

# FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN 2037

## MATTER 6.2:

### HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

#### HA1 NORTH AND SOUTH OF GREENAWAY LANE

#### EXAMINATION HEARING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF:

#### BARGATE HOMES

3 West Links, Tollgate, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, S053 3TG

T: 02382 542 777 | [www.pegasusgroup.co.uk](http://www.pegasusgroup.co.uk)

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | Dublin | East Midlands | Edinburgh | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Newcastle | Peterborough | Solent

 DESIGN  ENVIRONMENT  PLANNING  ECONOMICS  HERITAGE

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Group.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited [07277000] registered in England and Wales Registered Office: Pegasus House, Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT

Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited

## CONTENTS:

	Page No:
<b>1. MATTER 6 – HOUSING ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>General</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 What status do the Framework Plans have? How have the plans been drawn up? What is the justification for schemes 'according with' the Framework Plan? Is this too inflexible? Should they 'have regard' to them instead?</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>All Allocations</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.6 Are the sites allocated for housing in Policies FTC3-9, HA1-HA56 and BL1 soundly based; are the site-specific requirements set out in the relevant policies justified and effective and is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and deliverable in the timescales indicated in the Council's trajectory?</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>HA1 North and South of Greenaway Lane</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.7 How has the indicative yield been determined?</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.8 This allocation consists of a number of smaller sites which are the subject of separate planning applications. How will implementation be managed, how is it envisaged that the site will be phased and how would a high-quality comprehensive development be achieved?</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.9 How has the limited capacity of the local sewage infrastructure been considered? Should the occupation of the site be phased?</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.10 What impact will the development have on the settlement identity of Warsash and Locks Heath?</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.11 What are the infrastructure needs of the proposal and how will they be provided?</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1. MATTER 6 – HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

### *General*

#### **1.1 What status do the Framework Plans have? How have the plans been drawn up? What is the justification for schemes 'according with' the Framework Plan? Is this too inflexible? Should they 'have regard' to them instead?**

1.1.1 This response relates to Policy HA1 'North and South of Greenaway Lane'. Bargate Homes control land south of Greenaway Lane, as set out in detail in our Local Plan representations, dated July 2021, and summarised below.

1.1.2 The requirement to 'accord with' the Framework Plan is too prescriptive and fails to allow for flexibility should further site constraints or opportunities be identified as part of the preparation of detailed proposals.

1.1.3 We note that the New Forest District Local Plan Part 1, adopted in July 2020, includes text setting out the approach to the use of such plans and we suggest that similar such wording is introduced to clarify the status and function of the Framework Plans. Paragraphs 9.30 and 9.31 of the NFDC Local Plan include the following wording:

1.1.4 *"The Site Concept Master Plans are illustrative rather than prescriptive requirements... ..The layouts and details of development proposals will be subject to further consideration and discussion as sites come forward through the planning application process, including in pre-application discussions."*

1.1.5 The suggestion of using the wording that schemes should 'have regard' to the Framework Plans is welcomed and supported.

***All Allocations***

**1.6 Are the sites allocated for housing in Policies FTC3-9, HA1-HA56 and BL1 soundly based; are the site-specific requirements set out in the relevant policies justified and effective and is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and deliverable in the timescales indicated in the Council's trajectory?**

1.6.1 Bargate Homes control three parcels of land to the south of Greenaway Lane. Outline planning permission has been granted for up to 100 dwellings on the northern parcel 'Land South of Greenaway Lane' (adjacent to 125 Greenaway Lane) ref. P/17/0752/OA and for up to 140 dwellings on the southern parcel 'Land East of Brook Lane and North of Warsash Road' ref. P/19/0402/OA. The central parcel 'Land East of Brook Lane and West of Lockswood Road' benefits from a resolution to grant outline planning permission for up to 157 dwellings, ref. P/17/0998/OA (our client controls all but the easternmost part of the outline application site).

1.6.2 Since our previous representations, reserved matters have been approved for 76 dwellings as a first phase of development on the southern parcel on 16th February 2022 (ref. P/21/0300/RM) and a reserved matters application for 42 dwellings as a second phase has been submitted, and is with the Council for determination (ref. P/21/2019/RM). A reserved matters application for 81 dwellings on the northern parcel has also since been submitted and is pending determination (ref. P/21/1780/RM). A detailed application for circa. 126 dwellings on the remaining central parcel will be submitted later this year, taking the total number of dwellings across land in Bargate Homes' control to 325.

1.6.3 Bargate Homes consider that site HA1 is soundly based. It is positively prepared in that it contributes to meeting the area's objectively assessed housing need. It is justified in that appropriate evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the site is a sustainable location for development when considered against reasonable alternatives. It is effective in that it is deliverable over the plan period. This is demonstrated by the progress that has already been made in granting planning permissions across the allocation. It is also consistent with national policy in that it will deliver sustainable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

1.6.4 However, Bargate Homes do have concerns that some of the site-specific requirements are unjustified or ineffective. Our previous representations,

dated July 2021, set out in detail the reasons for our concerns and propose alternative wording for site-specific requirements b), f), g) and j).

- 1.6.5 Requirement b), which deals with highway access points, should be reworded so as to recognise that planning permission has already been granted for a vehicular site access from Greenaway Lane serving up to 100 dwellings (ref. P/17/0752/OA), and to accord with the Framework Plan which shows a 'principal vehicular access' from Greenaway Lane .
- 1.6.6 Requirement f), which deals with building heights, should be reworded to allow for some elements of three storey development to be provided on the allocation site, provided they are located sensitively in the central parts of the site and setback from the site boundaries. This is consistent with the recently approved reserved matters application for up to 76 dwellings on the southern portion of the allocation (ref. P/21/0300/RM), which includes a central three storey apartment block, and with the requirement for the efficient use of land as set out in the NPPF.
- 1.6.7 Requirement g) requires all trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order to be retained. This is not appropriate and is not justified, particularly in light of the vehicular link required through TPO woodland in the southern most portion of the allocation, which now benefits from planning permission.
- 1.6.8 It is also possible that cases may arise where it is necessary to remove a tree even if it is subject to a TPO, for example if the tree is no longer in a good condition or if it poses a health and safety risk in the future. The wording of this site-specific requirement should be amended as set out in our previous representations.
- 1.6.9 Requirement j) implies that financial contributions will definitely be required. This wording should be amended to provide more flexibility, in the event that it is agreed between the relevant parties that contributions are not in fact required in relation to one or more of the matters referred to.
- 1.6.10 In particular, the reference to health contributions should be deleted. The Council has determined that requests for such contributions from the NHS Trust do not meet the tests for planning obligations, as set out in the Committee report for application P/19/0402/OA 'Land South of Greenaway Lane' and as such does not form part of the S106 Agreements associated with

that permission of any other planning permissions for our client's land interests.

- 1.6.11 The requirement for the provision of two junior football pitches on-site should also be deleted. There are no requirements for the provision of on-site sports pitches within the relevant S106 Agreements relating to our client's sites. The provision of sports pitches in this location is not appropriate, particularly having regard to the likely noise and traffic implications associated with this use, as well as the presumed need for a complementary pavilion.
- 1.6.12 In terms of the requirement to provide off-site improvements to existing sports facilities, this is also inconsistent with the financial contributions that have been agreed as part of the S106 Agreements associated with the planning permissions for our client's land interests and this requirement has not been raised by the Council as part of this process. The wording of site-specific requirement j) should therefore be amended to provide more flexibility, as set out in our previous representations.

---

***HA1 North and South of Greenaway Lane***

**1.7 How has the indicative yield been determined?**

- 1.7.1 This question is for the Council to answer. However, we note that the yield of 824 dwellings across the allocation equates to a density of 24.6 dph. The average density of development proposed across the land under Bargate Homes' control is approximately 23.1 dph and is therefore broadly consistent with the average density proposed by the Council. The Bargate Homes proposals also broadly accord with the Council's Indicative Framework Plan, and include a wide central green corridor and wildlife buffers.
- 1.7.2 The indicative yield therefore appears to be appropriate and consistent with the density of development coming forward as part of detailed applications at the allocation site.

**1.8 This allocation consists of a number of smaller sites which are the subject of separate planning applications. How will implementation be managed, how is it envisaged that the site will be phased and how would a high-quality comprehensive development be achieved?**

1.8.1 Bargate Homes control the majority of the land to the south of Greenaway Lane and anticipate delivering approximately 325 dwellings across that land. Bargate Homes will bring forward their parts of the allocation in phases. This is likely to be in four separate phases ranging from approximately 42 to 125 dwellings, to be implemented between 2021 and 2026.

1.8.2 Each of the outline planning permissions has planning obligations secured by S106 Agreement requiring access and open space linkages between the sites to ensure a comprehensive and joined up approach.

1.8.3 Bargate Homes have designed the development proposed as part of their individual planning applications to facilitate this comprehensive approach and allow for a broad consistency of design and materials resulting in a high quality development. They are also committed to working with the promoters of adjacent land to enable connections as appropriate.



**1.9 How has the limited capacity of the local sewage infrastructure been considered? Should the occupation of the site be phased?**

1.9.1 As set out in response to the previous question, Bargate Homes will be phasing the delivery of development on land within their control.

1.9.2 We note that Southern Water has not raised any objections to the various planning applications relating to land under Bargate Homes' control.

**1.10 What impact will the development have on the settlement identity of Warsash and Locks Heath?**

1.10.1 Much of the allocation site has previously been developed as part of the historic horticultural use of the land. It is also largely surrounded by existing development. Whilst there will inevitably be an impact upon the settlement identity of Warsash and Locks Heath, this is considered to be limited and acceptable in helping to meet the area's objectively assessed housing need.

**1.11 What are the infrastructure needs of the proposal and how will they be provided?**

1.11.1 This question is for the Council to answer. However, S106 Agreements relating to various approved planning applications across the allocation site have secured the provision of education, open space and off-site highway improvements. This includes significant contributions towards four junction improvements to approaches to and from the A27, as well as towards investments at Sarisbury Infant and Junior Schools / Hook with Warsash Primary School / Brookfield Secondary School.