



**MATTER 11**  
**EUROPEAN PROPERTY VENTURES**  
**(NORTH HANTS)**  
**REPRESENTOR 164**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE**



**This Statement for Matter 11 will seek to address the Inspector's Questions identified below:**

Is the Plan based on a sound understanding of infrastructure requirements and their delivery?  
Is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan robust?

**Policy I1**

- Is Policy I1 consistent with national policy, insofar, that it requires all developments to make provision for infrastructure, including tariff style planning obligations?

To be effective and consistent with national policy, should Policy I1 refer to financial viability?

**Policy I2**

- The Government's Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 029 Reference ID: 8-029-20160211) sets out that: 'Local Plans should identify the strategic location of existing and proposed green infrastructure networks...'. Does the Plan fulfil this requirement?
- For the Plan to be effective should the existing Green Infrastructure network be illustrated on the Policies map?

**Policy I3**

- Is Policy I3 justified, effective and in accordance with national policy?
- Is the Transport Assessment supporting the Plan robust?
- Can the Plan be delivered without causing significant harm to the highway network, including Junction 4a of the M3?

**Policy I4**

- Is the Hart Open Space Study, 2016 based on robust evidence?
- Has Policy I4 been subject to a robust consideration of viability?
- Is Policy I4 consistent with national policy, insofar, that it requires all developments to make provision for open space (tariff style planning obligation)?
- Are each of the standards set out in Table 2 justified and in accordance with national policy and relevant guidance?
- Is the reference to 'sites per 1,000 head of population' in Table 2 effective? Is it clear what would be required of a development?
- Is the Plan sufficiently clear when an off-site contribution might be considered appropriate?
- To be effective should Policy I4 refer to the need for open space or other facilities to be connected to sustainable travel routes?
- To be effective, should Policy I4 refer to the expansion of schools on to play fields?
- Is the requirement for natural / semi-natural greenspace in addition to SANG requirement within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Zone justified?

**Policy I5**

- Is criterion ii at the end of Policy I5 justified?



- Is Policy 15 justified and consistent with national policy?

***Policy 16***

- Is Policy 16 justified and consistent with national policy? Is there a need to refer to viability?

***Policy 17***

- Is Policy 17 effective and justified?
- Is the proposed flood alleviation scheme deliverable?

***Policy 18***

- Is Policy 18 effective, justified and consistent with national policy?



## **Matter 11 – Infrastructure**

### **Introduction**

1. Claremont Planning Consultancy Ltd previously provided responses to the Council's emerging Local Plan on behalf of European Property (North Hampshire) Ltd (EPV) to seek to boost housing requirements and recognise the need to ensure housing delivery within the District of Hart.
2. It should not be underestimated that development contributes to the enablement and provision of infrastructure investment via the mechanism of developer contributions through Section 106 agreements. However, to ensure that the objectives of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Local Plan must ensure that it can execute a practical and deliverable development strategy. A robustly deliverable Plan will ensure that the requisite infrastructure can be provided within the District to support the essential growth to the meet the identified need of the Plan area.
3. Claremont Planning are of the mind that the Plan is not sound and does not meet the legal requirements that demonstrate a well and positively made Local Plan. Given that the Plan has acknowledged that it has pursued a lower housing delivery rate than is necessary and that is in contradiction with the HMA and National Policy, it is advanced that the Plan will not have the ability to secure the delivery of the infrastructure as identified in the Delivery Plan.

### **Infrastructure Provision and the Development Strategy**

4. The emerging Development Strategy is ineffective in ensuring the delivery of infrastructure that can support the growth of the District. This is of a further issue given that the need that has been brought forward into the Plan is of the lower identified figure arising from the HMA and as such, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not been provided a robust delivery framework to ensure its realisation.
5. As such, the overall strategy to both progress the development of homes in the District alongside that of supporting infrastructure cannot be justified given that the strategy is not compliant with national guidance where it is stressed that authorities must attempt to maximise their housing numbers beyond a minimal target. The LPA has therefore inappropriately pursued this figure which has unjustifiably resulted in the preference for larger sites to come forward to contribute towards the delivery of the required infrastructure to support this obligatory growth within the District.
6. The Plan's failure in accordingly relating the delivery of appropriate infrastructure with the development strategy results in the Plan overly relying on the delivery of strategic sites to ensure satisfactory realisation of Infrastructure. By removing sites at the middle strategic level, such as draft allocation SC5 at Yateley, the Plan has undermined its ability in achieving its objectives of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is advanced therefore, that the Plan's approach to infrastructure delivery is unsound and will not be able to meet its requirements over the Plan period. In turn, this will have a negative affect on the Council's ability to meet its statutory requirements and oversee sustainable growth of its district. It is pertinent that no new SANG is proposed at Yateley and yet the Council have identified it as an area of infrastructure that is in deficit.



7. Particular to this is the IDP's delivery of 5.1Ha of SANG at Moulsham Lane through a S106 Agreement for an appeal site – with no other SANG identified for delivery at Yateley. This is despite the recognised needs of the Town for SANG and the Moulsham Lane SANG serving the appeal scheme with little capacity to provide further mitigation for future development. The Plan's failure to identify further SANG provision at Yateley/Eversley and restrict infrastructure and housing provision by such limitation, will inhibit infrastructure and sustainable housing delivery over the plan period and beyond. The restriction of growth at Yateley is therefore unjustified and contrary to the objectives of the NPPF.

#### **Site Allocation and Delivery**

8. Allocations of sites across scales is fundamental in maximising the assurance of site delivery, given that sites at varying scales provide the delivery guarantee that an LPA requires to ensure a satisfactory level of growth that can both contribute to a robust housing land supply as well as enablement of requisite infrastructure delivery. At present, the improper strategy that has been brought forward into the emerging Plan is unable to realise the appropriate infrastructure provision that is identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. As such, the unjustified approach that has been adopted by the Plan renders it unsound given that it will be unable to both achieve its objectives of growth as well as infrastructure provision.
9. The site under control by EPV demonstrates development that will be able to meet the policy requirements of infrastructure provision in terms of establishment of GI through SANG as well as developer contributions to ensure that the growth at Yateley continues to be sustainable. The removal of this site, previously labelled as draft allocation SC5, results in the failure of the Plan to identify suitable sites for development that are able to contribute towards the Infrastructure Delivery Plan of the emerging Plan. The removal of this site from the Plan demonstrates that the LPA has selected an incorrect approach in achieving development in the District and establishes a preference of development that will not be able to achieve the infrastructure requirements identified as within the Delivery Plan.
10. The reliance of the Plan on windfall development and Neighbourhood Plan allocations cannot underpin the Infrastructure Delivery Plan given that they are not of a strategic level to contribute towards the provision of the infrastructure in the LPA. For example, Neighbourhood Plan allocations are designed to achieve development to meet local need arising within the Parish area, rather than to meet the need of the wider context of the District. Therefore, the development of such allocations will only look to contribute towards the provision of supporting infrastructure within the Parish rather across the entire District. This is also true of windfall developments, which are likely to be small scale developments which even cumulatively will not result in strategic investment that is applicable spatially across the District nor temporally, across the Plan period.

#### **Alternative Strategy and Achieving the Requisite Infrastructure Provision**

11. On behalf EPV, Claremont Planning identifies that the emerging plan and its strategic approach to delivering development is unsound. The failure of the plan to distribute development in accordance with the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework and the documented evidence base means that the resulting plan is ineffective and fails to meet the test for legal compliance given that it is not positively prepared to ensure the delivery of the required infrastructure across the District. Through these representations the failings of the proposed strategic approach are identified, specifically in respect of the over-reliance upon approved



windfall developments and large strategic growth proposals to deliver a consistent level of development delivery over the life of the plan period.

12. The EPV owned site at Eversley Road (SHLAA 273-272 and draft allocation SC5) is ideally located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. A series of technical reports were prepared supporting development at this location including ecological surveys by the Council's consultants. The development would result in a logical expansion to the town to the west, the only area that can accommodate growth due to the restrictions caused by flooding and Thames Basin Heath SPA at all other locations.
13. The SC5 site was previously a draft allocation in the regulation 18 consultation draft and was therefore previously considered suitable for development. This allocation was proposed following considerable discussions between Claremont, EPV and East Hants LPA who were the acting Planning Policy Officers for Hart DC at the time. However, it is maintained that the switch back to Policy Officers of Hart DC is the reasoning for its de-allocation and the failure to identify SANG for designation at Yateley; not the unsuitability of the site or inappropriateness of growth at Yateley. This does not advance any measure of the plan policy being positively prepared and seeking logical resolutions to recognised issues, such as the impact on the SPA and the need for SANG to be provided for the plan period at Yateley. A series of consultant reports were previously prepared by the Council supporting development at this location and recognising that it was more suitable for residential development than SANG or landscape break, a matter that has been overlooked whilst the LPA has pursued the plan forward.
14. The development of the EPV site SC5 – Eversley Road would result in a logical western expansion of the town and is the only area that can accommodate growth due to the restrictions caused by flooding and Thames Basin Heath SPA at all other locations. It was unjustified to remove this site from the draft allocations when the Local Plan is suggesting a restricted number of new homes across the plan period and not meeting the expectations for a long-term environmental strategy. The Local Plan proposes a low number of homes to be delivered to 2032 at existing settlements, although recognising that future requirements will be of a much higher level sufficient to justify a new settlement. The Council are therefore acknowledging that more houses are required than they suggest but they have no definitive plans for this 'New Settlement' and yet they have deleted a highly sustainable draft allocation for at least 100 dwellings at Yateley. This results in an illogical and ineffective strategy.
15. To ensure that the policies regarding the delivery of infrastructure are sound, the Plan must shift its position on the strategy and distribution of development within the LPA area. At present, whilst the Plan over relies on the delivery of sites at the top and bottom of the spatial scale, the Council is unable to ensure that enabling development can be provided to ensure that infrastructure can be realised within the District to support the aspired growth of the Council. Given that the site at Yateley is able to provide a circular recreational route through open space, alongside links to nearby promoted SANG areas, the development of 100 homes at the site is clearly deliverable whilst providing mitigation by way of the provision of SANG. The development of the site can therefore demonstrates satisfactory provision of SANG that is compliant with policies I4 and I2, as well as able to demonstrate the objectives of sustainable development, the LPA should follow this preference to ensure satisfactory development to underpin the vision of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.



16. Claremont Planning therefore request that the policy is amended to include all criteria set out by Natural England, which clearly states that 2ha is a sufficient space for SANG to operate successfully and that SANG is able to be provided privately to serve the needs of unrelated development. The SC5 site could deliver a highly sustainable form of development with onsite open space linkages and S106 funding to contribute to the provision of a wider strategic SANG within the Eversley Gap, so the SANG could therefore act as a buffer preventing any perceived coalescence of settlements.
17. It is suggested that the EPV site at Eversley Road is reinstated as a housing land allocation which can come forward for development sooner than a proposed new settlement on land that is yet to be identified and acquired and therefore it seems unrealistic to assume the new settlement can be delivered in the next 5 years. The SANG proposed in the masterplan meets with the requirements of Natural England and our client is considering the possibility of providing additional SANG on an adjoining site.
18. Claremont Planning have demonstrated that the plan cannot be found effective, sound or legally compliant without further modification given the inadequacies surrounding the identification of strategic growth locations and the lack of robust evidence to suggest that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and its supporting policies can be effectively realised.

**Word count: 1,968 words**