

**Planning Application - GE Aviation, Kings Avenue, Hamble-Le-Rice, SO31  
4NF - O/18/84191 - Representations from Hamble Parish Council**

Firstly, can I offer Cllr Underdown's apologies. He is hoping to be here but has been delayed.

Hamble Parish Council attended the last meeting of the LAC in July when the application was deferred. Cllr Hand and Cllr Underdown both addressed the Committee and set out a range of objections to this application - many of which still stand. Notwithstanding that our focus tonight is on the policy objections as they remain a current and central issue to the application.

Before I do that can I just say that there are changes that have been agreed with Sports England that relate to the mitigation package at the Roy Underdown Pavilion that have neither been discussed nor agreed with the Council. They are minor changes but none the less ones that may not be acceptable us.

Turning to our main point; HPC have objected to the application as it is contrary to "Policy 1CO" namely that the site is outside of the urban edge and is therefore deemed to be Countryside. The policy does not identify exceptions that would be relevant to this application and it remains current and relevant and should be applied and followed.

That said your own officer has identified that you are now in a different position to the one you were in in July. You now have an emerging Local Plan that is the subject of examination in public inquiry and as such, the policies in that Plan now have material weight. The new policy relating to Countryside and settlement gaps states:

*"There is a presumption against new development in the countryside, subject to other policies of this Local Plan. Countryside is defined **as all the areas outside the urban edge** as defined on the policies map, including river valleys, ancient woodland and the undeveloped coast."*

It doesn't create caveats about the nature of the countryside only that the presumption is against development.

The recent Satchell Lane Planning Appeal demonstrates the dangers of not taking a clear, consistent and unequivocal stance on countryside protection and settlement gaps. If this site is approved then it creates a further risk of precedent that could undermine the policy in the emerging Plan leaving much of the peninsula subject to further speculative applications.

Importantly the emerging Plan also highlights the constraints that exist on the Hamble peninsula which makes development unacceptable, namely the constraints arising from transport and traffic issues along Hamble Lane, the reserved minerals site and the need to safeguard settlement gaps. Your thinking in the emerging plan is that Hamble is not a suitable site for significant development now or up to 2036.

Had EBC not had a five-year housing land supply then this site might have been justifiable on the tilted balance argument, but this is not an approach you need to

adopt. You have an adequate supply of homes to meet need and as such you have no justification to depart from either "Policy CO1" or the emerging "Strategic Policy S7, New development in the countryside" - which would see development in the countryside as harmful.

In short you have a strong policy ground to refuse this application. The argument put forward for protecting jobs - which HPC has been sympathetic too - is not longer clear with the sale of the site and ambiguity about where the financial benefits from this development will end up. Will they be reinvested in the plant to improve efficiency as promised and protect orders and jobs or will it instead be absorbed on GE's balance sheet or the new purchaser's?

To conclude, in your report, paragraph 160 it states 'The development of this site would be contrary to saved policies 1.CO and 145.OS' and paragraph 78 says considerable weight can be afforded to saved Policy 1.CO. Given this members are asked to give the strong consideration to these policies conflicts and to make the right decision for Hamble and its future.