensitivity

- 3.15 There is no significant change to the policy approach. With respect to the SGOs, some further analysis of countryside gaps and historic landscapes has been undertaken and this is reported below.
- 3.16 Discussions with the South Downs National Park Authority have continued and as a result a minor change to the Local Plan SGO policy is proposed to refer to appropriate lighting (including from a 'dark skies' perspective).

Air Quality

- 3.17 There is no significant change to the policy approach.
- 3.18 The Council has commissioned an Air Quality Study. This will look at the air quality effects on human health which could arise from the additional traffic generated by the new development proposed, whilst taking account of improvements to vehicle technology. This will inform the Local Plan, including any need to elaborate on the existing policy references. This will also help the Council comply with its wider air quality responsibilities and inform the review of air quality management areas and action plans.
- 3.19 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been completed and provides a summary of the differences between the appraisal of each SGO. It considers that each SGO scores equally with respect to proximity to air quality management areas and/or noise (indicator 6.1); and equally with respect to the potential to generate pollution (indicator 6.2).
- 3.20 The Air Quality Study will consider this in more detail. At this stage, however, it is worth noting that the Transport Assessment indicates that, relative to the other SGOs, SGO B/C generates least additional congestion in the areas which experience the most congestion to start with (for example Southampton and Eastleigh town, which contain a number of air quality management areas).

Biodiversity

- 3.21 The full Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Local Plan has now been completed. This concludes that, provided mitigation measures are put in place, there will be no adverse effects from the Local Plan, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, on the integrity of any European designations. The HRA is

supported by detailed Air Quality and Hydrology Assessments, by the PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy, and by the southern damselfly Conservation Strategy (the latter was completed before the December Council decision).

- 3.22 The Council has continued to meet regularly with Natural England, the Environment Agency, the Forestry Commission, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, Winchester City Council and the SGO developers to discuss these matters.

Strategic Growth Options

- 3.23 As a result of the evidence regarding the SGO selection process being completed, it is considered there is a slight but not significant change in the overall balance of the issues as reported to Council in December 2017. However, this does not change the overall recommendation to support SGO B/C. The SGO Background Paper has been updated accordingly. Its original summary and conclusions were reproduced in the Council report (paragraphs 80 – 114). The latest (June 2018) SGO Background Paper provides more detail.
- 3.24 Overall for transport and accessibility issues, it is considered that the main changes since December 2017 are that the options are more evenly matched in terms of accessibility / distance travelled (although option E continues to perform less well in terms of walking / cycling); and that the final transport model indicates that SGO B/C performs better in minimising delays overall, minimising delays in the most congested areas, and minimising the overall effects on the quieter roads in the South Downs National Park. Overall, it is considered that the evidence continues to indicate that SGO B/C performs best in transport and accessibility terms.
- 3.25 The SGO Background Paper's Conclusion has been updated since that reported to Council in December 2017. It now sets out the evidence which has been completed, confirming that this evidence does not alter the overall conclusions (and which elements of evidence remain outstanding). The main changes are to include reference to option C and the latest transport evidence. The latest conclusion is set out in Appendix 5, and shows the changes made to the December 2017 report.
- 3.26 Paragraphs 115 to 117 of the December 2017 Report refer to the SGO draft Masterplan. An emerging version has now been completed. The development quantum is slightly revised from 5,189 dwellings to 5,300 dwellings. This incorporates the necessary buffers separating development from woodland and watercourses.

Retail and Leisure

- 3.27 There is no significant change to the policy approach.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people

- 3.28 Paragraph 119 of the December 2017 report refers to a need for 3 to 5 plots for travelling show people, at least three of which relates to people living on unauthorised plots elsewhere who have expressed a desire to locate in the Borough. Since December 2017, Winchester City Council has undertaken formal consultation on and submitted a Travellers Development Plan Document. Policy TR4 allocated

the site in Shedfield which accommodates these three plots. It is considered this will eliminate this element of need (however it should also be noted that Winchester have identified a total need for 24 travelling show people plots, allocates sites for 16 of them and has a criteria-based policy for any proposals to meet the need for the remaining 8 plots).

Development Management Policies

- 3.29 These policies form part of the Local Plan document and an indication of the changes is set out above.

Viability

- 3.30 There is no significant change to the policy approach. The Council had completed an initial viability assessment of the SGO in December 2017. This has now been finalised and remains broadly the same. The Council has also completed a wider viability assessment of the Local Plan policies which demonstrates that, in general terms, they do not render development unviable. (The study does, however, raise the prospect that the Council's 35% affordable housing policy may prove challenging to achieve on some brownfield sites in and around Eastleigh town centre). The Council has completed an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and broad costings for the infrastructure needed, informed by the evidence set out above.

Financial Implications

- 3.31 There is no significant change to the policy approach. (The Council has invested significant funding to produce a firm evidence base and enable full public engagement and consultation, and earmarked funding for the forthcoming examination). The Local Plan budget is being monitored and any significant changes will be reported to the Cabinet as part of the quarterly budget monitoring process).

Risk Assessment

- 3.32 There is no significant change to the policy approach.

Equality and Diversity Implications

- 3.33 There is no significant change to the policy approach.

Duty to Cooperate

- 3.35 The Council has produced a Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance which demonstrates how Eastleigh Borough Council meets the duty to co-operate in the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-36. The Duty to Co-operate is a legal test and also forms part of the tests of 'soundness' that a local plan is required to meet.
- 3.36 The Statement of Compliance is published as background evidence to support the Plan. It demonstrates how Eastleigh Borough Council has worked closely with Hampshire County Council, neighbouring authorities, statutory agencies and other duty to co-operate bodies to address the strategic cross boundary issues identified for the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan. It provides evidence of who the Council has co-operated with, when and how this has influenced the Local Plan as required by the

Planning Practice Guidance. The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Spatial Position Statement is a key document which also demonstrates this

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 With respect to the conclusions set out in the Council report of December 2017, there is no significant change to the policy approach with respect to paragraphs 127 – 129 or 131.
- 4.2 Paragraph 132 refers to the potential intervention of the Secretary of State. Since then, the Secretary of State has confirmed that he is not intervening on Eastleigh's Local Plan, although he is carefully monitoring the progress of the Plan in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme.
- 4.3 In order to submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State by the end of October 2018 (as set out in the LDS), we have secured additional resource to ensure we can: process the comments received during the Regulation 19 consultation; and provide a statement setting out the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations in accordance with the requirements set out in Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) of the Town and Country Planning (Local planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 4.4 Paragraph 130 of the December 2017 report explained that some of the technical work was ongoing. Whilst the initial findings supported the Local Plan, if the outstanding evidence did not support the approach and this resulted in a significant change to the Local Plan it would be brought back to Council for decision.
- 4.5 On this basis, the Council approved in principle the pre-submission Local Plan and gave delegated authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to commence Regulation 19 consultation provided the criteria in recommendation 1a were met. Since then, neither the finalisation of the wording and content of the Local Plan, nor the completion of the technical studies, are considered to have significantly changed the content or approach of the Local Plan. Therefore, the criteria in recommendation 1(a) are met and it is recommended that Regulation 19 consultation can commence under delegated powers, and without reference back to Council.
- 4.6 Eastleigh Borough Council's technical planning team have overseen the commissioning and signing off all the technical reports that underpin the Local Plan (see Appendix 6). Our external legal advisors (Paul Stinchcombe QC and Ned Helme) from 39 Essex Chambers have provided comments on these documents at draft stage, and their comments have been taken on board and incorporated where appropriate into the final versions of these reports.
- 4.7 For the reasons set out above, I have concluded that the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and its background evidence, are sufficiently complete for me to recommend the Chief Executive to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation pursuant to the 11 December 2017 Council decision.

Date: 22 June 2018
Contact Officer: Sam Fox
Tel No: 023 8068 3839
e-mail: sam.fox@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices 6

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (with tracked changes since December 2017)

Appendix 2 – Policies Map

Appendix 3 – Eastleigh Local Plan report to Council of 11 December 2017

Appendix 4 – Transport/Accessibility Update

Appendix 5 – Strategic Growth Option Update

Appendix 6 – Full list of evidence to be published alongside formal Regulation 19
consultation on the Local Plan

Appendix 4 - Transport / Accessibility Update

1. At the time of the December 2017 report, the Council had undertaken an assessment of transport and accessibility based on the location of existing (and the potential to provide new) facilities and public transport services, reflecting current travel data. It has now refined and completed this assessment, and the effects of this are reported in the Strategic Growth Option: Update Summary (Appendix 4).
2. At December 2017 the Council had also undertaken initial runs of the sub regional transport model (SRTM) for the Local Plan development proposals, based on some of the alternative locations (SGOs B/C and E). It has now completed the full SRTM runs, and for all alternative locations.
3. The initial transport model runs at December 2017 included an interim run with new transport interventions for a Local Plan based on SGO B/C. These included interventions listed at paragraphs 60 and 61 of the Council report (e.g. motorway improvements, Botley by-pass, improvements along the link road, and in the general vicinity of Fair Oak). The Council report and the updated assessment below set out the levels of delay at 2036 with just the baseline (e.g. already permitted) development and the full Local Plan development. The difference relates to the effect of the new Local Plan development allocations and associated transport interventions as at 2036.
4. The interim results showed that total Borough wide delays at 2036 would decrease by 4% in the AM peak and increase by 1% in the PM peak; and that along the Bishopstoke Road corridor there would be no material change to existing flows.
5. The full transport model runs use broadly the same interventions as the interim runs. However more motorway improvements have been included at the 2036 baseline stage. In addition, some junction designs have been improved, or new junction improvements added, and the baseline land use data refined. The full transport model runs include two scenarios for the Local Plan proposals based on different levels of transport interventions ('Do Something' and 'Do More'). These are relatively subtle differences relating to individual junction designs or a limited number of additional interventions.
6. The Transport Assessment indicates that traffic flows will not be significantly adversely impacted. Given the increase in development within the Plan period, total junction delays within the Borough at 2036 will only increase in the morning peak by 6% (Do More); and in the evening peak by 8% (Do More). This is in the context of the Local Plan delivering major new development which will generate 13.3% more trips in the AM peak; and 11.5% more trips in the PM peak which start or end in the Borough. These 'Do More' interventions are considered deliverable. Nevertheless, the latest 'Do More' assessment indicates there will be higher Borough wide delays than were set out in the December 2017 Council report.

7. It is important to note that the latest assessment includes the benefits of all the motorway improvements at the 2036 baseline stage², which means that fewer additional improvements are being put in to the Local Plan development scenarios. To that extent some of the increases in delays will relate to methodological rather than actual differences. The latest assessment of delays also includes results from the wider area, including surrounding Boroughs. This is important because none of the SGOs are far from the Borough boundary and each have varying effects elsewhere, particularly in parts of Winchester and Southampton districts. For the 'Do More' scenario the combined increase in delays across South Hampshire (the adjusted model area) is only 1% in both the AM and PM peaks. For Eastleigh / Southampton / Winchester combined alone it is only 3% in both the AM and PM peaks.
8. The Transport Assessment also provides the latest assessment of the impact of the additional development on traffic flows along Bishopstoke Road, which concludes that there is no material change in delays. The AM westbound peak hour delay is predicted to increase by 3% - 4% (or 2 to 3 seconds) in the 'Do Something' and 'Do More' scenarios respectively (Queue lengths are not predicted).
9. In summary, Borough wide delays are slightly greater than reported in December 2017, although at least some of this increase will relate to a methodological change. The latest assessment still indicates, once neighbouring Council areas are taken into account, that the overall increase in delays are slight. This is particularly so when considering the scale of development proposed. In other words, the additional strategic and other transport improvements continue to be effective in helping to deliver major new development. Nevertheless, there should be a slight change in the emphasis to that reported at paragraph 63 of the December 2017 to Council:

"The ~~interim~~ results show that the total ~~Borough-wide~~ delays across the South Hampshire area at 2036, with the major new Local Plan development, the link road and other ~~preliminary~~ highway enhancements, is ~~about the same as~~ only marginally more than at the baseline at 2036 without the new development or highway enhancements. Under the 'Do More' scenario, total network delays in the morning peak are 4% lower and in the afternoon peak are 1% higher morning and afternoon peaks are only 1% higher than in the 2036 baseline. This rises to 3% in the Eastleigh / Winchester / Southampton area, and 6% - 8% in Eastleigh Borough alone. This suggests that the major new Local Plan development with the link road and highway enhancements will not add significantly to the extra delays which will have arisen by 2036 from current developments and background growth. For example: this is the position predicted along Bishopstoke Road, with the model predicting no material change in ~~queue lengths~~ or delays in the interim Local Plan compared to the baseline".

² The latest assessment includes M27 and M3 Smart motorways, M27 Jnc 8 / Windhover improvements and Whiteley Way; whereas the Interim Transport Model runs for December 2017 only included the M27 Smart Motorways.

10. The Transport Assessment now includes a comparison of each SGO option, which is reported in the Strategic Growth Option section below. The Transport Assessment also considers the impact of the preferred SGO B/C with the link road in more detail.
11. It identifies that with additional transport improvements the new Local Plan development itself will only result in severe congestion at 8 junctions in the Borough, and that this usually only relates to parts of those junctions. (It is important to stress that this is only the additional severe congestion caused by the new Local Plan development at 2036. A considerably greater number of junctions are or will be congested, but this does not relate to the effects of the new Local Plan development). The severe congestion at these 8 junctions typically generates total delays (from all congestion, not just the 'Local Plan' congestion) ranging from 12 seconds to just over 2 minutes. This overall picture is not considered to represent severe congestion in the terms set out by, and in the context of, the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. The Council has continued its dialogue with other authorities on these matters (for example to agree the transport interventions to test through the transport model), including the two highway authorities for the Borough (Hampshire County Council and Highways England), Winchester City Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. Discussions have also involved the SGO developer, and others as needed on transport matters (i.e. Southampton City Council and Network Rail).
13. Highways England have identified that congestion at the M3 junction 12 (which SGO B/C's link road connects to) could be an issue, if traffic queues on the slip roads were to back on to the motorway. A 'micro-simulation' model has been commissioned to assess this and potential solutions in more detail, and this will be ready for when the Plan is submitted.

Appendix 5 Strategic Growth Option: Update Summary

1. There is no significant change to the policy approach in the introductory paragraphs 80 to 85 of the December 2017 Council report.
2. Since December 2017, the following are the main aspects of the evidence which have been completed or updated.
3. A review of the development capacity of each SGO has taken place. The draft Masterplan has been completed for SGO B/C which slightly increases the capacity from 5,200 to 5,300 dwellings³. A review of SGOs D and E has concluded their dwelling capacity should increase from 1,700 to 2,744 dwellings and 2,500 to 3,003 dwellings respectively. This reduces the supplementary development areas needed elsewhere, although does not eliminate the need for them.
4. A refinement of the SGO options has been assessed. In addition to assessing SGOs B/C, D and E; SGO C is assessed on its own, and two variants are considered for the supplementary development associated with SGO D, to ensure a comprehensive assessment of a range of scenarios. A refinement has also taken place of the facilities and public transport services each SGO can support, taking account of the revisions to the dwelling capacities, completion of bus assessment for options C and D, and a meeting with Network Rail.
5. Transport Modelling: This has now been completed for all SGOs, see the Transport and Accessibility section above.
6. Sustainability Appraisal: This has been updated to reflect the latest information.
7. Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA): This and supporting studies have now been completed, see the Biodiversity section above.
8. Landscape / Countryside Gap Appraisals: There has been some fine tuning to reflect the need for careful design, to consider the impact on countryside gaps if SGO D were extended south of the railway, and to consider the impact of non-designated locally registered historic parks and gardens (which affect each SGO).

SGO Summary

9. As a result of the above evidence being completed, it is considered there is a slight but not significant change in the overall balance of the issues as reported to Council. However, this does not change the overall recommendation to support SGO B/C. The SGO Background Paper has been updated accordingly. Its original summary and conclusions were reproduced in the Council report (paragraphs 80 – 114). Its latest summary and conclusions include the amendments set out in the paragraph below. The latest (June 2018) SGO Background Paper provides more detail.

³ The Transport Assessment has been based on 5,400 dwellings as an extra margin and so this slight increase in capacity does not affect the wider evidence. (The Transport Assessment was also based on the latest dwelling figures for options D and E).

Transport and Accessibility

10. Distance travelled: In December 2017 option E was considered slightly better because it is closest to Southampton and option B/C better because it provides more local facilities. The latest assessment indicates that SGO C or D are also likely to perform well in terms of providing local facilities; and the transport model evidence now indicates that these differing benefits cancel each other out (each SGO option generating similar average trip lengths and levels of carbon dioxide emitted).
11. Walking / cycling: The transport model evidence now indicates that SGO B/C performs better in these terms. This is considered consistent with the view set out in December 2017 that SGO B/C would provide more local facilities.
12. Bus: In December 2017, option B/C was considered better than other options in terms of existing bus services and this has not changed. It was also considered more likely than option E to sustain new bus services because it is a larger development. This assessment has now been updated to take into account higher development capacities in option E, and to include options C and D. Option B/C still performs better than option E (although the difference has narrowed), but scores around the same as option D. However, the transport model indicates that option D performs better in terms of encouraging bus use, probably because it has the shortest journey time to Eastleigh (this is on the assumption that new services can be provided). SGO B/C is the next best performer in these terms.
13. The December 2017 report to Council stated in paragraph 86 that in overall terms options B/C were considered to be better. In light of the above, it is now considered that all options perform in similar terms in respect of distance travelled / carbon dioxide emitted (for different reasons); and that SGOs B/C or D perform better in terms of walking / cycling or public transport.
14. Rail: Discussions have taken place with Network Rail which confirm to Council staff their view that SGOs D or E are unlikely to be able to deliver a new rail station. There is a letter from Network Rail which confirms this position.
15. Traffic delays / congestion: The December 2017 report set out the interim transport model results for a Local Plan based on options B/C, relative to the baseline (without the Local Plan development). This suggested (in summary) that there would be no increase in delays because the effects of the development would be counteracted by the effects of the transport improvements. The final transport model now indicates that there would be a slight increase in delays (this difference is at least partially due to the methodological differences as set out in the main Transport and Accessibility section above). The final transport results also provide a full comparison of all the SGOs. This indicates that relative to the other options, SGO B/C provides clear benefits in terms of minimising extra delays overall. For example, SGOs D or E generate 32% - 68% more delays across the whole day in South Hampshire than option B/C, despite generating 17% - 20% fewer trips in result of providing less development. There is still a (less marked) benefit in the peak hours, with SGOs D or E generating 9.5% - 32% more delays (it should be noted that SGO B/C only

achieves these benefits with the combined effects of the new link road and full 'Do More' junction improvements).

16. A Local Plan including SGO B/C and the link road minimises extra delays in the most congested areas in and around the Borough. For example, the most congested areas within the Borough are Eastleigh town and Hedge End / West End / Botley, and SGO B/C (with the link road and 'Do more' interventions) achieve a significantly lower increase in delays in these areas.
17. A Local Plan including SGO B/C and the link road generally generates more traffic flows on the B-roads on the edges of the South Downs National Park (as with other options, it generates a reduction at 2036 in Twyford), but minimises traffic flows on the quiet rural roads within the South Downs National Park. For example, on average, SGO B/C generates virtually no increase on these roads (with variations on individual roads), whereas the others do. Focussing in more detail on SGO B/C, it is considered that the delays generated are consistent with the parameters set out in national policy.
18. Overall for transport and accessibility issues, it is considered that the main changes since December 2017 are that the options are more evenly matched in terms of accessibility / distance travelled (although option E continues to perform less well in terms of walking / cycling); and that the final transport model indicates that SGO B/C performs better in minimising delays overall, minimising delays in the most congested areas, and minimising the overall effects on the quieter roads in the South Downs National Park. Overall, it is considered that the evidence continues to indicate that SGO B/C performs best in transport and accessibility terms.

Countryside Gaps

19. The Countryside Gaps section has undergone detailed refinement, as set out above. The SGO background paper summary section now recognises that option D would join Bishopstoke to Horton Heath and incorporates reference to option C. Its overall conclusion, that options B/C, D (and now C) are better than option E at protecting future countryside gaps, remains the same as reported to Council in December 2017.

Landscape

20. The Landscape section now includes an assessment of option C. The development capacity of options D or E have increased, which reduces the area of supplementary development required. The SGO background paper summary is very similar to that reported to Council in December 2017. The conclusion is the same: that SGO B/C will have more impact than SGO D, E (and now C).

Biodiversity

21. Since December 2017 the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA), supported by detailed studies, has been completed. In accordance with the relevant regulations, this focuses on the proposed Local Plan including SGO B/C (in combination with other plans and projects). As set out above, the HRA concludes that there will be no

adverse impact on the integrity of international sites. This has not led to major changes to the SGO background paper's biodiversity section as reported to Council in December 2017 because this focuses on a 'higher level' comparative assessment of the different SGOs, which is outside of the scope of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Nevertheless, some cross references are made to the HRA results. The latest and fuller comparison of traffic flows across the River Itchen has been included, although this confirms the position at December 2017 that all SGOs have the potential, and SGO B/C the greatest potential, to have an adverse effect without mitigation. Reference is made to the potential for recreational disturbance in the New Forest, and the potential impact from non-native invasive species. The reduced size of the supplementary areas is also relevant, although again the general point regarding the need for them still stands.

Other Environmental

22. Since December 2017 an assessment of each option with regard to local historic parks and gardens has been undertaken. The section on heritage recognises that each option would affect a non-designated locally registered historic park or garden, albeit in different ways. For example, Stoke Deer Park (affected by SGO B) has influenced the landscape structure of the area although few other remnants are likely to remain, and this has been taken into account in preparing the draft Masterplan. SGOs D or E are affected by Winslowe House and/or Allington Manor which have been affected to a degree by scattered development but continue to enjoy an open setting and are far more intact than the deer park.
23. The December 2017 report to Council (paragraph 109) explained that SGO B/C needs to be designed to avoid increasing flood risk. The hydrology report has now identified in broad terms the measures needed. The link road will also need to be designed to minimise noise impacts.

SGOs: Conclusions

24. The SGO Background Paper's Conclusion has been updated since that reported to Council in December 2017. It now sets out the evidence which has been completed, confirming that this evidence does not alter the overall conclusions (and which elements of evidence remain outstanding). The main changes are to include reference to option C and the latest transport evidence as above. The latest conclusion is as follows (with the changes since December 2017 highlighted):

4. "It is considered that SGOs B/C, C, and D will do most to protect the countryside gaps needed (an important local policy with more generic support in national policy) ~~and furthermore that SGOs B/C will do most to benefit transport/accessibility (an important national and local policy).~~ Whilst, taken in the round, each SGO performs in similar or broadly similar ways across a range of transport / accessibility objectives (for different reasons), SGO B/C delivers clear benefits in terms of minimising additional congestion. Therefore in overall terms SGO B/C does most to meet transport objectives (an important local and national policy consideration). None of the SGOs affect nationally or locally designated landscapes. SGOs B/C will have most impact

on non-designated landscapes with higher sensitivity to change, although it should be noted that the majority of its land is still classed as having moderate or low sensitivity to change. A Local Plan based on D or E will have some landscape impact on other areas of countryside too, for example within parts of option C. Each of the SGOs has the potential, without mitigation measures, to affect nearby ecology designations of international or national importance. The Habitat Regulations Assessment ~~will provide the evidence regarding the extent of any mitigation measures required (for international sites)~~. for the proposed submission Local Plan (including SGO B/C) concludes there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of international sites with mitigation measures incorporated.

- ~~2. It is important to recognise that there are some specific areas of evidence which are as yet emerging and/or uncompleted. These primarily relate to transport modelling, the Habitat Regulations Assessment and consequent environmental mitigation. Since the December version of this report, the transport modelling, habitat regulations assessment, infrastructure delivery plan and other evidence has been completed. The remaining evidence is now primarily focussed on a detailed assessment of M3 junction 12 and an assessment of air quality (e.g. in respect of air quality management areas). Engagement and consultation will continue until the Local Plan is submitted. Therefore the conclusions to date will need to be kept under careful review to identify whether or not they remain valid once the Local Plan evidence is complete.~~
3. It is considered that in overall terms, on the range of evidence available to date, that the key areas of difference between the SGOs are that SGO B/C has greater merit in meeting transport/accessibility aims than SGOs C, D or E; greater merit in protecting countryside gaps than SGO E; and less merit than SGOs C, D and E in protecting more sensitive (although non-designated) landscapes. The comparative balance between different SGOs with regard to biodiversity is considered to be more mixed. However a full Habitats Regulation Assessment ~~will be~~ has been completed for the proposed Local Plan which, as explained above, states there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of international sites with mitigation measures incorporated.
4. It is considered that national and/or local policy gives some emphasis to transport/accessibility aims and designated countryside gaps and less so to undesignated landscapes. On this basis it is considered that the greater benefits SGO B/C bring to meeting transport/accessibility and countryside gap aims outweigh the lesser merit it has in landscape terms. ~~Therefore the recommendation to Council on 11 December is to approve a Local Plan based on SGO B/C~~
5. It is important to emphasise that the relative weight to be given to completely different issues (transport/accessibility, countryside gaps and landscape sensitivity) also has an element of subjectivity to it. ~~It is therefore important that Council makes its decision once Members have carefully considered their views on these issues based on the current evidence.~~ The Council report set

this out, enabling the elected Council to carefully consider its views before reaching its decision”.

Strategic Growth Options (*Delivery of Preferred Option*)

25. Paragraphs 115 to 117 of the December 2017 Report refer to the SGO draft Masterplan. An emerging version has now been completed. The development quantum is slightly revised from 5,189 dwellings to 5,200 to 5,300 dwellings. This incorporates the necessary buffers separating development from woodland and watercourses. (This slight increase does not affect the Council’s assessment that 3,350 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period and so does not reduce the need for other housing sites).
26. The evidence above and as follows provides further information on the deliverability of the SGO and link road.
27. The viability study and infrastructure delivery plan take into account the likely cost of delivering the SGO and associated infrastructure (transport, education, etc.) and continue to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect for viable delivery in the context of the high level criteria set out in the NPPF. In addition, there are also likely to be a range of opportunities for public sector funding. This assessment will continue to be refined as further information on infrastructure costs, including any improvements at M3 junction 12, become available.
28. The developer’s initial assessment of the Allbrook Rail Bridge has been discussed with the highway authority (Hampshire County Council), Network Rail and Winchester City Council. The developer has since completed this assessment. There will be an increase in traffic and heavy goods vehicles traversing under the bridge. The assessment demonstrates that whilst the proposed improvements to the road alignment will not fully meet modern design standards with respect to the bridge, they can be considered acceptable given the overall benefit of the improvements to traffic flow; and will deliver a significant improvement for both existing and new traffic, enabling most HGVs to successfully pass.
29. The hydrology report identifies the measures to be put in place to address areas of flood risk.
30. Other infrastructure and delivery issues remain broadly as set out in the SGO Background Paper Delivery section in December 2017. This has been updated to reflect the above and other detailed changes. For example, the developers have completed a landscape appraisal of the link road and updated the noise assessment. The Council has continued to meet with Winchester City Council on a regular basis to discuss these matters.

Appendix 6:

Full list of evidence to be published alongside Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) for Regulation 19 Consultation

Study	Author
LOCAL PLAN	
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)	Eastleigh Borough Council
Policies Map	Eastleigh Borough Council
Council report 11 December 2017	Eastleigh Borough Council
Delegated Powers Report June 2018	Eastleigh Borough Council
DEVELOPMENT NEEDS	
Housing Needs	
PUSH SHMA - 2014	PUSH
PUSH SHMA - 2016	PUSH
Eastleigh OAN report (630 pa)	Eastleigh Borough Council
Government draft methodology	Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government
Affordable Housing ORS	ORS
Employment Needs	
PUSH report - 2016	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire
LEP Strategy	Solent Local Enterprise Partnership
Eastleigh local economy review - Jan 2017	Eastleigh Borough Council
Other Needs	
Retail and Leisure Needs	Carter Jonas
Gypsy and Traveller Needs	ORS
OVERALL SUPPLY OF SITES	
Housing	
Housing Trajectory / Housing Implementation Plan	Eastleigh Borough Council
Local Plan 5 year land supply	GL Hearn
Employment	
Employment background paper / trajectory	Eastleigh Borough Council
Commercial appraisal of existing sites	LSH
Addendum to commercial appraisal	LSH
Other	
Shopping Occupancy Survey	Eastleigh Borough Council
SELECTION AND DELIVERY OF SGO	
SGO Background Paper - Comparative Assessment	Eastleigh Borough Council
SGO Background Paper - Delivery	Eastleigh Borough Council
SGO Public Transport Accessibility	Eastleigh Borough Council

SGO Landscape sensitivity	Eastleigh Borough Council
Masterplan	Allies and Morrison
SGO Housing Trajectory	Eastleigh Borough Council
Reports from developers planning consultants	
WYG Environmental report	White Young Green
WYG Bat report	White Young Green
WYG Noise report	White Young Green
WYG Landscape reports including link road	White Young Green
WYG Archaeology and Heritage report	White Young Green
WYG Minerals	White Young Green
HCC link road report	Hampshire County Council
Hydrology / flood risk report	JBA
SELECTION OF OTHER SITES	
SLAA	Eastleigh Borough Council
Small / medium sites Background Paper	Eastleigh Borough Council
DELIVERY / INFRASTRUCTURE	
Transport Assessment - Part 1 comparative assessment of SGO options	Systra
Transport Assessment - Part 2 SGO B/C in more detail	Systra
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Eastleigh Borough Council
Viability study	Dixon Serle
PUSH Water Study	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire
National Standards evidence (internal space, mobility, water)	Eastleigh Borough Council
Demography background paper	Eastleigh Borough Council
ENVIRONMENTAL	
Environmental capacity	Eastleigh Borough Council
Countryside Gaps Background Paper	Eastleigh Borough Council
Open spaces study	Eastleigh Borough Council
Playing pitches study	Eastleigh Borough Council
PUSH SFRA	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire
Habitat Regulations Assessment	UEEC
Southern Damselfly survey and mitigation strategy	Arcadian
Ecology Air Quality	AQConsultants
Great Crested Newt	Eastleigh Borough Council
Sustainability Appraisal	LUC

CONSULTATION	
Statement of Community Involvement	Eastleigh Borough Council
Reg 19 Consultation Statement	Eastleigh Borough Council
Duty to Co-operate Statement	Eastleigh Borough Council
OTHER	
AMR	Eastleigh Borough Council
Local Development Scheme	Eastleigh Borough Council
Brownfield site register	Eastleigh Borough Council
Equalities Impact Assessment	Eastleigh Borough Council
NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY	
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Draft NPPF	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
PUSH Position Statement	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire
Link to PUSH evidence base	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire