

**Fareham Borough Planning Obligations
(excluding Welborne)**
Supplementary Planning Document

Post Consultation Statement

April 2016

Introduction

- I This statement summarises and addresses the main issues raised during the public consultation on the Fareham Borough Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (excluding Welborne). The SPD was published for public consultation for a period of 6 weeks from Wednesday 25 June 2014 to Wednesday 6 August 2014.
- II This post-consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1 Name of the Supplementary Planning Document

- 1.1 Fareham Borough Planning Obligations (excluding Welborne)

2 Persons consulted

- 2.1 Fareham Borough Council consulted persons and organisations on the Local Development Scheme (LDS) database who previously expressed a wish to be notified of Local Development Document (LDD) consultations. This comprised of 1613 emails and 780 postal letters.
- 2.2 Informal consultation was undertaken internally within Fareham Borough Council throughout the development of the draft SPD from March 2013 until May 2014 which also helped shape the direction and content of the SPD.
- 2.2 A summary of the main issues raised by the consultation responses together with the Council's response to those issues are set out in Appendix 1 to this document.

3 Availability of Consultation Documents

- 3.1 The draft Planning Obligations (excluding Welborne) SPD and a Pre-Consultation Statement were made available at the following places during the consultation:
 - Fareham Borough Council website: http://www.fareham.gov.uk/planning/local_plan/spds.aspx
 - Fareham Borough Council Civic Offices (Planning Reception)
 - Borough Libraries – Fareham, Lockswold, Portchester and Stubbington

Appendix 1: Summary of Issues raised by Consultation responses and how they have been addressed in the Adopted SPD

Ref.	Name of Respondent	Details of Representation	Council's Response
1	Southern Water	Request additional text that recognises that utility infrastructure will be sought through planning obligations where it is necessary to meet the needs of a development proposal.	The text in Sections 4 and 6 of the SPD has been amended to make reference to securing utilities infrastructure through planning obligations, where needed to serve a development proposal.
2	Historic England	<p>Development-specific planning obligations may offer opportunities for funding improvement to and the mitigation of adverse impacts on the historic environment. Reference to these opportunities could be made within the SPD.</p> <p>With regard to the viability of a scheme when considering the level of affordable housing or infrastructure contribution required, English Heritage also trusts that the Council would be particularly willing to consider a reduction in either contribution where viability was an issue and the scheme would deliver other public benefits in the form of the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets.</p>	<p>The text in Sections 4 and 6 of the SPD has been amended to make reference to securing improvements to the historic environment, and requiring measures to mitigate any adverse impacts, through planning obligations.</p> <p>The matter raised by Historic England is clearly a material planning consideration and one which will need to be given due weight by decision makers in balancing all relevant material considerations.</p>

Ref.	Name of Respondent	Details of Representation	Council's Response
3	Hampshire County Council	<p>The document should be more explicit about the types of obligations that can be secured and the types of improvements the Borough will expect to be funded by Section 106 contributions. The obligations that can be secured fall into three categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obligations that are not restricted by CIL 2. Obligations that are site specific 3. Obligations that relate to CIL and must be considered alongside the 123 list. <p>It would be useful for these areas to be identified separately within the document for clarity.</p>	A number of sections within the SPD have been reformatted and amended to address the concerns raised by Hampshire County Council.
4	RSPB	The SPD should also state that large developments may be required to provide additional bespoke mitigation measures (eg Suitable Accessible Natural Green Space SANGs) and undergo individual assessment under the Habitats Regulations.	The text in Sections 4 and 6 of the SPD has been amended to make reference to securing on site mitigation measures such as SANGs, through planning obligations.
5	RSPB	We strongly recommend that the reference to a reduced rate of contribution (in connection with the Solent Recreation and Mitigation Strategy) for one bedroomed properties without parking provision be removed.	The reference to a reduced rate of contribution for one bedroomed properties without parking provision has been removed from the SPD.