

Addendum to Appendix A of the Viability Report

A3 Scoping the policies in the Publication Local Plan 2037

A3.1 Appendix A of the Council's Viability Report (December 2019) provides a review of the policies set out in the Draft Local Plan (DLP) 2017 and the Supplement Plan published in 2020. This addendum report is considered appropriate to provide an update on how the policies of the Publication Local Plan 2037 were scoped for viability implications, which then fed into the Council's Viability Report. Table A3 below provides a review of the policies in the Publication Local Plan 2037. Each policy in the Plan has been considered and a traffic light system employed as per the previous scoping assessment to demonstrate the relative effects that each policy has on and viability, and thus delivery of a proposed scheme. Green indicates no impacts on viability/delivery of the Local Plan; amber suggests that there could be a small or marginal impact; and red indicates an impact that was tested in the assessment. The final column sets out how this impact has been tested in the Viability Study. In many cases these impacts will be considered within the testing of case studies to demonstrate what effect they might have on viability.

Table A3 Publication Fareham Plan 2037 policy review

Policy	Impact	Nature of Policy	How is it treated
DS1 – Development in the Countryside		Policy provides a list of proposals which would be supported in the countryside, which is defined as land outside the Urban Area as shown on the Policies Map. This includes proposals such as replacement buildings, small-scale housing developments or exception sites, employment development compliant with policies E1 or E5, etc.	No direct viability implications, however, typologies within countryside locations should be of a type and scale as noted within this policy. Any viability implications relating to infrastructure are tested under Policy TIN4.
DS2 – Development in the Strategic Gaps		Policy sets out two strategic gaps, 'Fareham / Stubbington and the Western Wards (Meon Gap)' and 'Fareham / Bridgemary and Stubbington / Lee-on-the-Solent (Fareham-Stubbington Strategic Gap)', in order to maintain a separation between settlement areas, and a commitment that proposals will not be permitted where they cause harm to the physical separation.	No direct viability implications.
DS3 – Landscape		Landscape policy to guide development to limit impact and enhance landscape quality. Identifies 8 Areas of Special Landscape Quality (ASLQ).	No direct viability implications.
H1 – Housing Provision		Sets out the requirement for the Borough for the net additional dwellings that will be provided in the Borough over the plan period. The policy also sets out a stepped requirement for the delivery of the housing requirement over the plan period.	The range of schemes tested in viability study should be representative of the different scales of delivery likely to come forward across the plan period shown in this policy.

<p>FTC1 – HA45 – Fareham Town Centre/Housing Allocation Policies</p>		<p>The policies set out in FTC1 – HA45 set out a number of housing allocations and allocations for Fareham Town Centre that are earmarked to bring forward the development necessary for the plan. They state the potential capacity, and various site characteristics.</p> <p>Where development gives rise to infrastructure needs, financial contributions will be sought to address those needs arising from the development.</p>	<p>Range of schemes tested in viability study to appropriately cover the development allocations in this policy. This means that tested sites should represent the same type, location and scale of delivery likely shown within these allocations.</p>
<p>HP1 – New Residential Development</p>		<p>Policy sets out the conditions where new residential development in the Urban Area Boundary and in the countryside are supported.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP2 – New Small-Scale Development Outside the Urban Areas</p>		<p>Promotes small scale development in sustainable locations.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP3 – Change of Use to Garden Land</p>		<p>A change of use of land outside of the Urban Area boundary to residential garden will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in keeping with the character, scale and appearance of surrounding area • It does not detract from the existing landscape • It respects views into and out from the site. 	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP4 – Five-Year Housing Land Supply</p>		<p>Flexible housing policy if the Council cannot demonstrate a Five-year supply of housing.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP5 – Provision of Affordable Housing</p>		<p>Sets out the guidance for affordable housing provision in Fareham, requiring that sites that can accommodate 10 or more dwellings or sites with an area of 0.5 hectares or more shall provide a proportion of affordable housing on greenfield, brownfield or town centre sites.</p> <p>The policy requires also provides guidance in relation to how the affordable housing provided should be split in relation to required tenure. The mix should also reflect local need and site characteristics.</p> <p>The Council will only accept affordable housing provision off site or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu where it is robustly justified and contributes to mixed and balanced communities.</p>	<p>The viability study directly addresses the requirements of this policy. Testing assumptions take account of various potential levels of affordable housing provision taking into account current estimates of costs and values and across a range of different market areas reflecting different viability characteristics in the Borough.</p>
<p>HP6 – Exception Sites</p>		<p>The development of Rural Exception sites will be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All dwellings are affordable 	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The affordable delivery is not meeting the affordable need and the development is relative to scale in scale to the shortfall • Located adjacent to, and well related to the existing urban area boundaries • Where affordable rent products are brought forward by not for profit social housing providers. • Meets the local needs of the adjacent settlement. <p>The development of Entry-Level Exception sites will be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is adjacent to existing settlements • All dwellings are affordable and a range of affordable tenure types, including those that are suitable for first-time renters of buyers are provided. • Site is less than 1ha or relative in scale. • It can be demonstrated that the need for the housing proposed will not be met through the plan allocations of development with extant permission. 	
<p>HP7 – Adaptable and Accessible Dwellings</p>		<p>Development proposals for all new dwellings shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 15% of all new dwellings at Category 2 standard; and • on schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing, shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties. 	<p>The viability study directly addresses the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Assumptions to account for the additional costs of meeting these standards are included within this appraisal.</p>
<p>HP8 – Older Persons and Specialist Housing Provision</p>		<p>Permission will be granted for new, or extensions and additions to existing, older persons" and specialist housing where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient parking and services are available • It is in a sustainable location • It provides appropriate provision of amenity space <p>New provision shall be provided within the Urban Area Boundary unless it can be demonstrated, based on an up to date alternative sites assessment provided by the developer, that the need for the housing proposed cannot be met elsewhere.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>

<p>HP9 – Self and Custom Build Homes</p>		<p>Proposals for self and/or custom build homes within the Urban Area boundary will be supported in principle.</p> <p>On sites of 40 or more dwellings or more (gross), 10% of the overall dwellings shall be provided through the provision of plots for sale to address local self or custom build need. Such provision shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be provided as serviced plots • Ideally in grouped plots • Design parameters in place to take account of existing and emerging form and no significant detrimental impact on amenity of existing and neighbouring plots. <p>Plots which are marketed appropriately but not sold within 12 months of initial promotion, may be developed for housing other than as self and/or custom build homes.</p> <p>Sites that appear to have been subdivided or are part of a cluster shall be considered cumulatively and if progressed on an individual basis 10% of dwellings shall be provided in accordance with the policy.</p> <p>Where a site's size and density make it unsuitable for self/custom build provision exemption will be considered on an individual basis.</p>	<p>The viability study directly addresses the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Case Studies have been prepared to assess the viability implications for providing self-build plots.</p>
<p>HP10 – Ancillary Accommodation</p>		<p>The policy sets out guidance on the provision of ancillary accommodation.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP11 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p>		<p>The policy sets out the conditions on which Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites may be permitted.</p> <p>It also sets out the conditions if there is a proposal for a loss of lawful Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>HP12 - Development Proposals within Solent Breezes Holiday Park</p>		<p>The policy provides guidance on planning permissions or proposals relating to the occupation of chalets or caravans at the Solent Breezes Holiday Park.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
<p>E1 - Employment Land Provision</p>		<p>Sets out the plan's ambitions for 104,000 sqm of new employment land over the period, noting sites that are allocated for employment use.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications, however, the range of employment-related typologies should reflect the type and scale that could come forward as described in this policy.</p>

E2 – E4 Employment Allocations		<p>Policies E2 – E4 proposes employment allocations at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faraday Business Park, Daedalus • Swordfish Business Park, Daedalus • Solent 2, Whiteley <p>Sites should be developed in line with the principles set out in their respective allocations.</p>	No direct viability implications, however, the range of employment-related typologies should reflect the type and scale that could come forward as described in this policy.
E5 – Existing Employment Areas		<p>States the intention that Employment Areas shown on the Policies map will be protected for existing and new office, general industrial and storage and distribution employment uses.</p> <p>Proposals for the extension of new buildings and intensification will be supported if it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would facilitate the creation of additional jobs • Acceptable car parking is provided in accordance with TIN1. <p>Policy also provides guidance on proposals that result in the loss of employment land to other uses within an Existing Employment Area.</p>	No direct viability implications, however, the range of employment-related typologies should reflect the type and scale that could come forward as described in this policy.
E6 - Boatyards		Existing boatyards shall be retained for marine related employment, unless no longer financially viable. Sets out guidance for when extensions or intensification might be considered.	No direct viability implications.
E7- Solent Airport		The policy states that the area defined as Solent Airport will be retained for airport related uses.	No direct viability implications.
R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Protecting the Vitality and Viability of Centres		<p>The policy states that main town centre uses will be permitted within the defined town, district and local centres and small parades, provided they meet the policy criteria.</p> <p>The policy also provides criteria for prospective proposals for changes of use and expansion of existing local centres and parades.</p>	No direct viability implications, however the range of retail typologies should reflect the type and scale of uses that could come forward from this policy.
R2 – Out-of- Town Proposals for Town Centre Uses		States that main town uses proposed in out of town locations will only be permitted where there is no significant harm, subject to a number of conditions including; being sequentially tested, appropriate parking is provided, the site is accessible particularly by public transport, the scale and design are appropriate to surroundings and that the proposal would not have any unacceptable environment, amenity or traffic implications.	No direct viability implications.
R3 - Local Shops		Policy indicates that the change of use of local shops outside the defined retail hierarchy will be permitted where there is an existing alternative local shop that can conveniently serve the area; or the unit has been vacant for a reasonable period of time.	No direct viability implications.
		Sets out the guidance on the provision of community and leisure facilities. Allows proposals	No direct viability implications.

R4 - Community and Leisure Facilities		<p>for new or extended facilities where there is a need for the facility that cannot be met elsewhere, consideration has been given to shared use, re-use and redevelopment of the existing buildings in the local community, the site is accessible and inclusive and the provision of facilities are of equal or better in quality and function.</p> <p>Where facilities are proposed that are considered to be main town centre uses then Policy R2 applies.</p> <p>Loss of community facilities shall be permitted if, the facility is no longer needed, no alternative community use is practical or viable and proposed replacement or improved facilities will be of equivalent or better.</p>	
CC1 – Climate Change		Policy to promote mitigation and adaptation to climate change e.g. adopting higher water efficiency standards	Some viability implications to consider within testing
CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems		SuDs to be incorporated into new development and reiteration of national policy towards flood risk	Some viability implications to consider within testing
CC3 – Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs)		The policy guides development in coastal areas, stating it will only be permitted where it will not result in an increased risk to life or significantly increase the risk to any property. The policy sets out two areas (Hook Spit to Workman’s Lane and Hook Park to Meon Shore) where development will not be permitted.	No direct viability implications.
CC4 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy		<p>Proposals for the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy (excluding wind turbines proposals) and the associated infrastructure will be supported provided that there are no severe adverse impacts the character of the surrounding landscape, heritage assets, ecology, water quality and water resources, surroundings (including air quality, shadow flicker, waste, odour and noise) of local residents and businesses; and traffic.</p> <p>Proposals requiring mitigation for any identified adverse impacts will need to be accompanied by a fully costed management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. Proposals will only be supported where the benefit of the development outweighs the harm and reasonable measures for mitigation can be demonstrated.</p>	Some viability implications to consider within testing
NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network		<p>Policy sets out certain conditions for where a development might be permitted. This includes where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated international, national sites and local sites of nature conservation are protected and enhanced • Protected and priority habitats and species, including breeding and foraging areas are protected and enhanced 	There are no specific viability implications. The means of complying with the policy are provided within typical assumptions for development costs and professional fees (e.g. ecological surveys). In most

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals would not prejudice the Ecological Network <p>Proposals whose primary objective is to conserve and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity and natural resources will be supported.</p>	cases it is expected that requirements can be accommodated within typical development sites (e.g. through Masterplanning) and allowances for planning obligations (e.g. open space).
NE2 – Biodiversity Net Gain		Policy sets out a requirement for providing 10% biodiversity net gain for 1 or more dwellings or a new commercial/leisure building.	Potentially some viability implications to consider within testing
NE3 – Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)		<p>Planning permission for proposals resulting in a net increase in residential units will be permitted where a financial contribution is made towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (SRMS).</p> <p>In the absence of a financial contributions towards the SRMS, proposals will need to avoid or mitigate any 'in combination' negative effects from recreation through a developer-provided package of measures for the lifetime of the development.</p>	Typologies have been tested with appropriate cost assumptions for financial contributions towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership strategy.
NE4 – Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and the Ramsar Sites of the Solent		Planning permission will be granted where the integrity of the designated sites is maintained or, where appropriate, improved, having regard to the effect of nutrients on the designated sites arising from increased wastewater production.	The viability study directly addresses the requirements of this policy, and includes policy contingencies such as nitrogen offsetting.
NE5 – Solent Wader and Brent Goose Sites		This policy sets out guidelines on sites used by Solent Waders and Brent Geese to prevent any adverse impacts on the site commensurate to the sites status. The policy sets out the Solent Waders and Brent Geese Network hierarchy. Some mitigation may be required depending on the site that the development falls within.	Typologies have been tested with appropriate cost assumptions for financial contributions.
NE6 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows		Policy to protect trees etc and enhance where possible.	No direct viability implications.
NE7 – New Moorings		The policy guides development of new moorings, and the replacement and relocation of existing moorings.	No direct viability implications.
NE8 – Air Quality		Policy includes measures to improve air quality including installation of EV charging points at 1 per residential dwelling with off street parking and 1 rapid charge per 10 dwellings or 1,000 sqm of commercial floorspace.	Include allowance for EV points within testing assumptions.

NE9 – Green Infrastructure		<p>Development proposals are expected to provide Green Infrastructure, where appropriate which is fully integrated into development and maximises opportunities to connect to the wider GI Network.</p> <p>Proposals that reduce the quality of the existing GI network will only be permitted where suitable mitigation is identified and secured.</p> <p>Policy also sets guidelines for proposals that directly impact upon, or are adjacent to, GI projects that are included within the Fareham Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan or PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>	<p>There are no specific viability implications. The means of complying with the policy are provided within typical assumptions for development costs and professional fees (e.g. ecological surveys). In most cases it is expected that requirements can be accommodated within typical development sites (e.g. through Masterplanning) and allowances for planning obligations.</p>
NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space		<p>Proposals on open space will be permitted provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The open space is surplus to local requirements and will not be needed in the long term; and • Replacement provision will be at least equivalent or better in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility and there will be no overall negative impact on the provision of open space; or • The development is for alternative recreational provision, which meets locally identified needs and outweighs the loss of the current or former use. <p>Proposals will be required to provide open and play space to meet the needs of new residents. Where possible, development shall address any additional identified deficiencies highlighted in the Open Space study.</p>	<p>There are no specific viability implications. The means of complying with the policy are provided within typical assumptions for development costs and professional fees (e.g. ecological surveys). In most cases it is expected that requirements can be accommodated within typical development sites (e.g. through Masterplanning) and allowances for planning obligations (e.g. open space).</p>
NE11 – Local Green Space		<p>Supports proposals that protect or enhance Local Green Space designations. Policy provides guidance on appropriate forms of development that would be permitted within Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
TIN1 – Sustainable Transport		<p>The policy encourages developments to offer a range of travel modes, including ones that reduce the need to travel by motor vehicle. It provides guidance as to how development may achieve this</p>	<p>No direct viability implications.</p>
TIN2 – Highway Safety and Road Network		<p>Supports proposals that have no unacceptable impact on highway safety, and the residual cumulative impact on the road networks is not severe and any impacts on the network can be mitigated through provision of improvements and enhancements to the local network or contributions to necessary or relevant off-site transport improvement schemes.</p>	<p>There are no specific viability implications. The means of complying with the policy are provided within typical assumptions for development costs and professional fees (e.g. ecological surveys). In most</p>

			cases it is expected that requirements can be accommodated within typical development sites (e.g. through Masterplanning) and allowances for planning obligations.
TIN3 – Safeguard Routes		<p>Development will not be permitted where proposals may compromise the ability of the Highway Authority to deliver public transport highway interventions at the safeguarded locations at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delme roundabout • The A27 from Delme roundabout to Portsmouth boundary • Quay Street roundabout and Fareham Bus Station 	No direct viability implications.
TIN4 – Infrastructure Delivery		<p>Indicates that proposals will be required to provide and contribute towards the delivery of new or improved infrastructure.</p> <p>Where appropriate, the Council will require developers to provide this infrastructure as part of development proposals. Alternatively, this must be secured off site.</p>	Testing assumptions include allowances for typical planning contributions towards infrastructure requirements.
D1 – High Quality Design and Place Making		<p>Proposals and spaces will be of high quality, based on principles of urban design and sustainability to ensure the creation of quality place.</p> <p>Policy sets out criteria which development should meet, which includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context – proposals respond to the positive elements of local character, etc. • Identity – proposals create places that are attractive, etc. • Built form – proposals create a three-dimensional pattern or arrangement and scale of development blocks, streets, etc • Movement – proposals create safe and accessible corridors, etc • Nature – proposals positively integrate existing and new habitats, etc • Public spaces – proposals create public spaces that are attractive and safe, etc • Uses – Proposals are well related and connected, with a mix of uses, etc • Homes and buildings – proposals provide a variety of dwelling sizes and tenures, etc • Resources – proposals reduce the use of natural resources, etc. • Lifespan – proposals are designed and constructed to create enduring high-quality buildings, etc. 	No direct viability implications.
D2 – Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions		Policy states that proposals must ensure good environmental conditions for all new and existing users of buildings and external space.	No viability implications.

		<p>Development proposals will be permitted where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not have an unacceptable adverse impact or cumulative impact on the environmental conditions of future occupiers and users or on adjacent/nearby occupants <p>Can demonstrate that future occupants and users of the development site will not be unacceptably adversely impacts from existing activities in the surrounding area.</p>	
D3 – Coordination of Development and Piecemeal Proposals		<p>Indicates that where proposals come forward that are part of a wider development site, supporting information will be expected to demonstrate that the proposal will not prejudice the development of the adjoining site(s) and that the proposal maximises place-making opportunities.</p> <p>Applications which seek to evade infrastructure provision by not fully maximising the use of the site or by putting forward piecemeal development will not be supported.</p>	No viability implications.
D4 – Water Quality and Resources		<p>All new dwellings that are located where there are water supply issues shall achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard for Water efficiency of no more than 110 litres per person per day.</p> <p>The policy seeks to improve water quality and manage the use of water resources by ensuring development proposals provide for the satisfactory supply and disposal of surface and wastewater.</p>	Typologies have been tested with appropriate cost assumptions to meet this standard
D5 – Internal Space Standards		Policy follows technical housing size standards published by government.	Testing includes sizes within the range set out in the standards.
HE1 – Historic Environment and Heritage Assets		Proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets, in line with local and national policy. The Council will take appropriate positive steps to conserve and enhance the Borough's historic environment and heritage assets.	No direct viability implications
HE2 – Conservation Areas		Policy provides criteria to be fulfilled before development can be permitted that affects a Conservation Area.	No direct viability implications
HE3 – Listed Buildings and Structures and/or their Settings		Policy provides criteria to be fulfilled before development can be permitted that affects a listed building/structure and/or its setting.	No direct viability implications
HE4 – Archaeology		Policy prevents harm to the significance of a Schedule Monument or nationally important archaeological site. Provides criteria for	No direct viability implications

		development on sites where there are archaeological remains.	
HE5 – Locally Listed Buildings and Non-designated Heritage Assets		Policy provides criteria to be fulfilled before development can be permitted that affects a non-designated heritage asset and/or its setting. Where development would demonstrably harm the significance and/or setting of a non-designated heritage asset, consent will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that this harm is outweighed by public benefits.	No direct viability implications
HE6 – Heritage at Risk		Policy provides criteria to be fulfilled before development can be permitted that affects heritage assets that are deemed at risk by national heritage at risk registers.	No direct viability implications