

Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 2 Examination Statement - Issue 2 The Existing Settlements

October 2014

Examination Reference: DREP413 – Persimmon
Homes (South Coast)

Turley

1. Issue 2: The Existing Settlements

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 Burrridge justified?

What part of the Plan is unsound?

- 1.1 Persimmon Homes (PH) considers that the LP2 is unsound as it has not been positively prepared or justified against reasonable alternatives by the Council not having carried out the settlement boundary review.

Which soundness criterion it fails?

- 1.2 LP2 fails the positively prepared and justified tests of soundness.

Why it fails

- 1.3 A reasonable alternative in respect of this question would have been for the Council to have undertaken a comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to ensure that the most suitable and deliverable sites can be identified and taken forward as allocations in LP2.

- 1.4 The need for a settlement boundary review was always envisaged in the Core Strategy as being an absolute requirement to inform LP2 but it has not been undertaken. To emphasise this, the commitment to carrying out this review is stipulated in the following paragraphs of the Core Strategy:

- 1.5 Paragraph 1.3 states:

"The Site Allocations and Development Management DPD will include details of proposed land use designations and review settlement boundaries across the remainder of the Borough including Fareham (outside the Town Centre AAP area), the Western Wards, Whiteley, Portchester, Stubbington & Hill Head and Titchfield."

- 1.6 Paragraph 5.18 states:

"The boundaries of the settlements will be reviewed within the Site Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document."

- 1.7 Paragraph 5.27 states:

"The Site Allocations and Development Management DPD will include details of proposed land use designations and review settlement boundaries in Fareham (outside the Town Centre Area Action plan area)."

- 1.8 Paragraph 5.39 states:

“The Site Allocations and Development Management DPD will include details of proposed land use designations and review settlement boundaries in the Western Wards and Whiteley.”

1.9 Paragraph 5.146 states:

“A review of the settlement boundaries will be undertaken in the Site Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document.”

1.10 It is evident from this that the Core Strategy is unequivocal that the Council will (not may) review settlement boundaries in the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. This has not been undertaken and therefore on this point alone LP2 is not in conformity with the Core Strategy.

1.11 PH contend that the failure to undertake a settlement boundary review is a fundamental flaw in LP2 and the Council cannot therefore claim that the site’s proposed for allocation are the most suitable or justified against reasonable alternatives sites that may exist adjacent to settlement boundaries. For example, PH’s interests on Land South of Oakcroft Lane is one such opportunity that is suitable for housing development yet currently constrained from coming forward by the Council’s proposed policy approach set out in LP2.

1.12 It is also evident that the suite of documents that together will form the Fareham Local Plan will not meet the Core Strategy housing requirement over the plan period to 2026. In this context there are no grounds to support the Council’s decision to not undertake the settlement boundary review as envisaged by the Core Strategy.

1.13 In this context, it is clear that LP2 has not been positively prepared or justified when considered against the reasonable alternatives, which as the very minimum should have been to carry out the settlement boundary review to consider greenfield opportunities such as PH’s interests at Land South of Oakcroft lane to assist in boosting significantly the supply of housing as required by the NPPF.

How can the plan be made sound?

1.14 PH request that the Council commit to an immediate review of the Core Strategy and allocate more land in LP2 that currently proposed to address issues with shortfall and objectively assessed needs set out in further detail their responses to Issues 1 and 7.

The precise change and / or wording that you are seeking.

1.15 Allocation of PH’s interests at Land South of Oakcroft Lane for 200 homes.

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?

1.16 Given the PH’s comments on the fundamental flaws in the Council’s approach to meeting the Core Strategy’s housing requirements set out in the Issue 1 and Issue 7 statements, we contend that a far more detailed review of the Strategic Gaps should have been undertaken.

- 1.17 It is clear that more land needs to be made available to boost significantly housing supply in Fareham. The Strategic Gap review should therefore have been undertaken in this context and at the same time as a comprehensive settlement boundary review to identify further opportunities for suitable sites that can be brought forward to boost significantly the supply of housing in the Borough.

Turley