



**FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN PART 2
DEVELOPMENT SITES AND POLICIES PLAN**

ISSUE 2: THE EXISTING SETTLEMENTS (DSP22-DSP26)

REPRESENTATION DREP 406

LAND AT OLD MANOR CROFTON

FOR MR AND MRS J ROUGHTON-BENTLEY

Prepared By:

Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd

*Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd
The Gallery
3 South Street
Titchfield
Hampshire
PO14 4DL*

October 2014

Caroline Jezeph of Bryan Jezeph Consultancy for Mr and Mrs Roughton-Bentley

1.0 Response to Inspector's Question 2.1

Why have the defined urban settlement boundaries not been subject to review, for example as anticipated for Fareham in paragraph 5.27 of the Core Strategy? Does the Council's approach reflect the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Is the lack of a settlement boundary for BurrIDGE justified?

1.1 Whilst paragraph 5.27 of the Core Strategy may anticipate that there will be a review of the settlement boundaries paragraph 5.146 of the Core Strategy is more explicit. It states:-

A review of the settlement boundaries will be undertaken in the site allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document.

1.2 This undertaking of the Core Strategy has been ignored by the LPP2 on the grounds that there is sufficient land already allocated. It is disputed that there are sufficient identified sites within LPP2 and the Council should be required to both review the urban settlement boundary and allocate more sites for development.

1.3 The urban settlement boundary defines the urban area from the countryside. As far as possible the urban settlement boundary should provide an accurate representation of the separation of urban area from countryside. Since the last review of the boundary in 2000 it is inevitable that the urban boundary has changed. Developments have taken place that are now outside the previously defined boundary and the boundary should now be amended to include these developments.

2.0 Response to Inspector's Question 2.2

Is the review of Strategic Gap boundaries sufficiently robust? Have the appropriate criteria been used in the assessment? Were proposed road schemes taken into account?

2.1 It appears to me that the Review of the boundaries was not robust because it was not sufficiently detailed in its examination. The Review was required to address the provisions of CS22, as detailed in paragraph 3.11 of the LPP2.

2.2 Paragraph 3.12 of LPP2 explains that the Review focussed on a survey and analysis of areas outside the defined urban settlement boundaries. It appears that these boundaries were accepted without consideration of whether they are an appropriate edge to the Strategic Gaps.

- 2.3 The Strategic Gaps boundaries do not appear to be sufficiently sensitive to development which is on the periphery of settlements but not currently within the urban settlement boundary.
- 2.4 The boundaries of the Strategic Gap should be reviewed to ensure that they are more sensitively and accurately defined. Should further land be designated for development then this will also call for revisions to the Strategic Gap boundaries
- 3.0 **Land at the Old Manor Crofton**
- 3.1 The land at Old Manor Crofton and at Farm House Close provides an example of where both the urban settlement boundary and the Strategic Gap are inappropriately drawn and require amendment.